Historic Biological Reports Scan Control Sheet

County Project Number(s):	TT-5155
Report Type (check one): Initial Study Species Inventory/Survey Focused Study EIR Draft EIR EIS ND MND MND Other	
Report Date (Month/Day/Year):	07/11/1998
Check if the following apply to the Wetland and/or aquatic habitat	e report:
☐ Within designated Coastal Zone	
☐ Potential movement corridor for	fish and/or wildlife

Tree Report

Site:

Tentative Tract 5155

Moorpark Home Acres, California

Prepared for:

Attention: Wayne Colmer
Colmer Development Company
5000 Parkway Calabasas, Suite 110
Calabasas, California 91302

Prepared by:

Kay J. Carlson, I.S.A.
Certified Arborist WC-1140
284 Valley Gate Road
Simi Valley, California 93065
(805) 577-8432

Date:

July 11, 1998

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
SCOPE OF WORK	, 1
TREE CHARACTERISTICS	2
TREE HEALTH	2
IMPACT ANALYSIS	3
GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS	4
WORK WITHIN THE PROTECTED ZONE	5
WORK OUTSIDE OF THE PROTECTED ZONE	5
GRADE CHANGES	5
INSPECTION	5
WARRANTY	6
APPENDIX A - FIELD EVALUATION FORMS	7
APPENDIX B - PHOTOGRAPHS	32
APPENDIX C. TREE I OCATION MAP	40

Tree Report

Tentative Tract 5155 Moorpark Home Acres, California

INTRODUCTION

This report was prepared at the request of Mr. Wayne Colmer of the Colmer Development Company. The site is located at the northwest corner of Citrus Drive and Ternez Drive in the unincorporated Moorpark Home Acres area in the County of Ventura. Mr. Colmer desires to create a ten (10) lot subdivision at the subject site. A Tentative Tract Map was prepared for the project by Peak Surveys, Inc. The proposed plan will impact a number of native and non-native trees that are protected by the Tree Protection Regulations of the County of Ventura. A significant number of additional trees exist on the site, however they are of smaller size and are therefore not covered by the ordinance.

This report was prepared in accordance with Tree Protection Regulations Section 8107-25 and the Tree Protection Guidelines of the County of Ventura, relating to the conservation of native, historical and heritage trees. Such trees within the County of Ventura are recognized as significant aesthetic, biological, cultural, historical and ecological resources. It is the intent of the Tree Protection Regulations to encourage responsible management of these resources. The report also reflects the standards of the International Society of Arboriculture.

SCOPE OF WORK

The scope of work included a full ground field observation of the cultural and physical conditions of twenty-four (24) trees. Each tree was tagged with a round aluminum tag, stamped with the tree number and affixed to the tree on the north side. Pertinent data was recorded on the Field Evaluation Forms included in Appendix A. Photographs for reference and record purposes are included in Appendix B. A Tree Location Map that depicts the layout of the proposed tract is included in Appendix C. As previously mentioned, the survey and proposed grading plan were prepared by Peak Surveys, Inc. All information provided by the preparer is certified by the preparer to be true and correct as of the date of the field observations.

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

The subject trees are located as shown on the Tree Location Map contained in Appendix C. The species distribution is as follows:

SPECIES	QUANTITY
Eucalyptus globulus	7
Eucalyptus leucoxylon	1
Fraxinus velutina glabra 'Modesto'	2
Juniperus spp.	1
Phoenix canariensis	1
Pinus halepensis	9
Sambucus mexicana	. 1
Schinus molle	. 2
TOTAL	24

The property is presently a partially developed residential lot within an existing tract. Detailed information with respect to diameter, height, canopy dimensions, form, crown class, and pruning history is provided for each tree on the Field Evaluation Forms in Appendix A.

TREE HEALTH

The trees exhibit varying qualities with respect to foliage color, epicormics, twig dieback, foliage density, leaf size, annual shoot growth, woundwood development, and vigor. Existing curbs and/or pavement provide a growth obstruction for some of the trees. No major pests or diseases were observed. Details are provided in the Field Evaluation Forms contained in Appendix A.

Specific comments of interest are as follows:

Tree Numbers 3 and 6 - These Aleppo Pines have barbed wire embedded in the trunk.

<u>Tree Number 11</u> - This Aleppo Pine has a small infestation of mistletoe.

<u>Tree Numbers 12 and 13</u> - These Modesto Ashes are growing within a planter that is too small for a tree of this species. Ash Anthracnose is visible on the leaves.

<u>Tree Number 14</u> - This Blue Gum was previously topped. The present trunks appear to be re-growth and may have weak attachments.

<u>Tree Number 18</u> - The branches of this Blue Gum interfere with those of the tree on the west side.

IMPACT ANALYSIS

Specific impacts to each tree as a result of the proposed site development are as follows:

<u>Tree Number 1</u> - As shown on the Tree Location Map, proposed grading for Lot 1 will require removal of this tree. A cut slope is proposed within three feet (3') of the center of the tree and approximately thirty-seven percent (37%) of the protected zone will be impacted. The cross-sectional area of this tree is 13.3 square inches.

<u>Tree Numbers 2, 3, 4, and 5</u> - As shown on the Tree Location Map, proposed grading for Lot 8 is minor within this area. A minor cut is proposed to create the pad. However, since the trees are located outside of the proposed building envelope, minor field adjustments to the grading will allow the trees to remain in place. The cross-sectional areas of Tree Numbers 2, 3, 4, and 5 are 309.3, 176.6, 132.7, and 132.7 square inches, respectively.

<u>Tree Numbers 12 and 13</u> - As shown on the Tree Location Map, the proposed building envelope for Lot 9 will likely require removal of these trees. As previously discussed, the trees are located within existing improvements that would need to be removed in order to create the new lot. The cross-sectional areas of Tree Numbers 12 and 13 are 78.5 and 266.9 square inches, respectively.

<u>Tree Number 14</u> - As shown on the Tree Location Map, proposed grading for Lot 1 will require removal of this tree. A cut slope is proposed within three feet (3') of the center of the tree and approximately fifty-four percent (54%) of the protected zone will be impacted. The cross-sectional area of this tree is 1,290.5 square inches.

<u>Tree Number 15</u> - As shown on the Tree Location Map, proposed grading for Lot 1 will encroach within the protected zone of this tree. A cut slope is proposed within eight feet (8') of the center of the tree and approximately thirty-three percent (33%) of the protected zone will be impacted. Excavation should be performed with hand tools in this area to protect the root zone to the extent possible. The cross-sectional area of this tree is 788.9 square inches.

<u>Tree Number 16</u> - As shown on the Tree Location Map, proposed grading for Lot 1 will require removal of this tree. A fill slope is proposed at the tree location. The cross-sectional area of this tree is 2,449.2 square inches.

Tree Numbers 17, 18 and 19 - As shown on the Tree Location Map, proposed grading for Lot 6 will require removal of these trees. A cut slope is proposed within six feet (6') of the center of each tree and well over fifty percent (50%) of the protected zone of each tree will be impacted. The cross-sectional areas of Tree Numbers 17, 18 and 19 are 754.4, 543.2 and 754.4 square inches, respectively.

<u>Tree Number 20</u> - As shown on the Tree Location Map, proposed grading for Lot 6 will encroach within the protected zone of this tree. A fill slope is proposed within seventeen feet (17') of the center of the tree and approximately four percent (4%) of the protected zone will be impacted. The cross-sectional area of this tree is 1,194.0 square inches.

<u>Tree Number 21</u> - As shown on the Tree Location Map, this tree should not be impacted by the proposed development. The cross-sectional area of this tree is 565.2 square inches.

<u>Tree Number 22</u> - As shown on the Tree Location Map, proposed grading for Lot 8 is minor within this area. A minor cut is proposed to create the pad. However, since the tree is located outside of the proposed building envelope, minor field adjustments to the grading will allow the tree to remain in place. The cross-sectional area of this tree is approximately 1,017.4 square inches.

<u>Tree Number 23</u> - As shown on the Tree Location Map, proposed grading for Lot 9 will require removal of this tree. A fill of approximately eight feet (8') is proposed at this location to create the pad. The cross-sectional area of this tree is 317.1 square inches.

<u>Tree Number 24</u> - As shown on the Tree Location Map, proposed grading for Lot 10 will require removal of this tree. A slope is proposed at this location to create the pad. The cross-sectional area of this tree is 834.5 square inches.

If it were desired that more of the subject trees be preserved on the site, grading adjustments would be required. The pad sizes and/or building envelopes would decrease to allow for fewer disturbances around the subject trees.

Utility runs should be routed outside of the protected zone of each tree to remain. Any construction within the protected zone of any of the trees to remain should be performed with hand tools only. Grade changes should be minimized to the maximum extent possible. Construction materials and vehicles must be kept outside of the protected zone of the trees at all times, unless required for the approved improvements.

Prior to the start of any construction, each tree to be preserved should be fenced at the protected zone in accordance with the standards of the County of Ventura.

Following completion, the area beneath the dripline of each tree should be covered with three inches (3") of an organic mulch to the extent possible. The mulch should be maintained several inches from the trunk.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The following general recommendations should be followed to establish and maintain a healthy cultural environment for trees. It must be understood that these recommendations apply to trees in general; specific questions should always be referred to the tree consultant.

WORK WITHIN THE PROTECTED ZONE

The protected zone is an area surrounding a tree, usually defined by local ordinance. It typically includes all area within the dripline of the tree, plus five feet beyond the dripline. This distance must generally be no less than fifteen feet from the trunk. Given the high sensitivity of trees, great care must be taken when work is conducted within the protected zone. Specifically:

Observation — All work conducted within the protected zone of a tree should be performed within the presence of a qualified tree consultant. Usually this work will also require a permit from the local government. This will help to insure that work is performed in a manner that will not harm a tree.

<u>Notice</u> -- Forty-eight hours notice should be provided to the tree consultant prior to the planned start of work. This notification must usually be provided to the local government also. The notice will insure that the project receives the highest possible scheduling priority and avoid delays.

<u>Hand Tools</u> -- All work should be accomplished with the use of hand tools only. Except under special circumstances, tractors, backhoes and other vehicles cannot be operated in a manner that will preserve major tree roots, minimize soil compaction, and insure the safety of both the vehicle operator and the tree.

<u>Certification</u> -- All work conducted within the protected zone should be certified by a qualified tree consultant. For work performed under a permit, this may be a requirement of the local government.

WORK OUTSIDE OF THE PROTECTED ZONE

To protect trees within the vicinity of major construction, trees should be temporarily fenced at the edge of the protected zone prior to the beginning of construction operations on a site. The fence should be constructed of chain link material, a minimum of five feet in height. The tree consultant should be contacted to develop a fencing plan, generally required by local ordinance. The fence may be removed at the completion of the construction upon approval by the local government.

GRADE CHANGES

Any change to the grade at the root crown of a tree can have a negative impact. As little as six inches can lead to the death of the tree. Drainage patterns should be maintained to prevent water from flowing and ponding at the base of a tree. If fill soil exists, use a shovel to remove the excess soil. The flare at the root crown should just be visible.

INSPECTION

Mature trees should be inspected on a periodic basis by a qualified tree consultant. The inspection basis should be determined by the relative hazard value of the tree. For example, trees surrounding a high-use business should be inspected on a quarterly

basis, whereas trees located within a low-use open space might only require bi-annual inspection. It is the responsibility of the property owner to establish and implement an appropriate inspection schedule upon the recommendation provided by the tree consultant.

WARRANTY

The trees discussed herein were generally reviewed for physical, biological, functional, and aesthetic conditions. This examination was conducted in accordance with presently accepted industry procedures: an at-grade, macro-visual observation only. No extensive microbiological, soil/root excavation, upper crown examination, nor internal tree investigation was conducted and therefore, the reportings herein reflect the overall visual appearance of the trees on the date reviewed. No warranty is implied as to the potential failure, health or demise of any part or the whole of any tree described in this report.

Clients are advised that should physical or biological concerns be evidenced for any specimen within this report, prudent further investigation, detailed analysis or remedial action may be required.

As living organisms, plants continually exhibit growth and response to environmental changes that influence the development, health and vigor of the specimen. These influences may not be externally visible and may be present or develop over various time periods depending on the site conditions.

It is recommended that due to the general nature of plant development and continued environmental and physical influences on vegetation at a specific site, regular monitoring by a qualified arborist be scheduled.

Locations of property lines or exact tree locations, site amenities, structures or easements are assumed to be as illustrated on any enclosed maps. They are a composite of information provided by the client, records of fact and/or on-site field review. No investigation was made to verify these conditions.

This report represents the independent opinion of the preparer and was conducted per the client's scope of request. The report is therefore limited to the extent described herein.

APPENDIX A - FIELD EVALUATION FORMS

Owner:	□ public 🔀	orivate 🛮 un	known 🗆	other:		
Site/Address: 10729 Citrus Drive		Thomas	s Guide: P	age:	Coordinate	e:
Date: <u>Une 27,199</u> Inspector: <u>1/6</u>	Date of last in	· -			- -	-
TREE CHARACTERISTICS		······································			esplining energy	
Tree #: Species: Quercus egrifo	olia 🗆 Quercus	lobata Do	ther	mbucus	Mexicona	<u>, </u>
# of trunks: $\frac{7}{2}$ dbH (inches): $\frac{2,2,2}{2}$	2, 2, 1, 1			Heigt	nt (feet):	
	E SE	S	sw	W	NW	
Dripline (feet) 3 Z Clearance to canopy 6 5	8 5	[4	3	2	
Form: generally symmetric minor asymmetry	7 major saymma	to: Disturb	enmut C			
Crown class: dominant co-dominant dinterm			sprout L	ı ərağ-nead		
Age class: 12 young (F-semi-mature mature	, ,		a crown rat	io (conifer	e only)	az
		•		,	crown reduc	
Pruning history: ☐ crown cleaned ☐ excessively thin ☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/braced ☐ none ☐ multiple				•		nknown
Special Value: ☐ specimen ☐ heritage/historic ☐ w **Clindigenous ☐ protected by government agency	vildlife 🗆 unusi	ial 🗀 street	tree 🗆 sa	creen 🗆	shade	
TREE HEALTH			oga er og samme Kongresser Manageria			
Foliage color: Anormal	•	oundwood der				e
Epicormics? Y (N) Twig Dieback? (T) N		poor 🗆 none	*		• • •	
Foliage density: normal Disparse	Viç	jor class: 🗆 e	xcellent [⊒ average	紅fair 為	-poor
Leaf size: [] normal [S.small	=	owth obstruct				igns
Annual shoot growth: □ excellent □ average		cables	rb/pavemer	it □ guai	rds	
Major pests/diseases:	. –					
	erika inggarakan ke			7.00 to 10.00	en gepáratugjare.	
SITE CONDITIONS		** #				
Site character: residence commercial indus	strial 🗆 park	•	/			
Landscape type: ☐ parkway ☐ raised bed ☐ conta	iner 🗆 mound	□ lawn □	3 shrub bor	der 🛭 wi	nd break	•
Irrigation: ☐ none ☐ adequate ☐ inadequate ☐	excessive	unk wetted	Pavement	lifted? Y		
Recent site disturbance? Y	soil disturbance	☐ grade cha	inge 🗆 lir	ne clearing	☐ site clea	ring
% dripline paved: 0% 10-25% 25-50%	50-75% 75	-100%				
% dripline w/fill soil: 0% 10-25% 25-50%	50-75% 75	-100%	•			
% dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50%	50-75% 75	-100%	•			
Soil problems: ☐ drainage ☐ shallow ☐ compacted ☐ disease center ☐ history of failure ☐ clay ☐ ex	d □ droughty cpansive ☑ slo		⊒ alkaline ———°	□ acidic aspect	□ small vol	ime
Obstructions: ☐ lights ☐ signage ☐ line-of-sight ☐ adjacent vegetation ☐ other	□ view □ ov	erhead lines	undergro	ound utilities	s 🛘 traffic	<u> </u>
Exposure to wind: I single tree	□ above canopy	☐ recently e	xposed [3 windward	i, canopy edge	e
Prevailing wind direction: Occur	rrence of snow/i	ce storms: 💆	never 🗆	seldom .	☐ regularly	

TARGET		. - '		Section 1995 and 1995
Use Under Tree: ☐ buildi ☐ small features ☐ utili			creation ☐ landscape leads la	□ hardscape
Occupancy: □ occasiona	l use	e 🛘 frequent use 🗘	constant use	
TREE DEFECTS - No	* * *			en e
ROOT DEFECTS: Sus	pect root rot? Y/N M	ushroom/conk present?	Y N ID:	<u> </u>
Exposed roots: sever	e □ moderate □ low	Undermined: ☐ seve	ere 🛘 moderate 🗀 low	
Root pruned:	feet from trunk Root a	rea affected:%	Buttress wounded? You	M When:
			nt failure: 🗆 severe 🗀 mo	
			self-corrected Soil heav	
	-			
-		I N Soil Cracking?	N Lean severny: Li se	vere 🛘 moderate 🗘 low
Compounding factors: _	 	-		
CROWN DEFECTS: S =	severe, M = moderate, L =	= low	•	
DEFECT	ROOT CROWN	TRUNK	SCAFFOLDS	BRANCHES
Poor taper				
Bow, sweep	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Co-dominants, forks			T	
Multiple attachments				
Included bark				
Excessive end weight				
Cracks/splits				
Hangers				
Girdling				
Wounds/seam	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		<u> </u>	
Decay				
Cavity				
Conks/mushrooms				
Bleeding/sap flow			<u> </u>	
Loose/cracked bark	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<u> </u>		
Nesting hole/bee hive				
Deadwood/stubs				L-M
Borers/termites/ants	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Cankers/galls/burls Previous failure		<u> </u>		 [
Previous failure				
RECOMMENDED TR	EATMENT			。 1. 化乙基基基基子的2.00
Prune: □ remove defectiv □ restructure □ shape	re part □ reduce end w	eight D crown clean	☐ thin ☐ raise canopy	☐ crown reduce
Pest control:		Cable/Bra	ace:	
Other Activities: aerat	e soil		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	:
Inspect further: ☐ root co	rown 🗆 decay 🗀 aer	ial 19 monitor Remov	ve tree? Y Replace t	ree? YAP o action required at this time
Effect on adjacent trees:	: 🖸 none 🤝 evaluate	Notification: ☐ owner	☐ manager ☐ governing	g agency Date:
ADDITIONAL COMM	ENTS	e e njego en de sekt		
Photo # 1		तः कृतः व्यवकारितकपुरः है, अवक्रीतिक विकेति विकासक्षेत्रक्षिक	es l'emplement le le fight es se transféré le jui l'hall	er i transe sessionistanista produkti i i filozofi.

Owner:	public	E private	e 🗆 uni	known i	other:		
Site/Address:			Thomas	Guide:	Page:	Coord	inate:
Date: June 27, 1999 Inspector: 06.							
TREE CHARACTERISTICS			•	Ω,	· · · ·	#2 2.81	
Tree #: Species: □ Quercus agrif	olia 🗆 Que	rcus lobat	a Xoti	her \underline{Pil}	nus hale	<u>Neasis</u>	
# of trunks: 2 dbH (inches): 15,13						ht (feet): _	22
Compass direction N NE		E	S	sw	W	NW]
Dripline (feet) 14 14 Clearance to canopy 15 15		2	$\frac{\rho}{\rho}$	2	15	15	-}
Form: generally symmetric minor asymmetry	- 				2 stag-head		
Crown class: □ dominant □ co-dominant □ intern	•			opiou:	in day	104	
Age class: young semi-mature mature mature				crown ra	tio (conifer	s only):	95 %
Pruning history: ☐ crown cleaned ☐ excessively thin☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/braced ☐ none ☐ multiple	nned 🛭 top	ped 🗆	crown rais	sed 🗆 p	oliarded i	crown r	educed
Special Value: ☐ specimen ☐ heritage/historic ☐ indigenous ☐ protected by government agency	wildlife 🛚 u	nusual	□ street t	tree 🛚 :	screen 🔼	shade	
TREE HEALTH							
Foliage color: Ø normal □ chlorotic □ necrotic		•			: 🗆 exceller		erage
Epicormics? Y (b) Twig Dieback? Y (f)		□ poor		-		/	
Foliage density: 🗗 normal 🗆 sparse		Vigor cl	ass: 🗆 ex	ceilent	☐ average	72 fair	□ poor
Leaf size: normal small			obstructi			vire/ties	□ signs
Annual shoot growth: excellent severage	poor				ent 🗆 gua		
Major pests/diseases:							-
SITE CONDITIONS	garana kan di seggi di kacala Kanada kan di segarah kan	i en english	e esta gorda for a	1.0 es 3.00 - 5	e usubu ka jihat Kalendari	- John Holling St. John Co.	LANGE DESCRIPTION
Site character: 'É-residence □ commercial □ indu	ıstrial □ pa	_					
Landscape type: ☐ parkway ☐ raised bed ☐ cont							
_] excessive		•		t lifted? Y/	N)	
\sim \sim \sim] soil disturbar				ے line clearing	. 🗀 site	clearing
% dripline paved: 0% (10-25%) 25-50%	6 50-75%	75-1009	6				
% dripline w/fill soil: 0% 10-25% 25-50%	6 50-75%	75-1009	6	•		-	
% dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50%	6 50-75%	75-1009	6				
Soil problems: □ drainage □ shallow □ compacto □ disease center □ history of failure □ clay □ e	_	· -	saline C	alkaline	☐ acidic aspect	∕ smail	l volume
Obstructions: lights signage line-of-sight adjacent vegetation other	□ view □	overhea	d lines	underg	round utilitie	s 🗆 tra	ffic
Exposure to wind: I single tree below canopy I area prone to windthrow	☐ above can	ору 🗆 (recently ex	xposed	☐ windward	i, canopy	edge
Prevailing wind direction: N Occu	irrence of sn	ow/ice st	orms: 炬	never	□ seldom	□ regula	rly

FIELD EVALUATION	ON FORM - PAGE 2 C)F 2	Tree	Number 2
TARGET	and the second of the second o			
Use Under Tree: ☐ build: ☐ small features ☐ util	ing l⊅ parking Ø traffic ity lines Can target be mo	12 pedestrian ☐ rec oved? Y A Can use i	reation □ landscape be restricted? Y	☐ hardscape
	al use			•
TREE DEFECTS - N	oted as applicable		garage (17) Markar (17)	general Grand Company
ROOT DEFECTS: Sus	pect root rot? Y 🔊 Mus	shroom/conk present?	Y 🕟 ID:	·
	re 🗆 moderate 🗆 low	·	-	er e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e
	feet from trunk Root are			
	severe D moderate			oderate Diow
Decay in plane of lean? Compounding factors:		Soil cracking? Y		ving? Y
DEFECT	ROOT CROWN	TRUNK	SCAFFOLDS	BRANCHES
Poor taper	NOOT ONOTH	TAORIA	JOANTOLDO	DIGNIGIES
Bow, sweep				
Co-dominants, forks	· · ·			
Multiple attachments				
Included bark				
Excessive end weight		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Cracks/splits				
Hangers		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Girdling				
Wounds/seam				
Decay				
Cavity				
Conks/mushrooms				•
Bleeding/sap flow				
Loose/cracked bark				
Nesting hole/bee hive Deadwood/stubs				1 01
Borers/termites/ants			<u> </u>	<u></u>
Cankers/galls/burls				 - -
Previous failure				
RECOMMENDED TF Prune: remove defectir restructure	ve part	ght □ crown clean □	-	□ crown reduce
<u></u>	te soil	Cable/Brac		c. 🗆 fertilize/water
Inspect further: ☐ root of Move target:? Y	rown 🗆 decay 🗆 aerial Other:	monitor Remove	tree? Y 🕟 Replace	tree? Y AV o action required at this time
Effect on adjacent trees	:□ none Devaluate N	otification: 🛘 owner 📑	⊒ manager É□ governin	g agency Date:

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Photo #2

Owner: □ public 😾 private □ unknown □ other:
Site/Address: Thomas Guide: Page: Coordinate:
Date: Tune 27,1918 Inspector: Date of last inspection:
TREE CHARACTERISTICS Tree #: Species: Quercus agrifolia Quercus lobata Quercus lobata # other Pinus Pinus Pinus Pinus
of trunks: dbH (inches): Height (feet):
Compass direction N NE E SE S SW W NW
Dripline (feet) D 12 18 10 12 10 15 Clearance to canopy 20 18 18 18 18 15 15
Form: ☐ generally symmetric ☐ minor asymmetry ☐ major asymmetry ☐ stump sprout ☐ stag-headed
Crown class: ☐ dominant ☐ co-dominant ☐ intermediate ☐ suppressed
Age class: □ young □ semi-mature □ mature □ over-mature/senescent Live crown ratio (conifers only): 75
Pruning history: ☐ crown cleaned ☐ excessively thinned ☐ topped ☐ crown raised ☐ pollarded ☐ crown reduced ☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/braced ☐ none ☐ multiple pruning events Approximate dates:
Special Value: ☐ specimen ☐ heritage/historic ☐ wildlife ☐ unusual ☐ street tree ☐ screen Ø shade ☐ indigenous ☐ protected by government agency
TREE HEALTH
Foliage color: ဩ-normal □ chlorotic □ necrotic Woundwood development: □ excellent ☑ average
Epicormics? Y N
Foliage density: ☑ normal ☐ sparse Vigor class: ☐ excellent ☐ average ☑ fair ☐ poor
Leaf size: ☑ normal ☐ small ☐ cables ☐ curb/pavement ☐ guards
Annual shoot growth: excellent Staverage poor other
Major pests/diseases:
SITE CONDITIONS
Site character: M residence
Landscape type: ☐ parkway ☐ raised bed ☐ container ☐ mound ☐ lawn ☐ shrub border ☐ wind break
Irrigation: Ø-none □ adequate □ inadequate □ excessive □ trunk wetted Pavement lifted? Y Ø▽
Recent site disturbance? Y 🐼 🗆 construction 🗅 soil disturbance 🗆 grade change 🗆 line clearing 🗅 site clearing
% dripline paved: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100%
% dripline w/fill soil: 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100%
% dripline grade lowered: (0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100%
Soil problems: 🗆 drainage 🗆 shallow 🗆 compacted 🗀 droughty 🗆 saline 🗀 alkaline 🗀 acidic 🗀 small volume
Obstructions: 🗆 lights 🗎 signage 🗀 line-of-sight 🗀 view 🗀 overhead lines 🗀 underground utilities 🗀 traffic
Exposure to wind: single tree
Prevailing wind direction: Occurrence of snow/ice storms: ©never □ seldom □ regularly

Tree I	Number <u>3</u>
ndscape [□ hardscape
	e de la vincia de la composición de la Composición de la composición de la co
te 🗆 low	
	When:
	oderate D low
	ing? Y (1)
arity: LJ SeV	vere ☑ moderate ☐ low
DLDS	BRANCHES
	L-M
ten jih unger	e entire per me so
se canopy	☐ crown reduce
ove wire, etc.	☐ fertilize/water

				
TARGET		t garding.		
			creation 🗆 landscape	□ hardscape
		_		•
	al use Mintermittent use			
TREE DEFECTS - N	oted as applicable			e de la Caracteria de la companya d
ROOT DEFECTS: Sus	pect root rot? Y M	ushroom/conk present?	Y (N) ID:	
	_		ere I moderate I low	and the second of the second o
			Buttress wounded? Y	
Restricted root area:	severe 🗆 moderate 🛭	low Potential for roc	ot failure: □ severe □ m	oderate 🛘 low
LEAN: 15 de	orees from vertical ⊠n	atural 🗆 unnatural 🗆	self-corrected Soil heav	ring? Y AV
Decey in plane of lear-2	V 60 Danta bankana 1	(A) Call assakings V	All con poveritor.	vere 72 moderate 11 low
		Soil cracking?	Lean severity: U se	vere 12 moderate 11 low
Compounding factors: _				
CROWN DEFECTS: S =	severe, M = moderate, L =	iow :		
DEFECT	ROOT CROWN	TRUNK	SCAFFOLDS	BRANCHES
Poor taper				
Bow, sweep				
Co-dominants, forks				
Multiple attachments	·		•	
Included bark				
Excessive end weight				
Cracks/splits			•	
Hangers		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		1
Girdling				
Wounds/seam	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Decay				
Cavity				1
Conks/mushrooms				
Bleeding/sap flow				
Loose/cracked bark				
Nesting hole/bee hive				
Deadwood/stubs				L-M
Borers/termites/ants				
Cankers/galls/burls			•	
Previous failure			<u> </u>	
RECOMMENDED TR Prune: □ remove defection □ restructure □ shape	ve part	eight 🛘 crown clean	☐ thin ☐ raise canopy	□ crown reduce
Pest control:	ja	Cable/Bra	BCE;	
Other Activities: 🛘 aera	te soil		anting 12 remove wire, etc	~
Inspect further: ☐ root c Move target:? Y	rown 🗆 decay 🗀 seri	ial 🗆 monitor Remov	ve tree? Y Replace t	ree? Y (N) o action required at this time
		Notification: □ owner	·□ manager □ governing	g agency Date:
ADDITIONAL COMM	IENTS	Radiotalisti almetra 2014.		
Photo H	3 Tree is	on the left.	Remove barbea	Vire embelded
	in stunk			

Owner:	☐ public	private	🗆 unkno	wn □ ot	her:	·	
Site/Address:	 	т	homas Gu	ide: Page	e:	Coordi	nate:
Date: Tune 27,1998 Inspector: 106	Date of las	it inspectio	n:		_ □ not p	previous	ly inspected
TREE CHARACTERISTICS Tree #: Species: □ Quercus agrif	olia □ Quer	rcus lobata	⊠-other	Pina	, halep	ensis	
# of trunks: 1 dbH (inches): 13			<u> </u>		Height (feet): _	25
Compass direction N NE	E SI	E S	S	w	W	NW	7
Dripline (feet) 6 2			0 1	\$	12	2	1
Clearance to canopy 20 /8		8 1			12	18	J
Form: ☐ generally symmetric ☐ minor asymmetry		•	stump spre	out 🗆 si	ag-headed		
Crown class: □ dominant							(4.0
Age class: ☐ young ☐ semi-mature ☐ mature ☐	☐ over-mature	/senescent	Live cro	wn ratio (conifers o	nly):	7> %
Pruning history: ☐ crown cleaned ☐ excessively thir ☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/braced ☐ none ☐ multiple					rded 🗆 c		duced Sunknown
Special Value: ☐ specimen ☐ heritage/historic ☐ no indigenous ☐ protected by government agency	wildlife 🗆 ur	nusual 🛚	street tree	□ scre	en 大山sha	ade	
TREE HEALTH		The State of the S	en sin di	Andreas and the second			
Foliage color: 🖆 normal 🗆 chlorotic 🗀 necrotic		Woundwo	od develo	pment: 🛘	excellent	Æave	rage
Epicormics? Y N Twig Dieback? N		□ poor 〔	□ none				
Foliage density: Anormal		Vigor class	s: 🗆 excei	lent 🗆 a	verage ,l	Zi fai r	□ poor
Leaf size: 🔯 normal 🔲 small	•	Growth ob					🗆 signs
Annual shoot growth: □ excellent Ø average □ p	2000	□ cables □ other _			_		•
Major pests/diseases:							
SITE CONDITIONS	entra de la grafia de la compansión de la La compansión de la compa		en de trans de La caractería	Alin J.			umyst († 1. m.) Mej se mil
Site character: D residence			space [3 natural	□ woodi	and/fore	st
Landscape type: □ parkway □ raised bed □ conta							
Irrigation: Done □ adequate □ inadequate □		☐ trunk wet	•	ement lift	_	7 .	
Recent site disturbance? Y				☐ line o	clearing (□ site c	learing
% dripline paved: 0% 10-25% 25-50%		75-100%					_
% dripline w/fill soil: /0% 10-25% 25-50%		75-100%			• •		
% dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50%		75-100%	٠٠.				
Soil problems: ☐ drainage ☐ shallow ☐ compacte ☐ disease center ☐ history of failure ☐ clay ☐ e		nty □ sali slope	ne □all		acidic [] small	volume
Obstructions: ☐ lights ☐ signage ☐ line-of-sight ☐ adjacent vegetation ☐ other	□ view □	overhead li	nes 🗆 u	ndergroun	d utilities	□ traff	īc
Exposure to wind: ☐ single tree ☐ below canopy ☐ area prone to windthrow	□ above cano	ру 🗆 гес	entiy expos	sed w	rindward, c	anopy e	dge
Prevailing wind direction:Occu	rrence of sno	w/ice storn	ns: 💋 nev	er 🗆 se	oldom _ 🗆	regulari	y .

FIELD	EVALL	NOITAL	FORM -	- PAGE	2 OF	2

TARGET	and the second of the second o	per transfer of the second		
Use Under Tree: ☐ build	ling Crearking Chraffi lity lines Can target be r	c Dipedestrian D removed? Y	creation landscape	☐ hardscape
	al use Lintermittent use	<u> </u>		·
TREE DEFECTS - N	oted as applicable			
	spect root rot? Y/N/ M			
	. //		ere 🛘 moderate 🗘 low	
•			Buttress wounded?	المستعدد معاري يعتبي
			ot failure: 🖸 severe 💢 m	
: <i>A</i>				
	9	The state of the s	self-corrected Soil hear	
Decay in plane of lean?	Y N Roots broken?	NO Soil cracking? Y	Lean severity: □ see	evere Kmoderate 🗆 low
Compounding factors:	<u> </u>			
CROWN DEFECTS: S=	severe, M = moderate, L =	= low		
DEFECT	ROOT CROWN	TRUNK	SCAFFOLDS	BRANCHES
Poor taper	ROOT GROWN	11101111	1	1 213 413 123
Bow, sweep				
Co-dominants, forks			\ 	
Multiple attachments				
Included bark	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	 	+
Excessive end weight				+
				
Cracks/splits			<u> </u>	
Hangers				
Girdling				
Wounds/seam		· · ·		
Decay				<u> </u>
Cavity			T	
Conks/mushrooms	_			
Bleeding/sap flow				
Loose/cracked bark			Ţ	<u> </u>
Nesting hole/bee hive			 	1 .
Deadwood/stubs				(-M
Borers/termites/ants				†
Cankers/galls/burls				
Previous failure				
RECOMMENDED TO	REATMENT		MARIO NORTH TORING	
		7-NA	5 4 5 .	
Prune: I remove defecti I restructure I shape		eight 🛘 crown clean	☐ thin ☐ raise canopy	□ crown reduce
Pest control:		Cable/Br	ace:	
, ,	te soil	☐ remove irrigation/pla	inting	c. fertilize/water
Inspect further: ☐ root of Move target:? Y	crown 🗆 decay 🗀 aeri	al monitor Remov	ve tree? Y Replace	tree? Y 🛱
Effect on adjacent trees	: □ none evaluate	Notification: □ owner	☐ manager ☐ governin	g agency Date:
ADDITIONAL COMM	MENTS	Agaman Markatak	unione de la companya della companya della companya de la companya de la companya della companya	
	3 Tree is	on the sin	-/ -/	en in term of a term was a steeling of the
		1 N 1	11.	

Owner: D p	oublic B priva	ate 🗀 un	iknown E	other:		
Site/Address:		Thomas	s Guide: P	age:	Coordin	ate:
Date: 14he 27/1998 Inspector: 106 Date	e of last inspe	ection:		□ no	t previousl	y inspected
TREE CHARACTERISTICS	and the second s	•			からか。 フ	
Tree #: Species: @ Quercus agrifolia	☐ Quercus lob	ata 💆 of	ther <u>J</u>	nipera	<u> </u>	2 ~
# of trunks: dbH (inches):				Heigh	t (feet):	25-
Compass direction N NE E	SE	S	sw	W	NW	
Dripline (feet) est 9 12 8/2 Clearance to canopy 18 15 15	15	15	15	15	188	
Form: generally symmetric minor asymmetry maj						
Crown class: □ dominant	·		-		· -	
Age class: young semi-mature mature over			e crown rat	io (conìfers	oniv): \leq	55 %
Pruning history: □ crown cleaned □ excessively thinned □ flush cuts □ cabled/braced □ none □ multiple pruni	□ topped □	I crown rai	sed □ po	ollarded [crown red	
Special Value: ☐ specimen ☐ heritage/historic ☐ wildlife ☐ indigenous ☐ protected by government agency	-	•	 -		·	
TREE HEALTH			ang sagarah terbesa Sagarah sagar Sagarah sagarah Sagarah sagarah			
Foliage color: to normal □ chlorotic □ necrotic			•	☐ excellent	13 aven	age
Epicormics? Y N Twig Dieback? Y N	•	r 🗅 none				·
Foliage density: @ normal	Vigor	ciass: 🛚 e	xcellent	alaverage	☐ fair	□ poor
Leaf size; 🗷 normal 🔲 small		_	tions: 🗆 sta	akes □wi nt □guard		j signs
Annual shoot growth: excellent average poor						· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Major pests/diseases:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					·
SITE CONDITIONS	terpega yang kanada da kepadi Manada da	tanga kalawas kalawa an m		uru da har yhterasi hara ka		wajika ya 100 mili Maraji
Site character: A residence	□ park □ (
Landscape type: → parkway □ raised bed □ container		🕽 lawn 🛭	3 shrub bor	der 🗆 win	d break	
Irrigation: ☐ none Øadequate ☐ inadequate ☐ exces	sive 🗆 trunk	wetted	Pavement	lifted? Y		•
Recent site disturbance? Y N 🗆 construction 🗆 soil di	sturbance 🛘	l grade cha	nge 🗆 lit	ne clearing	Site cle	earing
% dripline paved: 0% 10-25% (25-60%) 50	75% 75-100)%				
% dripline w/fill soil: 6% 10-25% 25-50% 50	75% 75-100)%				
% dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-	75% 75-100)%				
Soil problems: ☐ drainage ☐ shallow ☐ compacted ☐ ☐ disease center ☐ history of failure ☐ clay ☐ expansi		saline [alkaline	☐ acidic aspect	□ small v	olume
Obstructions: lights signage line-of-sight view signage line-of-sight view signage line-of-sight view signage line-of-sight view view line-of-sight view view	w ☐ overhe	ead lines	undergre	ound utilities	□ traffi	c
Exposure to wind: Single tree below canopy so about area prone to windthrow	ve сапору 🛚 🗆	l recently e	xposed (3 windward,	сапору ес	ige
Prevailing wind direction: Occurrence	of snow/ice s	storms: 🞾	never E	l seldom (□ regularly	,

FIELD EVALUATION	ON FORM - PAGE 2	OF 2	Tree l	Number
TARGET	en e	, from the		er egres e
		pedestrian ☐ red	creation Flandscape [be restricted? Y	∃ hardscape
	al use			,
TREE DEFECTS - N	oted as applicable			a de la companya de l
ROOT DEFECTS: Sus	pect root rot? Y MY Mu	shroom/conk present?	Y Ø 10:	
	_		re 🗆 moderate 🗆 low	
· ·				
Root pruned:	feet from trunk Root an	ea affected:%	Buttress wounded? Y	When:
Restricted root area: 🗆	severe moderate	low Potential for room	t failure: 🛘 severe 🔻 🗖 mo	derate 🗆 low
LEAN: de	egrees from vertical	tural 🗆 unnatural 🗆	self-corrected Soil heavi	ng? Y N
				•
Decay in plane of lean?	Y N Roots broken? Y	N Soil cracking? Y	N Lean severity: ☐ sev	ere 🛘 moderate 🗀 lov
Compounding factors: _				
CROWN DEFECTS: S =	severe, M = moderate, L =	low		
DEFECT	ROOT CROWN	TRUNK	SCAFFOLDS	BRANCHES
Poor taper				
Bow, sweep				
Co-dominants, forks				
Multiple attachments				
Included bark				
Excessive end weight				
Cracks/splits	7			 -
Hangers				
Girdling				
Wounds/seam				
Decay				
Cavity				
Conks/mushrooms				
Bleeding/sap flow				
Loose/cracked bark				
Nesting hole/bee hive				·
Deadwood/stubs			ļ	
Borers/termites/ants				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Cankers/galls/burls			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Previous failure	<u>t</u>		<u>.l</u>	
RECOMMENDED TF Prune: remove defecti restructure shape	ive part	eight 🔲 crown clean	□ thin □ raise canopy	□ crown reduce
<u></u>		Cable/Dea	ice:	<u>.</u>
Pest control:			•	
Other Activities: aera Inspect further: root o		•	nting □ remove wire, etc. re tree? Y N Replace to	_
	Other:			action required at this tin

Photo # 4. Couldn't get to trunk to tag tree, surrounded by hippscur.

Effect on adjacent trees:

none Sevaluate Notification:

owner I manager I governing agency Date:

Owner:	D public	private □	unknown 🛘	other:
Site/Address:		Thom	as Guide: Pa	age: Coordinate:
Date: <u>June 27,1998</u> Inspector: <u>DG</u>	Date of las	t inspection: _	?	
TREE CHARACTERISTICS	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	St. Server in	D.	holean
Tree #: Species: □ Quercus agri	folia 🛮 Quei	rcus lobata 🏻 🏋	other Pinc	es hary cosis
# of trunks: 1 dbH (inches): 26	·			Height (feet): 40
Compass direction N NE Dripline (feet) /	E S	E S 22	2.2	W NW 25 18
Dripline (feet) 18 15 18		0 15	7.0	25 18
Form: generally symmetric minor asymmetry				
Crown class: ☐ dominant	, , mediate □ s	uppressed		•
Age class: ☐ young ☐ semi-mature ☐ mature	□ over-mature	/senescent Li	ve crown rati	o (conifers only): 85 %
Pruning history: □ crown cleaned □ excessively thi □ flush cuts □ cabled/braced □ none □ multiple	inned 🛭 topp	oed 🗆 crown r	aised 🗆 po	llarded 🛘 crown reduced
Special Value: ☐ specimen ☐ heritage/historic ☐ ☐ indigenous ☐ protected by government agency	wildlife 🗆 u	nusual 🗆 stree	et tree . 🗆 sc	reen Øshade
TREE HEALTH	Jana 1777 Parana Santanga			
Foliage color: Anormal Chlorotic Cnecrotic				□ excellent
Epicormics? Y N Twig Dieback? N		□ poor □ no	ne	• • •
Foliage density: A normal sparse		Vigor class: □	excellent 12	Caverage □ fair □ poor
Leaf size: ⊠ normal □ small		Growth obstru		
Annual shoot growth: excellent Average	poor	□ cables □	curb/pavemen	t Li guards
Major pests/diseases:				
SITE CONDITIONS	rijera i sagresa ek Kar	eng jagakas kalabaka Tanan salah	i sasata	
Site character: X residence □ commercial □ indu	ustrial 🛚 par	k □ open spa	ce 🗆 natura	al · □ woodland/forest
Landscape type: □ parkway □ raised bed □ conf	tainer 🗆 mo	und 🗀 lawn	🗅 shrub boro	ler 🛘 wind break
•] excessive	☐ trunk wetted	Pavement I	ifted? Y
] soil disturban	ce 🛚 grade cl	nange 🗆 lin	e clearing
% dripline paved: 0% 10-25% 25-50%	6 50-75%	75-100%		•
% dripline w/fill soil: 0%) 10-25% 25-509	6 50-75%	75-100%		•
% dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50%	6 50-75%	75-100%	•	·
Soil problems: ☐ drainage ☐ shallow ☐ compact ☐ disease center ☐ history of failure ☐ clay ☐ €	•	nty 🗆 saline	☐ alkaline	☐ acidic ☐ small volume aspect
Obstructions: ☐ lights ☐ signage ☐ line-of-sight ☐ adjacent vegetation ☐ other	🗆 view 🗆	overhead lines	□ undergro	und utilities 🔲 traffic
Exposure to wind: ☐ single tree ☐ below canopy ☐ area prone to windthrow	Mabove cand	py 🗆 recently	exposed C	windward, canopy edge
Prevailing wind direction: Occi	urrence of sno	w/ice storms:	⊠never □	seldom D regularly

Photo A.S. Remove barked wire embedded in trust

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Owner:	□ public	: ⊠ priva	ate 🛭 ur	nknown [other:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	·
Site/Address:			Thoma	s Guide: F	age:	Coordin	ate:
Date: June 27,199 Inspector: 16	Date of	last inspe					
TREE CHARACTERISTICS	en e	v zeme		i partitografia.	1 2	. Po toku t	
Tree #; Species: □ Quercus agri	folia 🗆 🔾	uercus lob	ata 🗘 o	ther <u>Pina</u>	15 halo	FC455	
# of trunks: dbH (inches):					Heigh	it (feet):	18
Compass direction N NE	E	SE	S_	sw	W	NW	
Dripline (feet) /2 // Clearance to canopy 4 // 0	0	0	10	15	12	12	
Form: ☐ generally symmetric ☐ minor asymmetry							
Crown class: dominant				o spiout L	a blug-licud		
Age class: young semi-mature Age mature				e crown rai	io (conifer	s only in	W
Pruning history: 🗆 crown cleaned 🗀 excessively thi							~~ luced
☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/braced ☐ none ☐ multiple		, .		•	_	_	unknown
Special Value: ☐ specimen ☐ heritage/historic ☐ ☐ indigenous ☐ protected by government agency	wildlife E] unusual	☐ street	tree 🛘 s	creen 🛚 :	shade	
TREE HEALTH	الله الله الله الله الله الله الله الله		Harana (L.) Marana (L.)	i daga kalanggaranga Baga Badah Managarangan			
Foliage color: Anormal		Wound	dwood de	velopment	: 🗆 excellen	t /Z faven	age.
Epicormics? Y (N) Twig Dieback? (O)N		□ poo	r 🗆 non	е		•••	ż
Foliage density: Ø-normal sparse		Vigor	ciass: 🛭 e	excellent	□ average	D fair	□ poor
Leaf size: 风 normal				tions: 🗆 st			3 signs
/ Annual shoot growth: □ excellent / 🗗 average □	poor				nt 🛮 guar		·
Major pests/diseases:		•	•				
SITE CONDITIONS	erine e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e	regate a legac	re. an este estale:	ru (u. 1940) Color	ورومین این این بیش از در درومین		ewa je 1000 Godina
Site character: Ø-residence			•				
Landscape type: ☐ parkway ☐ raised bed ☐ conf		-					
Irrigation: Ø none □ adequate □ inadequate □						_	
	3 excessive 3 soil disturi	•			ne clearing	□ site cle	earing
% dripline paved: 0% 10-25% 25-509			_	ange Li	no cleaning	D Site on	-0.1179
% dripline w/fill soil: 0% 10-25% 25-509							
% dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-509						,	
% dripfine grade lowered. \(\times \)% 10-25% 25-507	0 3U-137	75-100	, ,,,		•		
Soil problems: drainage shallow compact disease center history of failure clay		0 ,		□ alkaline 	□ acidic aspect	□ small v	olume
Obstructions: lights signage line-of-sight adjacent vegetation other	□ view	□ overhe	ad lines	□ undergr	ound utilities	traffi	c
Exposure to wind: single tree below canopy area prone to windthrow	☐ above c	anopy C	recently (exposed	□ windward	, canopy ed	ige
Prevailing wind direction:Occ	urrence of	snow/ice	storms: 🎾	never [3 seidom	☐ regularly	1

Tree	Number <u>7</u>
landscape i	□ hardesana
d?Y N	inatuscape
	er i vila Siling og stanskarre i gjerter
erate low	When:
	oderate 🗆 low
d Soil heav	
	vere □ moderate □ low
FOLDS	BRANCHES
	·
	L-M
·	
	1985
aise canopy	☐ crown reduce

FIELD EVALUATION FORM - PAGE 2 OF 2

TARGET				
			creation □ landscape be restricted? Y N	□ hardscape
Occupancy: A eccasion	al use	e □ frequent use □ c	constant use	
			to the second se	
ROOT DEFECTS: Sus	spect root rot? Y N / M	ushroom/conk present?	(D) ID:	••
F				- to a second
Root pruned:	re ⊔ moderate ⊔ low feet from trunk Root a	rea affected:%	re ☐ moderate ☐ low Buttress wounded? You	When:
Postsisted root areas [7]	severe D moderate D	I law Detential for rea	et failures El covere . El m	oderate 🛘 low
			self-corrected Soil heav	
Decay in plane of lean?	Y Roots broken?	Soil cracking? Y	N Lean severity: 8 se	vere 🗆 moderate 🗀 low
Compounding factors:	_			
		- less		
CROWN DEFECTS: 5 =	severe, M = moderate, L =	- 10W		
DEFECT	ROOT CROWN	TRUNK	SCAFFOLDS	BRANCHES
Poor taper				
Bow, sweep				
Co-dominants, forks				
Multiple attachments		,		
Included bark				
Excessive end weight		·		
Cracks/splits				
Hangers				
Girdling				
Wounds/seam			 	
Decay			 	
Cavity				· -
Conks/mushrooms				
Bleeding/sap flow		<u> </u>		
Loose/cracked bark		<u> </u>		
Nesting hole/bee hive				
Deadwood/stubs				1.40
Borers/termites/ants				L-N
				
Cankers/galls/burls Previous failure	-		 	1
RECOMMENDED TR	REATMENT			
B				
□ restructure □ shape	•	eight Li crown clean	thin I raise canopy	□ crown reduce
Pest control:		Cable/Bra	ace:	
Other Activities: aera	te soil	☐ remove irrigation/pla	anting remove wire, etc	:. 🛘 fertilize/water
Inspect further: ☐ root of Move target:? Y	crown decay aen	ial Monitor Remov	ve tree? N N Replace 1	tree? Y D o action required at this time
Effect on adjacent trees	: 🗆 none 🧏 evaluate	Notification: ☐ owner	☐ manager ☐ governing	g agency Date:
_	MENTS	Samuel De la Colonia de la La Colonia de la Colonia de		

Photo # 6 Iree is on The left.

Owner:			D pu	ıblic 🏿 pr	ivate 🗆 i	unknown	other: _		
Site/Address:						as Guide:			
Date: <u>June 27, 1998</u> 1	nspector: _	116.	Date	of last ins	pection:	7.	or	not previous	ly inspected
TREE CHARACTERIST	ics					P	. h	ale an	
Tree #:	Species: □	Quercus a	grifolia [Quercus le	obata 🔼	other	nus .ii	rigens3	1
# of trunks:	dbH (inches):_ <u></u>			<u> </u>		Heig	ht (feet): _	15
Compass direction	N	NE	E	SE	S	SW	W	NW	
Dripline (feet) Clearance to canopy	12	15	0	0	0		0	3	
		acummetr.					□ cton boo		l
Form: generally symmetric			,			ib shionr	□ stay-fiea	ueu	
Crown class: dominant							-41- (1 4 -		Z < "
Age class: □ young □ se									
Pruning history: ☐ crown cl ☐ flush cuts ☐ .cabled/bra	ced 🗆 nor	excessivery ne 13 mul	tiple prunin	g events	⊔ crown r Approximat	raised U te dates:	pollarded		aucea] unknown
Special Value: ☐ specimen ☐ indigenous ☐ protected	-			🗆 unusua	ıl □ stree	et tree 🛚	screen	l shade	
TREE HEALTH	ing and selection of the selection of th	egen. Samuel Language (1995) Samuel Congress (1995)		ing Salaundung	era y la marti. Vinaso el la Tra				
Foliage color: Inormal						evelopmen		2	rage
Epicormics? Y N Twig I		<u> </u>			oor 🗆 no	-			
Foliage density: Dinormal	-	•		Vigo	r class: 🗆	excellent	□ average	25 fair	□ poor
Leaf size: ⊅ normal □ sn				Gro	wth obstru	ctions: 🗆 s	takes 🗆	wire/ties !	□ signs
,			П			curb/paveme	_		• •
Annual shoot growth: ex		average	∴ poor	01	ner			·	
Major pests/diseases:									
SITE CONDITIONS	and the second s	rent de la companya d La companya de la co	a greenere i san A san san san san	ranga sebebah di di	pratices a series professional	Park Control of the Park Control of the Control of	Mayar 1966 Lib		amada di 1 m Elifonia
Site character: 1 residence	□ commo	ercial 🗆 i	ndustrial	🗆 park 🛭	open spa	ce 🗆 nat	ural 🗆 wo	odland/fore	st
Landscape type: parkway	/ □ raised	bed □ c	ontainer	□ mound	□ lawn	□ shrub bo	order 🗆 w	ind break	
Irrigation: ☑ none □ ade	quate 🗆 ir	nadequate	□ excess	sive 🗆 tru	nk wetted	Pavemen	t lifted? Y	N	
Recent site disturbance?	(N) □ ∞	nstruction	☐ soil dis	turbance	☐ grade ci	hange 🗆	line clearing	. □ site c	learing
% dripline paved:	10-2 10-2	25% 25-	50% 50-	75% 75-1	00%				
% dripline w/fill soil:	0% 10-2	25% 25-5	50% 50-7	75% 75-1	00%			• ••	
% dripline grade lowered:	0% 10-2	25% 25 _~ 5	50% 50-7	75% 75-1	00%	•			
Soil problems: ☐ drainage☐ disease center☐ ☐ histor	☐ shallow y of failure	•		droughty e 12 slope		□ alkaline	□ acidic aspect _	□ smail · NN	volume ——
_	signage Cother	line-of-sig	ht 🗆 vie	w 🗆 över	head lines	□ underg	ground utilitie	es 🗆 trafi	fic
Exposure to wind: 🖸 single	tree Dahe	elow canopy	/ □ abov	e canopy	☐ recently	exposed	□ windwar	d, canopy e	dge
Prevailing wind direction:	<i>N</i>	•	ccurrence	of snow/ic	e storms: j	never	□ seldom .	□ regular	y

FIELD EVALUATION	ON FORM - PAGE 2	OF 2	Tree	Number 8
TARGET		1.4.4		
Use Under Tree: ☐ build☐ small features ☐ uti	ling □ parking □ traff lity lines Can target be	ic f≸ p edestrian □ re moved? Y N Can use	creation □ landscape [be restricted? Y Ø	□ hardscape
Occupancy: Occasion	al use	e 🗆 frequent use 🗆 c	constant use	
TREE DEFECTS - N	oted as applicable		ma jili <u>je</u> s	en de la companya de La companya de la co
ROOT DEFECTS: Sus	spect root rot? Y	ushroom/conk present?	Y (ID:	
	_	_	re I moderate I low	
			Buttress wounded? Y	
Restricted root area:	severe moderate figure 1	☐ low Potential for roo	t failure: 🗆 severe 🗀 mo	derate 🔲 low
LEAN: 12de	egrees from vertical 🏿 🍎 n	atural 🛘 unnatural 🗖	self-corrected Soil heav	ing? Y 🐠
Decay in plane of lean?	Y A Roots broken?	Y AG Soil cracking? Y	Lean severity: 🛘 sev	rere 22 moderate 15Klow
Compounding factors:			,	5.0 /2<
•				<u> </u>
CROWN DEFECTS: S =	severe, M = moderate, L :	= low		
DEFECT	ROOT CROWN	TRUNK	SCAFFOLDS	BRANCHES
Poor taper				
Bow, sweep				
Co-dominants, forks		-		
Multiple attachments				
Included bark				
Excessive end weight				
Cracks/splits				
Hangers				-
Girdling				
Wounds/seam				
Decay				
Cavity			 	
Conks/mushrooms			 	
Bleeding/sap flow			 	
Loose/cracked bark				
Nesting hole/bee hive			 	
Deadwood/stubs				L-M
Borers/termites/ants			·	
Cankers/galls/burls				
Previous failure			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	,
RECOMMENDED TO	CATHENT	ne ne zer	e part sale at	e significant de la companya de la c
Prune: remove defectire restructure shape	ve part	eight □ crown clean		□ crown reduce
Pest control:		Cable/Bra	rce:	•
Other Activities: aera	te soil 🔲 remove fill soil		nting ☐ remove wire, etc.	☐ fertilize/water
Inspect further: ☐ root of Move target:? Y		ial Monitor Remov	re tree? Y Replace to	ree? Y (A) action required at this time

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Photo # 6 Tree is on The right.

Effect on adjacent trees: 🗆 none 🗡 evaluate Notification: 🗆 owner 🗆 manager 🗀 governing agency

Owner:			🗆 pu	ıblic 🖄 pı	ivate 🛚 u	nknown [other:	· <u></u>	
Site/Address:	·				Thoma	ıs Gu <u>i</u> de: P	age:	Coordin	ate:
Date: June 28, 1998	nspector:	DG_	Date	of last ins	pection:	7		t previously	y inspecte
TREE CHARACTERIST	ics		e ve e Ve e		·· <u>·</u>	e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e		ar regard	
Tree #:	Species: □	Quercus a	grifolia 🕻	Quercus i	obata 💢 o	ther Vi	nus Me	pensis	
# of trunks:	ibH (inches)	: 15					Heigh	t (feet):	8
Compass direction	N	NE	E	SE	S	SW	W	NW	
Dripline (feet) est. Clearance to canopy	20	12	15	70	18	15-	8	15	
			<u> 15</u>			•	12	_ <i>_18</i>	
Form: generally symmetric			•			sprout L	J stag-neade	ed	
Crown class: ☐ dominant						_			90
Age class: ☐ young ☐ se									
Pruning history: ☐ crown cl ☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/brad									tuced unknown
Special Value: □ specimen □ indigenous □ protected	-		□ wildlife	🗆 unusua	il □ street	tree 🗆 s	creen 🗆 s	hade	
TREE HEALTH		an ing production of the second	e de la companya de l			i de la coloria. La coloria			
Foliage color: A normal	3 chlorotic	☐ necrotic		Woo	ındwood de	velopment:	☐ excellent	Z aven	age
Epicormics?YN Twig I					oor 🗆 non	-			
Foliage density: Foliage dens				Vigo	or class: 🛘 (excellent j	A average	□ fair	□ poor
Leaf size: 🗘 normal 🛘 sm	•			Gro	wth obstruc	tions: □ sta	ikes 🗆 wi	re/ties [] signs
,			П		ables 🗆 ci	•	•		
Annual shoot growth: □ ex	cellent bas	iverage	⊔ po or		ther	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Major pests/diseases:		<u> </u>							
SITE CONDITIONS	and the same	** **	e such executive	Militaria esta esta esta esta esta esta esta est	erang panganan Pangan	*. j. 1880	Maria de presenta Productivos		
Site character: Dresidence	. 🗆 comme	rcial 🗆 is	ndustrial	□ park l	i open spac	e 🗆 natur	al 🗆 wood	dland/fores	st .
Landscape type: ☐ parkway	☐ raised	bed □ c	ontainer		□ lawn	shrub bor	der 🛚 win	d break	
Irrigation: 11 none 🛘 adec	uate □ in:	adequate	□ excess	ive □ tru	nk wetted	Pavement !	lifted? Y 🗗		•
Recent site disturbance?	N □ cor	struction	🛘 soil dis	turbance	☐ grade cha	ange 🛭 lir	ne clearing	□ site cle	earing
% dripline paved:	10-2	5% 25-5	50% 50-7	75% 75-1	00%				•
% dripline w/fill soil;	0% / 10-2				00%				
% dripline grade lowered:	0% 10-2			75% 75-1	00%				
Soil problems: drainage disease center history	☐ shallow of failure	•	acted			☐ alkaline	☐ acidic aspect	□ small v	olume
_	signage 🛛 ther	line-of-sig	ht 🗆 vie	w 🗆 over	head lines	☐ undergro	ound utilities	☐ traffi	c
Exposure to wind: single area prone to windthrow	tree Zabei	ow canopy	□ abov	e canopy	☐ recently (exposed [⊐ windward,	canopy ed	ige ·
Prevailing wind direction:	<u>//</u>	0	ccurrence	of snow/ic	e storms: 🞗	<u>1 n</u> ever □	i seldom - l	☐ regularly	1

Tree	Number
ndscape I	□ hardscape
-	green and the second of the se
te Dlow	A CONTRACTOR OF THE CONTRACTOR
	N When:
	oderate D low
	ing? Y 🔊
erity: 焰 se	vere □ moderate □ low
DLDS	BRANCHEC
<u> </u>	BRANCHES
•	
-	
-	L-M
e canopy	☐ crown reduce
`	☐ fertilize/water
Replace to	ree? YAP

Photo #7 Remove broken play on top of trunk.

Owner:	☐ public	private	uni 🗆 uni	known [3 other:		
Site/Address:			Thomas	Guide: F	Page:	Coordi	nate:
Date: Juhe 28,1998 Inspector: 06	Date of la	st inspect	tion:	· -	D nd	t previous	ly inspected
TREE CHARACTERISTICS)	ar gyr.	7
Tree #: Species: □ Quercus agrif	olia 🗆 Que	ercus lobati	a Xioti	ner	nas ha	Copris	
# of trunks: dbH (inches):					Heigh	it (feet): _	28
Compass direction N NE		SE	s	SW	W	ŃΜ]
		28	12	15	$-\frac{Q}{A}$	-	ł
						_ <i>u</i>	J
Form: generally symmetric minor asymmetry Security disconnection of intermediate of interme	•			sprout t	stag-nead ב	ea	
Crown class: ☐ dominant ☐ so-dominant ☐ intern	neciate Li	suppresse	Q -4 12		·· ·· · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		90
Age class: young semi-mature mature	J over-matur	e/senescer	nt Live	crown ra	uo (coniter	s only):	
Pruning history: ☐ crown cleaned ☐ excessively thir ☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/braced ☐ none ☐ multiple							aucea Junknown
Special Value: □ specimen □ heritage/historic					·		
TREE HEALTH	The second s	n na mhili Shaell a Baile	gereggene Desakking	en en regeriere La grand de la La grand de la grand de			
Foliage color: Inormal Chlorotic Inecrotic		Woundw	vood dev	elopment	: 🗆 excellen	t 🗖 ave	rage
Epicormics? Y 🗭 Twig Dieback? 🔗 N		□ poor	☐ none				
Foliage density: 🗗 normal 🛘 🗎 sparse		Vigor cla	ass: 🗆 ex	cellent	average	🖸 fair	□ poor
Leaf size: 10 normal					akes 🛚 w		_
Annual shoot growth: ☐ excellent	000r			•	nt □ guar ————		· .
Major pests/diseases:		·					
SITE CONDITIONS	energia de la composição de la composição La composição de la composição d	i uma en egalada. En en en en		No see Address of		erakokkirina. Historia	
Site character: A residence							•
Landscape type: □ parkway □ raised bed □ cont	ainer 🗆 me	ound 🔲	lawn 🛚	shrub bo	rder 🗆 wii	nd break	
Irrigation: <u>∕ n</u> one □ adequate □ inadequate □					lifted? Y		
Recent site disturbance? Y			rade chai	nge 🛭 li	ne clearing	□ site c	learing
% dripline paved: 0% 10-25% 25-50%		75-100%		_	,		
% dripline w/fill soil: 0% / 10-25% 25-50%	50-75%	75-100%	•				
% dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50%	50-75%	75-100%	•				
Soil problems: ☐ drainage ☐ shallow ☐ compacte ☐ disease center ☐ history of failure ☐ clay ☐ e	ed 🖸 droug xpansive [ghty □s □slope _	aline E	alkaline	□ acidic aspect	□ small	volume
Obstructions: ☐ lights ☐ signage ☐ line-of-sight ☐ adjacent vegetation ☐ other	□ view □	⊒`overhead	i lines	□ undergr	ound utilities	trafi	ic
Exposure to wind: I single tree below canopy area prone to windthrow	above can	юру 🗆 п	ecently ex	cposed	🛘 windward,	, canopy e	dge
Prevailing wind direction:Occu	rrence of sn	now/ice sto	orms: 💢	never T	3 seldom	🗅 regular	y . ,

TARGET	en de la companya de La companya de la co	en jobski produktion († 1941) 1940 – Produktion († 1941)		and the second second
	ing □ parking □ traff lity lines Can target be			□ hardscape
	al use 🔲 intermittent us	٧-		
TREE DEFECTS - N	oted as applicable	in tanggapagapagan na mangapagan na mangapagan na mangapagan na mangapagan na mangapagan na mangapagan na mang Mangapagan na mangapagan n	ala de la composição de la	er i de la companya del companya de la companya del companya de la
ROOT DEFECTS: Sus	pect root rot? Y 🔊 M	ushroom/conk present?	Y/N ID:	
	- ,,		re 🛘 moderate 🗘 low	
			Buttress wounded?	
Restricted root area:	severe 🏻 moderate [☐ low Potential for roc	t failure: ☐ severe ☐ m	noderate 🗆 low
LEAN: 30 de	egrees from vertical AZI n	atural 🗆 unnatural 🗆	self-corrected Soil hea	vina? YAD
Decay in plane of lean?	Y N Roots broken?	Y (N) Soil cracking? Y	AT Lean severity: ☐ \$6	evere 🖾 moderate 🗆 low
Compounding factors:	•			/
CROWN DEFECTS: S =	severe, M = moderate, L:	= low		
DEFECT	ROOT CROWN	TRUNK	SCAFFOLDS	BRANCHES
Poor taper				
Bow, sweep				
Co-dominants, forks				
Multiple attachments				
Included bark				
Excessive end weight				
Cracks/splits				
Hangers				
Girdling	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Wounds/seam				
Decay				<u> </u>
Cavity				<u></u>
Conks/mushrooms		ļ		<u> </u>
Bleeding/sap flow_				
Loose/cracked bark				<u> </u>
Nesting hole/bee hive				
Deadwood/stubs				
Borers/termites/ants				
Cankers/galls/burls	·		<u> </u>	4
Previous failure	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u></u>
RECOMMENDED TO	REATMENT	· 基础 图 图 2015年		e metrologis (Filosof)
Prune: ☐ remove defecti ☐ restructure ☐ shape	ve part ロ reduce end w	eight 🗆 crown clean	☐ thin ☐ raise canopy	□ crown reduce
Pest control:		Cable/Bra	ace:	
Other Activities: 🗆 aera	te soil 🔲 remove fill soil	☐ remove irrigation/pla	inting 🔲 remove wire, et	c. fertilize/water
Inspect further: ☐ root of Move target:? Y	rown 🗆 decay 🗀 aer	ial monitor Remo	re tree? Y ∕N Replace	tree? Y () no action required at this time
Effect on adjacent trees		Notification: ☐ owner	□ manager □ governin	ig agency Date:
ADDITIONAL COMM	MENTS	Paparana di Kalabaran Karatan		
Photo #				

Owner:	public 1	private 🗆 un	known 🗆 d	other:	
Site/Address:		Thoma:	s Guide: Pag	ge: Coord	inate:
Date: June 28,199 Inspector: 06	Date of last in	spection:	?	D not previou	sly inspecte
TREE CHARACTERISTICS					
Tree #: Species: □ Quercus agrifo	lia 🗆 Quercus	ilobata ⊠ of	ther Pinu	s halepensis	
# of trunks: dbH (inches):			. 	Height (feet):	55
	E SE		SW	W NW]
	0 35	30	75	20 25	4
	20 30	15		20 30	J
Form: generally symmetric minor asymmetry	- •	-	sprout 🗆 :	stag-headed	
Crown class: ☐ dominant ☐ co-dominant ☐ interm	ediate 🛘 supp	ressed			0-
Age class: ☐ young ☐ semi-mature ☐	over-mature/se	nescent Live	crown ratio	(conifers only): _	<u>/>_</u> %
Pruning history: ☐ crown cleaned ☐ excessively thing ☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/braced ☐ none ☐ multiple	ned 🗆 topped	Crown rai	sed 🛮 polla	arded 🛮 crown n	
Special Value: ☐ specimen ☐ heritage/historic ☐ w☐ indigenous ☐ protected by government agency	rildlife 🔲 unus	ual 🗆 street	tree 🗆 scr	een 🛭 shade	
TREE HEALTH					
Foliage color: Tormal] excellent 🔏 av	
Epicormics? Y W Twig Dieback?		poor 🗆 none	-		
	Vi	gor class: 🛭 e	xcellent 🗷	average 🛭 fair	□ poor
Foliage density: Anormal Sparse		owth obstruct	,	•	
Leaf size: Dinormal D small		cables 🗆 cu		_	
Annual shoot growth: excellent excelle		other			
Major pests/diseases:					.
SITE CONDITIONS					
Site character: Presidence Commercial I indus	trial 🗆 park	☐ open space	natural	□ woodland/for	est
Landscape type: ☐ parkway ☐ raised bed ☐ conta	iner 🗆 mound	□ lawn [3 shrub borde	er 🔲 wind break	
Irrigation: ☑ none ☐ adequate ☐ inadequate ☐	excessive 🛘 t	runk wetted	Pavement lif	ted? VA	
Recent site disturbance? Y/N construction	soil disturbance	☐ grade cha	inge 🗆 line	clearing	dearing
% dripline paved: 8% 10-25% 25-50%	50-75% 75	-100%			
% dripline w/fill soil: (0%) 10-25% 25-50%	50-75% 75	-100%	•		
• (/	,	-100%			
Soil problems: drainage shallow compacted lidisease center history of failure clay ex	d 口 droughty pansive 卢 sl o	pe		□ acidic □ small spect <u>//</u>	volume
Obstructions: ☐ lights ☐ signage ☐ line-of-sight ☐ adjacent vegetation ☐ other	□ view □ ov	erhead lines	undergrou	nd utilities tra	ffic
Exposure to wind: single tree below canopy area prone to windthrow	1 above canopy	☐ recently e	xposed []	windward, canopy	edge
Prevailing wind direction: Occur	rence of snow/	ce storms:	never 🛚 s	seldom 🗀 regula	rly

_		- 1	' /	•
Tree	Number	- (- /	

FIEL!	D E\	/AL	MOITAU	I FORM	- PAGE	2 OF 2
				VIV	- 1 /70/-	- U I -

TARGET	and the second s			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Use Under Tree: ☐ build ☐ small features ☐ util		c □ pedest <u>r</u> ian □ re	creation □ landscape i	□ hardscape
Occupancy: Doccasiona	al use 🔲 intermittent use	r □ frequent use □ c	constant use	
TREE DEFECTS - N	oted as applicable	1000 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 10	And the second second	to the second of
			Y 69 ID:	,**
			re 🗆 moderate 🗆 low	# 1 1 1 # 1 1 M # 1 M # 1 1 M # 1 1 M # 1 1 M # 1 1 M # 1 1 M # 1 1 M # 1 1 M # 1 1 M # 1 1 M # 1 1 M # 1 1 M # 1 1 M # 1 M # 1 1 M # 1 1 M # 1 M # 1 M # 1 M # 1 M # 1 M # 1 M # 1 M # 1 M # 1 M # 1 M # 1 M M # 1 M M # 1 M M M M M M M M M M
•			Buttress wounded? Y	_
			t failure: 🗆 severe 🗆 mo	
			self-corrected Soil heav	
Decay in plane of lean?	Y N Roots broken?	Soil cracking? Y	X7 Lean severity: Ø sev	vere I moderate I low
		my contracting.	<i>(</i>	
Compounding factors:		-		
CROWN DEFECTS: S =	severe, M = moderate, L =	: low		
DEFECT	ROOT CROWN	TRUNK	SCAFFOLDS	BRANCHES
Poor taper				
Bow, sweep		-		
Co-dominants, forks				
Multiple attachments				
Included bark				
Excessive end weight				
Cracks/splits			1	
Hangers				
Girdling				
Wounds/seam				
Decay	· · · · · ·			
Cavity				
Conks/mushrooms			 	
Bleeding/sap flow			 	
Loose/cracked bark	<u> </u>			
Nesting hole/bee hive				
Deadwood/stubs	······································		 	L-M
Borers/termites/ants		· ·	-	
Cankers/galls/burls		Mistlete L-M		-
Previous failure		TIISIRITE CTI		
RECOMMENDED TF	REATMENT			
Prune: ☐ remove defecting restructure ☐ shape	ve part	eight 🛘 crown clean	☐ thin ☐ raise canopy	□ crown reduce
Pest control:	<u></u>	Cable/Bra		
Other Activities: aera	te soil	☐ remove irrigation/pla	nting	
Inspect further: ☐ root of Move target:? Y	rown 🗆 decay 🗀 aeri Other:	al Monitor Remov	re tree? Y	ree? Y AN o action required at this time
		Notification: □ owner	☐ manager ☐ governing	,
ADDITIONAL COMM	,			

Owner:			🗆 рі	ublic X pr	ivate □ u	ınknown 1	🗆 other:		
Site/Address:					Thom	as Guide: I	Page:	Coordi	nate:
Date: <u>June</u> 28,1998 li	spector: _	DG	Date	e of last ins	pection:	?		ot previous	aly inspected
TREE CHARACTERIST			Ar A		pre e in			e syntae	
Tree #:	Species: [Quercus a	ngrifolia [□ Quercus f	obata 💢	other <u>Fr</u>	zxinus	velu	ting
# of trunks:	lbH (inches							ht (feet): _	1 77
Compass direction	N	NE	E	SE	S	SW	W	NW]
Dripline (feet) Clearance to canopy	<u> 10 _ </u>	66	<u>8</u>	6_	5	12	10	15	-
<u> </u>	12	10		1_2		<u> </u>		12_	J
Form: generally symmetric			,			np sprout	□ stag-hea	aea	
Crown class: dominant	<i>'</i>								
Age class: □ young ☐ se									
Pruning history: ☐ crown cl									educed Dunknown
Special Value: ☐ specimen ☐ indigenous ☐ protected	☐ heritag	e/historic	☐ wildlife						
TREE HEALTH									
Foliage color: Lormal						evelopmen			нале
Epicormics?	`		•		por 🖸 no	-	. B caccio		, age
0		· N		Vigo	or class: 🗆	excellent	☐ average	É Lfair	□ poor
Foliage density: normal	/			_		ctions: 🏻 s	_	•	□ signs
Leaf size: normal sm				□ α	ables 🗷	curb/paveme			
Annual shoot growth: □ ex	cellent 1	average	₽ poor	□ 0	ther				<u> </u>
Major pests/diseases:						_ 			<u> </u>
SITE CONDITIONS			et gebeure en ge		geathers weak	11. j. 3945 -	in and the second states		garantijest. Sporta
Site character: Site residence		ercial □i	industrial			ce □ natı			
Landscape type: □ parkway				•	, ,				
Irrigation: □ none □ ade		nadequate			ink wetted		t lifted? Y		
_	·	•					line clearing		elearing
Recent site disturbance? Y				sturbance	-	nange Li	inte clearing	l Dave (
% dripline paved:	7)				00%				
% dripline w/fill soil:	/				100%	•			
% dripline grade lowered: \	09% 10-	25% 25-	50% 50-	75% 75-1	100%				
Soll problems: ☐ drainage ☐ disease center ☐ histor	☐ shallow of failure	•	acted □ □ expansi	droughty ve 🗆 slop		alkaline	☐ acidic aspect _	small	volume
· -	signagel	□ line-of-siç	ght 🗆 vie	ew 🗆 over	head lines	□ underg	round utilitie	es 🗆 traf	ffic
Exposure to wind: 🗆 single	tree 55.b	elow canopy	y 🖸 abov	e canopy	☐ recently	exposed	□ windwar	d, canopy (edge
Prevailing wind direction:	/\/		ccurrence	of snow/ic	e storms: ,	never	□ seldom	☐ regular	rly · ·

Tree Number/ 2-	Tree	Number	12-
-----------------	------	--------	-----

 _	_							_		_
n	F١	ΙΔΙ	ΙΙΔ	TION	IFORM	- PA	GE.	7	CIE	っ
 						- 1 /		_	U	~

		:			
		•		t to see the second	
Use Under Tree: ☑ buildi ☐ small features ☐ util	ing [Vparking 12 traffi ity lines Can target be r	c Ø p edestrian ☐ red noved? Y Ø Can use	creation □ landscape (be restricted? Y	□ hardscape	
Occupancy: Coccasional use intermittent use I frequent use I constant use					
TREE DEFECTS - N	oted as applicable			e de la composition della com	
ROOT DEFECTS: Sus	pect root rot? Y M	ushroom/conk present?	Y/N ID:		
	(/		re 🗆 moderate 🗆 low		
•			Buttress wounded? You		
Restricted root area: □	severe 🛘 moderate 🗀	low Potential for roof	t failure: 🗆 severe 🗆 mo	oderate 🗆 low	
<i>LEAN</i> : 12 de	arees from vertical 15 na	atural 🗆 unnatural 🗆	self-corrected Soil heav	ing? Y M	
			Lean severity: □ seve		
		O'S Soli Clacking:	Lean seventy. Li set	vere Elliodelate Catom	
Compounding factors: _		<u>. </u>			
CROWN DEFECTS: S =	severe, M = moderate, L =	= low			
DEFECT	ROOT CROWN	TRUNK	SCAFFOLDS	BRANCHES	
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep					
Co-dominants, forks		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Multiple attachments Included bark					
Excessive end weight			 		
Cracks/splits			†		
Hangers		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Girdling					
Wounds/seam					
Decay			<u> </u>		
Cavity	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
Conks/mushrooms Bleeding/sap flow			 		
Loose/cracked bark			 		
Nesting hole/bee hive					
Deadwood/stubs				L-M	
Borers/termites/ants					
Cankers/galls/burls					
Previous failure		<u></u>			
RECOMMENDED TR					
Prune: ☐ remove defection ☐ restructure ☐ shape	ve part 🔲 reduce end w	eight □ crown clean (☐ thin ☐ raise canopy	☐ crown reduce	
Pest control:	<u> </u>	Cable/Bra	ce:		
		• • •	nting		
Inspect further: ☐ root of Move target:? Y (N) C	rown 🛘 decay 🗘 aeri	ial Remov	e tree? ØN Replace t	ree? Y (AV) o action required at this time	
	•		☐ manager ☐ governing		
ADDITIONAL COMM	ients Planter	is too shill	I for a tree,	co as Ash	
Photos 16	and 17. Tre	e is on the 1	eff. Leaves a	showing signs	
C	of Ash Anti	hracnose; not s	erious. Ugly tr.	e.	

Owner:	□ public	priva	ate 🛭 ui	nknown	other:		
Site/Address:			Thoma	s Guide:	Page:	Coordin	ate:
Date: July 28,1998 Inspector: DG.	Date of	last inspe	ection:	7	🗆 no	ot previous!	y inspected
TREE CHARACTERISTICS	a wallan		• •				ta.
Tree #: Species: □ Quercus agrifo	olia 🗆 C	uercus lob	ata 💆 o	ther <u>Fr</u>	exinus v	eluting	Moder
# of trunks: 2 dbH (inches): 14,12					Heigh	ıt (feet):	18
Compass direction N NE	E	SE	S	SW	W	NW	
Dripline (feet) est, 15 15 Clearance to canopy 12, 17,	15	128	12	$\frac{o}{o}$	15	15	
Form: ☐ generally symmetric ☐ minor asymmetry	<u>'. </u>			 			
Crown class: dominant Co-dominant interm	•					-	
Age class: ☐ young				e crown ra	atio (conifer	s only):	%
Pruning history: ☐ crown cleaned ☐ excessively thin			•		pollarded E		
☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/braced ☐ none ☐ multiple							unknown
Special Value: □ specimen □ heritage/historic □ v □ indigenous □ protected by government agency	wildlife [1 unusual	□ street	t tree 🛚	screen 🗆	shade	
TREE HEALTH	10.403	n turi. Suurindi luudad	Maria ng Vilan Maria na Milita				
Foliage color: Dormal Dechlorotic Decrotic					t: 🗆 excellen		
Epicormics? N Twig Dieback? N		□ poo	r. 🗆 non	ie			
Foliage density: 🖾 normal 🗆 sparse		Vigor	class: 🗆 e	excellent	☐ average	12 fair	□ poor
Leaf size: 1/2 normal			•		takes 🔲 w		3 signs
Annual shoot growth: ☐ excellent Average ☐ p	юог		er Klo		ent 🛮 guai		
Major pests/diseases:				···			
SITE CONDITIONS	New York States of the States		eati, ili se lela a	tu kayam			
Site character: Thresidence					•		st
Landscape type: □ parkway □ raised bed □ conta							
Irrigation: № none □ adequate □ inadequate □			•		t lifted?	ה	
Recent site disturbance? Y N 🗆 construction 🗆			•				earing
% dripline paved: /0% 10-25% 25-50%			•	unge <u> </u>			
% dripline w/fill soil: 0% 10-25% 25-50%						-	
% dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50%				*			
Soil problems: ☐ drainage ☐ shallow ☐ compacte ☐ disease center ☐ history of failure ☐ clay ☐ ex	ed 🗆 dre xpansive	oughty [□ slope] saline	□ alkaline	□ acidic aspect	□ small v	olume
Obstructions: ☐ lights ☐ signage ☐ line-of-sight ☐ adjacent vegetation ☐ other	□ view	☐ overhe	ead lines	□ underg	round utilitie:	s 🗆 traffi	e
Exposure to wind: single tree Lelow canopy of area prone to windthrow	□ above c	anopy [3 recently	exposed	□ windward	, canopy ed	ige _.
Prevailing wind direction: Occu	rrence of	snow/ice	storms:)	never	🗖 seldom 🗇	☐ regularly	y , .

		 フ
Tree	Number	 ٤

				
TARGET			n v	· · · - <u>- ·</u> · · ·
		ic ⊈pedestrian □ re moved? Y Ø Can use	creation Alandscape 2	É hardscape
	al use	•		
,		. —		
ROOT DEFECTS: Sur	spect root rot? Y/N/ M	lushroom∕conk present?	Y / ID:	
Exposed roots: seve	ere 🗆 moderate 🗆 low	Undermined: D seve	ere 🗆 moderate 🗀 low	A TO TO THE PROPERTY OF THE PR
			t failure: ☐ severe ☐ m	
LEAN: de	egrees from vertical Sign	atural 🛘 unnatural 🗖	self-corrected Soil heav	ing? Y 🕅
Decay in plane of lean?	Y N Roots broken?	Y N Soil cracking? Y	N Lean severity: □ se	vere 🗷 moderate 🛚 low
Compounding factors:		<u> </u>		···········
CROWN DEFECTS: S =	severe, M = moderate, L :	= low		÷
DEFECT	ROOT CROWN	TRUNK	SCAFFOLDS	BRANCHES
Poor taper		<u></u>		
Bow, sweep				
Co-dominants, forks			1	
Multiple attachments				<u></u>
Included bark				
Excessive end weight				
Cracks/splits				
Hangers			1	
Girdling				
Wounds/seam	1		1	
Decay				
Cavity	1		T	
Conks/mushrooms			1	
Bleeding/sap flow				
Loose/cracked bark			1	
Nesting hole/bee hive				
Deadwood/stubs				4-41
Borers/termites/ants	1		,	
Cankers/galls/burls				
Previous failure		•		
RECOMMENDED TO		_		
Prune: ☐ remove defect ☐ restructure ☐ shape	ive part □ reduce end w e	eight 🗆 crown clean	☐ thin ☐ raise canopy	□ crown reduce
Pest control:		Cable/Bra	ace:	
			anting remove wire, etc	
Inspect further: ☐ root of Move target:? Y	crown	ial Monitor Remov	ve tree? N Replace t	ree? Y D or action required at this time
	•	_	☐ manager ☐ governing	
ADDITIONAL COM	MENTS To	ed the war can	of Ash Anthrope	
Photos 16	and 17 Tr	co is on The	of Ash Anthrecond right, Ugly to This tree.)C.
- / '	Place	the state of the	1 1911, vigiy	ree,
	1 lahter 13	TOO SMILL TON	this tree.	

Owner:	□ public, 🎏 pri	ivate 🛭 u	nknown E	other:		
Site/Address: CHrus Dr.		_ Thoma	as Guide: F	age:	Coordin	nate:
Date: July 11,1918 Inspector: DG	Date of last ins	pection:		O no	ot previous	ly inspected
TREE CHARACTERISTICS		ji i s ^{ir} a			1 # 1 J. #5	
Tree #: Species: □ Quercus agrifoli	ia 🔲 Quercus lo	obata 🙇	other	1 (alypti	45 9k	bulus
# of trunks: 10 dbH (inches): 31 , 16	14,8,8, 1, 1,7,	2,2		Heigi	nt (feet): _	45
	E SE	S	SW	W	NW	
	5 70 n 15	20	2 <i>c</i> 2 <i>5</i>	72	<u>/5</u>	
Form: generally symmetric minor asymmetry					ed	J
Crown class: □ dominant #= co-dominant □ interme			, op		-	
Age class: □ young □ semi-mature □			re crown rat	tio (conifer	s only):	%
Pruning history: ☐ crown cleaned ☐ excessively thinn ☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/braced ☐ none ☐ multiple	ed f3-topped	□ crown ra	sised 🗆 po	ollarded [crown re	
Special Value: specimen heritage/historic indigenous protected by government agency						
TREE HEALTH		and Alexander (1992) Andries (1994)				
Foliage color: Inormal chlorotic necrotic			velopment		,	rage
Epicormics N Twig Dieback? Y N		oor 🗆 nor	-			
Foliage density: Dinormal	Vigo	r class: 🗆	excellent	☑ average	☐ fair	□ poor
Leaf size: ☑ normal □ small			tions: 🗆 st			🗆 signs
Annual shoot growth: D excellent 20 average D po		ables 70 c	urb/paveme	nt 🗆 gua	rds	·. ,
Major pests/diseases:						
	nne seegn ja kaas	Santaga an as an an a	6,80	e dana a jawa	ros vijilije	week of the
Site character: ☐ residence ☐ commercial ☐ indust	trial □ nark □					
Landscape type: □ parkway □ raised bed □ contai						
		•		,		
		nk wetted		iifted? Y (
	,	grade ch	ange Li	ne clearing	□ site c	learing
% dripline paved: 0% 10-25% (25-50%)	50-75% 75-1					
% dripline w/fill soil: /0%/ 10-25% 25-50%	50-75% 75-1					
% dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50%	50-75% 75-1	00%				,
Soil problems: □ drainage □ shallow □ compacted □ disease center □ history of failure □ clay □ ex		saline	□ alkaline	☐ acidic aspect	□ small	volume
Obstructions: ☐ lights ☐ signage ☐ line-of-sight ☐ adjacent vegetation ☐ other	□ view □ over	head lines	undergr	ound utilitie	s 🗆 traff	ic
Exposure to wind: single tree below canopy area prone to windthrow	above canopy	☐ recently	exposed	□ windward	l, canopy e	edge
Prevailing wind direction: Occur	rence of snow/ic	e storms: Y	7 never C) seldom	☐ regular	ly .

1

)

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Photo # 1-3 Tree has been topped and it looks like the present trusts (or most of hen) have come out as a reaction to be cut

Owner:	🗆 public	private	unkn	own 🗅	other:	 -	
Site/Address:		'	Thomas (Buide: Pa	age:	Coordi	nate:
Date: July 1/198 Inspector:	Date of la	st inspect	ion:		🗆 no	t previous	ly inspected
TREE CHARACTERISTICS		. *****	, e ^a		error illo La Signa e	an the	
Tree #: Species: □ Quercus agrife	olia 🗆 Que	ercus lobati	a Sothe	er <u>Fo</u>	(alp)	145 JA	balus
# of trunks: 3 dbH (inches): 28, 11,	10				_ Heigh	t (feet): _	70
Compass direction N NE		SE	S	SW	W	NW]
Dripline (feet) est. 15 10 . Clearance to canopy 42 40			22	30 30	30 40	30 40	ł
Form: generally symmetric minor asymmetry					stag-head		J
Crown class: □ dominant	•	-		,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	stag-nead		
Age class: young semi-mature mature mature mature mature mature mature mature mature mature mature mature mature mature mature mature mature mature mature mature mature mature mature				rown rati	o (coniform	onha:	04
Pruning history: Crown cleaned Clexcessively thin					llarded [
☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/braced ☐ excessively thin							J unknown
Special Value: Specimen Sheritage/historic Indigenous Directed by government agency	wildlife 🛭 u	l lsuzunı	□ street tre	ee 🗆 so	reen 🖄	hade	
TREE HEALTH					tamingon a league vinet y College Vig		ra n erek bere Markatatan
Foliage color: Stnormal chlorotic necrotic	and graden						rage
Epicormics? Y N Twig Dieback? Y N		☐ poor					J
Foliage density: Amormal		Vigor cla	ess: 🗆 exc	ellent -Ç	average	☐ fair	□ poor
Leaf size: ⊅ normal □ small					kes 🔝 🗆 w		🗆 signs
Annual shoot growth: Dexcellent Average Dp	oor	☐ cables ☐ other	curb	/pavemen 	t □ guar	ds	•.
Major pests/diseases:	,001	El Otilei					
The second secon	(personal subaggiorisma)	g art in the ward	, sa se esta agranje	. 48-22	1200, 2013 (1984)	ensi kananan kanan	MRAUNT T
SHE CONDITIONS				· .			
Site character: 19 residence	•	•	-				est
Landscape type: ☐ parkway ☐ raised bed ☐ conta	ainer 🗆 m		•				
Irrigation: none adequate inadequate	excessive	☐ trunk w	etted Pa	vement i	ifted? Y	N .	
	soil disturba	-	-	ge 🛘 lin	e clearing	□ site c	learing
% dripline paved: 0% 10-25% 25-50%	50-75%	75-100%	•				
% dripline w/fill soil: 10-25% 25-50%	50-75%	75-100%)				
% dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50%	50-75%	75-100 %					
Soil problems: □ drainage □ shallow □ compacte □ disease center □ history of failure □ clay □ e		7 1	aline 🗆	alkaline ——°	acidic aspect	small E	volume
Obstructions: ☐ lights ☐ signage ☐ line-of-sight ☐ adjacent vegetation ☐ other	□ view 〔	overhead	i lines 🗆	undergro	und utilities	□ trafi	fic
Exposure to wind: I single tree I below canopy I area prone to windthrow	above can	opy 🗆 n	ecentiy exp	osed C) windward,	canopy e	edge
Prevailing wind direction: Occu	rrence of sn	ow/ice sto	orms: 🇖 n	ever 🛚	seldom	🗆 regulari	ly

Effect on adjacent trees: 🗆 none 🛛 evaluate Notification: 🗅 owner 🗅 manager 🚨 governing agency Date:

)

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Photo # \$

Owner:	I public private	□ unknown {	3 other:	
Site/Address:	<u> </u>	Thomas Guide:	Page: Coo	ordinate:
Date: July 11/198 Inspector: 16 I	ate of last inspecti	ion:	D not previ	ously inspected
TREE CHARACTERISTICS			*** *** ******************************	
Tree #:	☐ Quercus lobata	stother <u>E</u>	ucakptus	globe lu;
# of trunks: 4 dbH (inches): 54, 10, 10,	2	·'	Height (feet): <u>6C</u>
Compass direction N NE E		s sw	W NW	
Dripline (feet) etf. 15 20 25 Clearance to canopy \$0.28 30 35		70 25 70 30	22 70 35 30	
	 			
Form: generally symmetric minor asymmetry n			🖺 stag-headed	
Crown class: dominant co-dominant intermedi		•		
Age class: ☐ young ☐ semi-mature ☐ ov		*		
Pruning history: ☐ crown cleaned ☐ excessively thinned ☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/braced ☐ none ☐ multiple pru			ollarded	
Special Value: 🗵 specimen 💋 heritage/historic 🗆 wild	ife □ unusual [□ street tree › □ s	screen 🗆 shade	
TREE HEALTH				
Foliage color: 🕰 normal 🗆 chlorotic 🚨 necrotic			:□excellent 52K	-
Epicormics? Twig Dieback? Y	_	□ none		
Foliage density: Dinormal	Vigor cla	ss: 🗆 excellent	☐ average ☐ fa	ir 🛮 poor
Leaf size: ☑ normal □ small			akes U wire/ties	🗆 🗆 signs
Annual shoot growth: □ excellent		curb/paveme	nt 🔟 guards	
Major pests/diseases:				
SITE CONDITIONS	ingorum yan ili jogawa.	er et kesk it til gelædet i stil i	n da an a Saltifeting (1874)	– Nagadas in tim
SITE CONDITIONS Site character: presidence commercial industrial		A		
•		-		
Landscape type: □ parkway □ raised bed □ containe	•	•		3K
Irrigation I none adequate inadequate ex			lifted?	
	•	rade change	ine clearing 🔲 si	te clearing
	50-75% 75-100%			
	50-75% 75-100%	·		
% dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50%	50-75% 75-100%			~ "
Soil problems: ☐ drainage ☐ shallow ☐ compacted ☐ disease center ☐ history of failure ☐ clay ☐ expa	☐ droughty ☐ sansive ☐ slope _//	aline 🔲 alkaline	□ acidic □ sn aspect — →	nail volume
Obstructions: □ lights □ signage □ line-of-sight □ □ adjacent vegetation □ other	view Doverhead	lines 🛘 underg	round utilities 🔲	traffic
Exposure to wind: □ single tree □ below canopy □ a □ area prone to windthrow	bove canopy D re	ecently exposed	□ windward, canop	oy edge
Prevailing wind direction: Occurren	ice of snow/ice sto	rms: never	D seldom □ regi	ularly

TARGET	and the second of the second o	s in the second of the		
Use Under Tree: ☐ buildi	ing G-parking ⊠traffi	ic 1 7 p edestrian □ re	ecreation 🗆 landscape	□ hardscape
Occupancy: occasiona	/			
	-			
			Y Y ID:	
-		•	ere 🗆 moderate 🗆 low	
Root prunea:	reet from trunk Root a	rea affected:	Buttress wounded? Y	wnen:
Restricted root area: !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	severe 🛘 moderate 🕻	low Potential for roo	ot failure: 🗆 severe 🗆 m	oderate 🗆 low
LEAN: de	grees from vertical 🔲 na	atural 🗆 unnatural 🗅	self-corrected Soil heav	ring? Y N
				vere □ moderate □ low
Compounding factors: _				
CROWN DEFECTS: S =		= low		
DEFECT	ROOT CROWN	TRUNK	SCAFFOLDS	BRANCHES
Poor taper		-		
Bow, sweep				
Co-dominants, forks				
Multiple attachments				
Included bark				
Excessive end weight				
Cracks/splits				
Hangers				
Girdling				
Wounds/seam	1		1	
Decay		·	-	
Cavity				
Conks/mushrooms				
Bleeding/sap flow				
Loose/cracked bark				
Nesting hole/bee hive				
Deadwood/stubs				L-M
Borers/termites/ants				
Cankers/galls/burls				
Previous failure				
RECOMMENDED TR	REATMENT			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Prune: ☐ remove defective ☐ shape	•	eight 🛘 crown clean	☐ thin ☐ raise canopy	☐ crown reduce
Pest control:		Cable/Br	ace:	
Other Activities: aerai	te soil	remove irrigation/pla	anting	c. fertilize/water
Inspect further: ☐ root c Move target:? Y	rown 🗆 decay 🗀 aer	ial 12 m onitor Remo	ve tree? Y N Replace	tree? Y (N) o action required at this time
Effect on adjacent trees		Notification: ☐ owner	☐ manager ☐ governin	g agency Date:
/ 1i	ENTS 45	The Albert of the Land of the State of the S		
7 107	9 41 0			

Owner:	🗆 public	c Ø∱priv	ate 🗆 un	iknown 🗆	other:	<u>-</u>	
Site/Address:			Thomas	s Guide: P	age:	Coord	inate:
Date: July 1/1998 Inspector: DC						t previou	sly inspected
TREE CHARACTERISTICS			. Day		,	- কর্মাসক -	
Tree #: Species: □ Quercus agri	ifolia 🗆 C	Quercus lot	ata X iot	ther $\underline{E_0}$	ical y ta	5 0/01	rlas
# of trunks: dbH (inches):					Heigh	t (feet):	50_
Compass direction N NE	E	SE	S	sw	W	NW]
Dripline (feet) e.f. 12 0 Clearance to canopy 28 6	0	2	78	32	<u> 25</u> 15	<u>12</u> 20	
Form: generally symmetric minor asymmetry							_
	•	-		spiout L	stag-ricaut		
Crown class: ☐ dominant ☐ co-dominant ☐ inter		•			ia (aanifaa		. 0/
Age class: ☐ young ☐ semi-mature ☐ mature			•				
Pruning history: ☐ crown cleaned ☐ excessively th☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/braced ☐ none ☐ multiple						Crown r	unknown
Special Value: 57 specimen 57 heritage/historic 12 indigenous 13 protected by government agency	wildlife [D unusua l	☐ street	tree D s	creen 🗆 s	shade	÷
TREE HEALTH				aran yang barangan Lagar arang barangan Kabupatèn Salah Barangan			
Foliage color: Thormal Chlorotic Cnecrotic		Woun	dwood dev	velopment:	□ excellent	Z av	erage
Epicormics? Y & Twig Dieback? Y N		□ poo	or 🗆 none	e		+ -=-	
Foliage density: 🖾 normal 🗆 sparse		Vigor	class: □ e	excellent of	average	C) fair	□ poor
Leaf size: 内normal				tions: 🗆 sta		_	🛘 signs
Annual shoot growth: excellent saverage	poor		er	irb/pavemer	it Li guai	<u></u>	*.
Major pests/diseases:		·					
SITE CONDITIONS	estano e militar por e La compansa de la co	gang att vikjaya Militaria	ragional responsibilità de la compansional de la compansional de la compansional de la compansional de la comp La compansional de la compansional	. jagana	nous a passa.	 	aluman ji li ee Ali oo t
Site character: 🗖 residence 🗆 commercial 🗀 ind				•			
Landscape type: ☐ parkway ☐ raised bed ☐ con							
Irrigation: ☑none ☐ adequate ☐ inadequate ☐				Pavement			
Recent site disturbance? Y N				ange 🗆 lir	ne clearing	site	clearing
% dripline paved: 0% 18-25% 25-509			_				
% dripline w/fill soil: 0% 10-25% 25-509	% 50-759	% 75 - 10	0%				
% dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-509			0%	•		•	
Soil problems: ☐ drainage ☐ shallow ☐ compact☐ disease center ☐ history of failure ☐ clay ☐				alkaline	.□ acidic aspect	□ smal	volume
Obstructions: □ lights □ signage □ line-of-sight	□ view	□ overh	ead lines	undergre	ound utilities	□ tra	ffic
Exposure to wind: single tree below canopy area prone to windthrow	above c	anopy [☐ recently e	exposed [⊒ w indward,	, сапору	edge
Prevailing wind direction: Occ	urrence of	snow/ice	storms:	never E	seldom	☐ regula	rly

Tree Number	17

TARGET	en de la companya de La companya de la co			
Use Under Tree: ☐ build☐ small features ☐ util	ing <u>Crparking</u> Straft lity lines Can target be	ic চxpedestrian □ re moved? Y N Can use	creation 🛘 landscape be restricted? Y	□ hardscape
Occupancy: occasion	al use [intermittent us	e □ frequent use □ c	constant use	
TREE DEFECTS - N	oted as applicable		essa (j. 1820. g. e. 1955).	en e
ROOT DEFECTS: Sus	spect root rot? Y/N N	lushroom/conk present?	Y 65 ID:	
			re 🗆 moderate 🗆 low	
Root pruned:	feet from trunk Root a	rea affected:%	Buttress wounded? Y	When:
		low Potential for roo		oderate 🗆 low
<i>LEAN</i> :	egrees from vertical	atural 🗆 unnatural 🗆	self-corrected Soil heav	ring? YN
Decay in plane of lean?	Y N Roots broken?	Y ⋀ Soil cracking? Y	Lean severity: □ se	vere Exmoderate 5 low
Compounding factors:	(C)			, ,
•	severe, M = moderate, L	= low	:	_
DEFECT	ROOT CROWN	TRUNK	SCAFFOLDS	BRANCHES
Poor taper				
Bow, sweep		·		
Co-dominants, forks				
Multiple attachments				
Included bark				
Excessive end weight			<u> </u>	
Cracks/splits		ļ		
Hangers	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			<u> </u>
Girdling				<u> </u>
Wounds/seam	•			
Decay	<u> </u>	·		
Cavity			<u> </u>	4
Conks/mushrooms				
Bleeding/sap flow				
Loose/cracked bark				<u> </u>
Nesting hole/bee hive				
Deadwood/stubs				L-M
Borers/termites/ants			- 	
Cankers/galls/burls			 	,
Previous failure	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	J
RECOMMENDED TO	•			
Prune: ☐ remove defecti ☐ restructure ☐ shape	•	eight 🔲 crown clean 📜	☐ thin ☐ raise canopy	☐ crown reduce
Pest control:	 	Cable/Bra	ace:	
			inting ☐ remove wire, etc	
Inspect further: ☐ root of Move target:? Y		rial II monitor Remov	ve tree? Y (N) Replace to	tree? Y 1000 o action required at this time
Effect on adjacent trees	: 🗆 none 🏿 Evaluate	Notification: ☐ owner	☐ manager ☐ governing	g agency Date:
ADDITIONAL COMM	ments #6	the second control of the second		

Owner:	□ public	private	e 🗆 unk	nown E	other:		
Site/Address:			Thomas	Guide: P	age:	Coord	linate:
Date: July 11,1998 Inspector: DG	Date of la	ast inspec	tion:		🗆 n	ot previou	sly inspected
TREE CHARACTERISTICS	y. The	e de la companya de l			٠ "	i dynyns	er en
Tree #: Species: □ Quercus agrife	olia □ Qu	ercus lobat	a Qoth	ier <u>Eu</u>	calinto	es 961	by les
# of trunks: 2 dbH (inches): 26 , 4	 				Heig	ht (feet):	60
Compass direction N NE		SE	S	sw	W	NW]
Dripline (feet) est. 3 6 Clearance to canopy 6 17	8	30 30	15 L	10	20	20	-
		<u> </u>		_ <i>J</i> ?	4C		لـ
Form: generally symmetric minor asymmetry minor asymmetry	/			sprout L] stag-head	1ea	
Crown class: ☐ dominant ☐ co-dominant ☐ interm		•		_			·
Age class: U young U semi-mature D			-				
Pruning history: ☐ crown cleaned ☐ excessively thin ☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/braced ☐ none ☐ multiple				-	_	□ crown r	educed D unknown
Special Value: Specimen Special Value: Specimen Special Value: Specimen Specimen Special Value:							
TREE HEALTH		e projekty 2016-a zadyransk	y na 12 ma Magazia	and the services and the services of services			
Foliage color: 🖄-normal 🗆 chiorotic 🔘 necrotic		Woundy	vood deve	elopment:	☐ exceller	nt Aav	erage
Epicormics? Y 🕟 Twig Dieback? Y 🕏		□ poor	□ none				
Foliage density: ⊠ normal □ sparse		Vigor cl	ass: □ ex	cellent	∡average	🗆 fair	□ poor
Leaf size: 🔯 normal 🚨 small					skes 🔲 v		🛘 signs
Annual shoot growth: □ excellent Ø average □ p	oor				nt 🖸 gua		
Major pests/diseases:	·	· 					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
SITE CONDITIONS	terrer - Stephen de la	era esta la conseñera La conseñera	i je se ve sasta se je s Le se se				
Site character: Aresidence C commercial indu							
Landscape type: □ parkway □ raised bed □ contr	ainer 🛭 m	nound 🗆	lawn 🗆	shrub bor	der ⊈ w	ind break	
Irrigation: ⊠ none □ adequate □ inadequate □	excessive	□ trunk v	vetted F	avement	lifted?	N .	
Recent site disturbance? Y 🔊 🗆 construction 🗆	soil disturba	ance 🗆 g	grade char	nge □ lis	ne clearing	□ site	clearing
% dripline paved: 0% 10-25% 25-50%	50-75%	75-1009	6	_	• •		•
% dripline w/fill soil: 10-25% 25-50%	50-75%	75-1009	6				
% dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50%	50-75%	75-1009	6				
Soil problems: ☐ drainage ☐ shallow ☐ compacte ☐ disease center ☐ history of failure ☐ clay ☐ e		ghty □ s Ø <u>sl</u> ope _		alkaline °	☐ acidic aspect	□ smai	i volume
Obstructions: ☐ lights ☐ signage ☐ line-of-sight ☐ adjacent vegetation ☐ other	□ view	□ overhea	d lines l	undergr	ound utilitie	s 🗆 tra	ffic
Exposure to wind: single tree below canopy area prone to windthrow	above car	nopy , .□ I	ecently ex	posed I	□ windward	d, canopy	edge
Prevailing wind direction: Occu	rrence of s	now/ice st	orms: 🗖	never E) seldom	□ regula	rly : · ;

)

Tree	Number	15

)

FIFI	ח	FVΔ	LUA	TION	FORM -	- PAGE	2	OF	2
			レンハ		I OIVINI -		_	VI.	_

TARGET	the first the second second			
Use Under Tree: ☐ build ☐ small features ☐ uti	ing চ parking ∱ traffi lity lines Can target be r	c	creation I landscape I be restricted? Y	⊒ hardscape
Occupancy: occasion	al use	☐ frequent use ☐ c	constant use	
TREE DEFECTS - N	oted as applicable		The state of the s	er en
ROOT DEFECTS: Sus	spect root rot? Y 🔊 M	ushroom/conk present?	Y 🐠 ID:	
			re 🗆 moderate 🗆 low	The second secon
Root pruned:	feet from trunk Root a	rea affected:%	Buttress wounded? Y	Ø When:
	severe moderate			oderate 🗆 low
			self-corrected Soil heav	ing2 VAD
LEAU.	grees non vertical so la		Self-corrected Soft field	g: ↑
Decay in plane of lean?	Y N Roots broken?	Y Soil cracking? Y	Lean severity: Sev	vere ⊠moderate □ low
Compounding factors:				
CROWN DEFECTS: S =	severe, M = moderate, L =	· low		
DEFECT	ROOT CROWN	TRUNK	SCAFFOLDS	BRANCHES
Poor taper				
Bow, sweep			1	
Co-dominants, forks				
Multiple attachments				
Included bark	_			
Excessive end weight			 	
Cracks/splits			 	
Hangers				
Girdling				
Wounds/seam			<u> </u>	
			+	
Decay	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		- 2 2111 17	
Cavity			<u> </u>	
Conks/mushrooms			-	ļ ——
Bleeding/sap flow				
Loose/cracked bark			<u> </u>	
Nesting hole/bee hive		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<u> </u>	
Deadwood/stubs			<u> </u>	L-M
Borers/termites/ants				
Cankers/galls/burls				
Previous failure				
RECOMMENDED TO	REATMENT			
Prune: ☐ remove defecti	ve part	eight 🛘 crown clean	☐ thin ☐ raise canopy	□ crown reduce
Pest control:		Cable/Bra	ice:	
Other Activities: aera	te soil	☐ remove irrigation/pla	inting I remove wire, etc	. 🗆 fertilize/water
Inspect further: ☐ root of Move target:? Y	crown 🛘 decay 🗖 aen Other:	al Elmonitor Remov	/e tree? Y (T) Replace t	ree? Y (N) o action required at this time
Effect on adjacent trees	:: 🛘 none 🗸 🚾 evaluate	Notification: □ owner	☐ manager ☐ governing	g agency Date:
ADDITIONAL COMM				
Photo a	\$7 Tree bio	inches in to term	with tree hest or	f this one

Owher:	D public	Private	unk	nown 🗆	other:		
Site/Address:		<u>'</u>	Thomas	Guide: Pa	age:	Coordin	nate:
Date: July Inspector: 16	Date of la	st inspect	tion:		□ not	t previous	ly inspecte
TREE CHARACTERISTICS	# - Total	A Service of the serv	.	~	* .	97.774	
Tree #: Species: □ Quercus agrif	folia 🛚 Que	arcus lobata	a Doth	er _ Eul	alypta	5 900	tular
# of trunks: dbH (inches):					Height	t (feet): _	60
Compass direction N NE		SE	S	SW	W	NW	
Dripline (feet) est & 28 Clearance to canopy 45 40		7	32 40	15 40	50	40	
							J
Form: generally symmetric minor asymmetry Statement of the statement of				sprout L	stag-neade	:u	
Crown class: ☐ dominant ☐ co_dominant ☐ intern				4			
Age class: ☐ young ☐ semi-mature ☑ mature ☐			•				
Pruning history: ☐ crown cleaned ☐ excessively thin ☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/braced ☐ none ☐ multiple					llarded		duced 3 unknown
Special Value:	wildlife 🛭 u	inusual 1	□ street ti	ree 🗆 so	reen □s	hade	·
TREE HEALTH		in de la companya da	n vjana me Nasadinas	e a market i mer Jeger Millia Jeger William			
Foliage color: Inormal Inchlorotic Inecrotic					□ excellent	4	
Epicormics? Y Ø Twig Dieback? Y Ø		□ poor	□ none			<u> </u>	
Foliage density: ♠ normal □ sparse		Vigor cla	ass: 🗆 ex	cellent 👤	Yaverage	☐ fair	□ poor
Leaf size: 💆 normal 🔲 small					kes 🔲 🗀 wi		□ signs
	oor			•	t 🗆 guard	is	•. • .
Major pests/diseases:							
SITE CONDITIONS	i Statemen – Albergarde († 1886) 18. – Projecti – Alberta	alah sebebah	and the second state of	janesekkira en la 1. janesekkira en la	tani ili ku ji ji ji ja ja ku ji	oga PARALI Lindo	angologiji in Angologiji
Site character: 79-residence	ıstrial 🗆 pa	rk 🗆 op	en space	Ø natura	al 🗆 wood	dland/fore	st
Landscape type: parkway raised bed cont	ainer 🛘 mo	ound 🗀 l	lawn 🗓	shrub bord	ter Æ(win	d break	
irrigation: Д none □ adequate □ inadequate □					,		
Recent site disturbance? Y/N 🗆 construction	l soil disturba	nce □g	rade chan	ge 🗆 lin	e clearing	☐ site ci	earing
% dripline paved: 0% 80-25% 25-50%		75-100%		_			-
% dripline w/fill soil: 10-25% 25-50%	50-75%	75-100%	•				
% dripline grade lowered: (0%) 10-25% 25-50%	50-75%	75-100%					
Soil problems: ☐ drainage ☐ shallow ☐ compacte ☐ disease center ☐ history of failure ☐ clay ☐ e		•	aline □	alkaline	acidic aspect	□ smail v	volume
Obstructions: ☐ lights ☐ signage ☐ line-of-sight ☐ adjacent vegetation ☐ other	□ view □	overhead	i lines [□ undergro	und utilities	□ traff	ic
Exposure to wind: single tree below canopy area prone to windthrow	∄ -above can	ору 🗆 г	ecently ex	posed [] windward,	сапору е	dge
Prevailing wind direction: Occu	irrence of sn	ow/ice sto	orms:/x	never 🗆	seldom (⊒ regulari	y .

)

Prune: | remove defective part | reduce end weight | crown clean | thin | raise canopy | crown reduce | restructure | shape |

Pest control: | Cable/Brace: |

Other Activities: | aerate soil | remove fill soil | remove irrigation/planting | remove wire, etc. | fertilize/water |

Inspect further: | root crown | decay | aerial | monitor | Remove tree? Y | Replace tree? Y | N |

Move target:? Y | Other: | Street | Decay |

Photo #8

Owner:	public	private	unk 🗆 unk	rnown E	other:		
Site/Address:			Thomas	Guide: P	age:	Coordi	nate:
Date: 14/1998 Inspector: 106.	Date of la	st inspect	ion:		D no	ot previous	ly inspected
TREE CHARACTERISTICS		an September		er wert		e est per protes	
Tree #: Species: □ Quercus agrif	folia 🛘 Que	ercus lobate	a 155 ott	ner <u>Eu</u>	ca lypto	15 9/0	helus
# of trunks: dbH (inches):					, .	it (feet): _	$C \cap$
Compass direction N NE		E	S	SW	W	NW]
Dripline (feet) eff. 38 30 Clearance to canopy 45 4€		4	3Z 22	25	75 30	<u>30</u> 35	-
Form: generally symmetric							
Crown class: □ dominant □ co-dominant □ interm	-	•		-			•
Age class: ☐ young ☐ semi-mature ☑ mature [- •		crown rat	io (conifer	s only):	
Pruning history: □ crown cleaned □ excessively thin						crown re	_
☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/braced #1_none ☐ multiple							unknown
Special Value: Specimen Aheritage/historic Dindigenous Oprotected by government agency							
TREE HEALTH	n de la compania de La compania de la co			ers System System Sign			
Foliage color: Strormal		Woundw	ood dev	elopment:	□ excellen	t Dave	rage
. Epicormics? Y Twig Dieback? Y		□ poor					z.
Foliage density: Dinormal		Vigor cla	ass: 🛚 ex	cellent	average	□ fair	□ poor
Leaf size: normal small		•			akes 🛘 w nt 🗘 guai		□ signs
Annual shoot growth: excellent average	poor	O other		•			<u> </u>
Major pests/diseases:	·	<i>.</i> 					
SITE CONDITIONS	न्द्राच्याम् । अञ्चलकृतसम् । । । (१)	e ente — sogre ente.	پرې هندن د ده. د او د	in asking a	ermana agrawa Lina		garagat ya 100 km Miliawa
Site character: Presidence	ıstrial 🗆 pa	rk 🗆 op	en space	☑ natu	ral 🗆 woo	odland/fore	st
Landscape type: parkway raised bed cont	tainer 🛚 mo	ound 🗆	lawn 🗆	l shrub boi	der V Wi	nd break	
Irrigation: none adequate inadequate] excessive	☐ trunk w	etted F	Pavement	lifted? Y	£ P	
Recent site disturbance? Y 🕅 🗆 construction	I soil disturba	nce 🛮 g	rade char	nge 🛮 li	ne clearing	☐ site c	learing
% dripline paved: 0% 10-25% 25-509	₹ 50-75%	75-100%	•				
% dripline w/fill soil: 0% 10-25% 25-50%	6 50-75%	75-100%	•				
% dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50%	6 50-75%	75-100 %	•				
Soil problems: drainage shallow compact	-	ghty □s Sislope	aline [alkaline •	□ acidic aspect	□ small	volume
Obstructions: ☐ lights ☐ signage ☐ line-of-sight ☐ adjacent vegetation ☐ other	□ view [overhead	i lines	undergr	ound utilitie:	s 🗆 traf	fic
Exposure to wind: single tree below canopy area prone to windthrow	M above can	ору 🏻 г	ecently ex	rposed i	□ windward	, canopy e	edge
Prevailing wind direction: Cocc	urrence of sn	ow/ice sto	orms: 🗸	never C] seldom	□ regular	ty

_			_
Tree	Nι	ım	ber

20	
()	

TARGET	era er	e e tradition de la company		er en
		ic Øpedestrian □ rec moved? Y Ø Can use		☐ hardscape
Occupancy: occasiona	al use Dintermittent us	e □ frequent use □ c	onstant use	
TREE DEFECTS - N	oted as applicable		San en San San en S	a de la companya de
ROOT DEFECTS: Sus	pect root rot? Y N /N	lushroom/conk present?	Y (1) ID:	
	, ,		re 🗆 moderate 🗀 low	
•			Buttress wounded? Y	
			t failure: 🗆 severe 🗆 mo	
LEAN: de	grees from vertical 🛛 🗆 n	atural 🗅 unnatural 🗅	self-corrected Soil heav	•
Compounding factors: _				
CROWN DEFECTS: S =		= low		
DEFECT	ROOT CROWN	TRUNK	SCAFFOLDS	BRANCHES
Poor taper				
Bow, sweep				
Co-dominants, forks				
Multiple attachments				
Included bark				
Excessive end weight				
Cracks/splits				
Hangers				
Girdling				
Wounds/seam				
Decay				
Cavity				
Conks/mushrooms	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<u> </u>		
Bleeding/sap flow				
Loose/cracked bark				
Nesting hole/bee hive				
Deadwood/stubs				
Borers/termites/ants		1		
Cankers/galls/burls Previous failure		<u> </u>		
RECOMMENDED TE	REATMENT			L
Prune: ☐ remove defection	•	veight	☐ thin ☐ raise canopy	□ crown reduce
Pest control:		Cable/Bra	ce:	
•	te soil	remove irrigation/pla		. 🗆 fertilize/water
Inspect further: ☐ root of Move target:? Y	rown 🛘 decay 🗘 ae	rial 🛘 monitor Remov	e tree? Y D Replace t	ree? Y N action required at this time
	•	Notification: owner	☐ manager ☐ governing	agency Date:
ADDITIONAL COMM		The manifest to and of the milest will		

Owner:		Dublic	1751 private □ u	ınknown 🔲 other	•
Site/Address:	- A.		Thom	as Guide: Page: _	Coordinate:
Date: July 11,1998 In	spector: <u>fc,</u>	Date of	ast inspection:		☐ not previously inspecte
TREE CHARACTERISTI	CS				je ko sa najmaji, na k
Tree #:	Species: Quercus	s agrifolia 🔲 Qu	iercus lobata	other Eucale	tos leucoxyla,
# of trunks: 2 d	bH (inches): 24	12	<u>.</u>	, ,	leight (feet): 70
Compass direction	N NE		SE S	sw w	NW
Dripline (feet) Clearance to canopy	70 15 30 28		Ge 32 G 30	6 6	16
					
Form: generally symmetric		,		ip sprout — Li stag-	rieaded
Crown class: dominant			• •		-Mara andrew 04
Age class: young sen	, —			•	
Pruning history: ☐ crown cle ☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/brac					d ☐ crown reduced ☐ unknown
Special Value: Specimen I indigenous Sprotected in	/2 heritage/historic	□ wildlife □			
TREE HEALTH					
Foliage color: 🗓 normal 🛛	l chlorotic 🔲 necro	otic	Woundwood d	evelopment: 🗆 exc	cellent Raverage
Epicormics? Y N Twig D	ieback? Y/N		poor no	ne	
Foliage density: Cnormal			Vigor class: □	excellent Draver	age 🛘 fair 🗘 poor
Leaf size: 🗖 normal 🗆 sma	_			ctions: 🛘 stakes _	
Annual shoot growth: □ exc		D poor	☐ cables ☐ other	curp/pavement D	guards
Major pests/diseases:					
	eterna en la companya de la company	to the first profession of the control of the contr	english to the second to the second	eta kajantan eta Junio.	
SITE CONDITIONS		·	and the same of the		
Site character; Z residence	□ commercial □	🛘 industrial 🗀 p	oark 🛮 open spa	ce 🗆 natural 🗈] woodland/forest
Landscape type: parkway	🗆 raised bed 🗆	3 container 🗆 r	nound 🗆 iawn	☐ shrub border	wind break
Irrigation: ⊠none □ adeq	uate 🛘 inadequate	e 🗆 excessive	□ trunk wetted	Pavement lifted?	YBO
Recent site disturbance? Y	☐ construction	n 🔲 soil disturb	ance 🛛 grade cl	nange 🛭 line clea	ring 🛚 site clearing
% dripline paved:	0% 10-25% 2	5-50% 50-75%	75-100%		
% dripline w/fill soil:	0%) 10-25% 2	5-50% 50-75%	75-100%		
% dripline grade lowered: (0% 10-25% 2	5-50% 50-75%	75-100%	•	
Soil problems: ☐ drainage ☐ disease center ☐ history			ughty saline slope	☐ alkaline ☐ ac	idic small volume
Obstructions: lights statement lights statement lights statement statement lights statement st	signage line-of- ther	sight Uview	Overhead lines	☐ underground u	tilities 🗆 traffic
Exposure to wind: ☐ single t☐ area prone to windthrow	ree 🛘 below cand	ppy Øabove ca	nopy 🗆 recently	exposed wind	ward, canopy edge
Prevailing wind direction: _	<u> </u>	Occurrence of s	nowlice storms:)	never 🗆 seldo	m 🛘 regularly

7

)

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Photo A 10

Owner:	public 🗷 private 🗆 unknown 🗅 other:
Site/Address:	Thomas Guide: Page: Coordinate:
Date: July 11, 1918 Inspector: Da	te of last inspection:
TREE CHARACTERISTICS	· 大学
Tree #: Species: Quercus agrifolia	□ Quercus lobata Aother Phoenix Candricuses
# of trunks: dbH (inches):	Height (feet): 28
Compass direction N NE E	SE S SW W NW
Dripline (feet) /2 /2 /2 /2 Clearance to canopy 8 /0 9	12 /2 12 12 /2 10 10 10 10 0
Form: generally symmetric minor asymmetry ma	
Crown class: dominant So-dominant intermediat	
, ·	r-mature/senescent
, —	☐ topped ☐ crown raised ☐ pollarded ☐ crown reduced
☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/braced 💆 none ☐ multiple prun	
Special Value: Specimen A heritage/historic Special wildlife indigenous Speciment by government agency	e 🖸 unusual 🚨 street tree 🔲 screen 📙 shade
TREE HEALTH	
Foliage cotor: 🗷 normal 🗆 chlorotic 🗅 necrotic	an'
Epicormics? Y Twig Dieback? Y	poor I none
Foliage density: Filinormal	Vigor class: ☐ excellent
Leaf size: Q∕normal □ small	Growth obstructions: 🗆 stakes 🗀 wire/ties 🗀 signs
Annual shoot growth: □ excellent Ø average □ poor	☐ cables
-	
Site character: Is residence □ commercial □ industrial	
Landscape type: □ parkway □ raised bed □ container	☐ mound ☐ lawn ☐ shrub border ☐ wind break
•	ssive 🛘 trunk wetted Pavement lifted? Y
	listurbance ☐ grade change ☐ line clearing ☐ site clearing
% dripline paved: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50	P-75% 75-100%
% dripline w/fill soil: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50	P75% 75-100%
% dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50	L-75% 75-100 %
Soil problems: □ drainage □ shallow □ compacted □ disease center □ history of failure □ clay □ expans	- -
Obstructions: ☐ lights ☐ signage ☐ line-of-sight ☐ vi ☐ adjacent vegetation ☐ other	ew 🛘 overhead lines 🗘 underground utilities 🗘 traffic
☐ area prone to windthrow	ove canopy
Prevailing wind direction: Occurrenc	e of snow/ice storms: Thever D seldom D regularly

				•
TARGET	and the second of the second o			e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e
Use Under Tree: ☐ build ☐ small features ☐ uti	ing ⊠parking G∕traffi lity lines Can target be n	c predestrian □ red noved? Y Can use	be restricted? Y	□ hardscape
	al use □ intermittent use			
TREE DEFECTS - N	oted as applicable			a variantista (m. 1945). 1990 - January Barrer, principal de la companya (m. 1948).
ROOT DEFECTS: Sus	spect root rot? Y 🔊 Mi	ushroom/conk present?	Y 🐠 ID:	and the second second
Exposed roots: seve	re □ moderate □ low	Undermined: ☐ seve	re 🛘 moderate 🗘 low	
Root pruned:	feet from trunk Root ar	ea affected:%	Buttress wounded? \	When:
	severe D moderate D			
LEAN:de	egrees from vertical	itural 🗆 unnatural 🗖	self-corrected Soil hea	ving? Y N
Decay in plane of lean?	Y N Roots broken? Y	N Soil cracking? Y	N Lean severity: 🗆 se	evere 🗆 moderate 🗀 iow
Compounding factors:	***************************************			•
	severe, M = moderate, L =	low		
DEFECT	ROOT CROWN	TRUNK	SCAFFOLDS	BRANCHES
Poor taper				
Bow, sweep				
Co-dominants, forks				T
Multiple attachments				
Included bark			[i .
Excessive end weight				
Cracks/splits				<u> </u>
Hangers				T
Girdling				1
Wounds/seam				1
Decay		•		
Cavity				
Conks/mushrooms				
Bleeding/sap flow				<u> </u>
Loose/cracked bark				
Nesting hole/bee hive				
Deadwood/stubs			<u>† - </u>	L Frends
Borers/termites/ants	; .		-	1
Cankers/galls/burls		*		
Previous failure				
RECOMMENDED TO	REATMENT	deal front		年间 的 是1000年
Prune: ☐ remove defecti ☐ restructure ☐ shape	ve part 🛛 reduce end we	eight D crown clean	☐ thin ☐ raise canopy	☐ crown reduce
Pest control:		Cable/Bra	ce:	
Other Activities: □ aera	te soil	☐ remove irrigation/pla	nting 🛘 remove wire, et	c. fertilize/water
Inspect further: ☐ root of Move target:? Y	crown 🗆 decay 🗆 aeri Other:	al 🛘 monitor Remov	re tree? Y N Replace	tree? Y DO action required at this time
Effect on adjacent trees	: ☐ none	Notification: □ owner	☐ manager ☐ governin	g agency Date:
ADDITIONAL COM	MENTS	The Margar Maria San San Ward San	Barrella de la Carta de Carta Carta de Carta de Ca	
_ 1	to A //		•	

Owner:	·-·- <u>-</u> -	_ 🛮 public	p í p riva	ate 🛭 ur	iknown [other:		<u> </u>
Site/Address:				Thoma	s Guide: F	Page:	Coord	linate:
Date: July 11,1998 Inspec	tor: <u>///</u> 6	Date of	last inspe	ection:	<u> </u>	🗆 n	ot previou	sly inspected
TREE CHARACTERISTICS								
Tree #: 2.3 Spec	ies: 🛘 Quercus ag	rifolia 🛮 Qu	uercus lob	ata 🗖 o	ther $\frac{\sum_{i}^{n}}{\sum_{i}^{n}}$	horse 1	75/16	
# of trunks:3 dbH (i	nches): <u>16/72</u>					Heig	ht (feet):	75
	N NE	E	SE	S	SW	W	NW]
	F 20		70	15,	- 15 12	7E 15	18	-
								_1
Form: generally symmetric Service class: description		•			sprout i	_ stay-neat	Jea	
Crown class: dominant						tia /aanifaa		· «
Age class: 🗆 young 🗆 semi-ma				•				
Pruning history: ☐ crown cleaned ☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/braced						ollarded		unknown □
Special Value: ☑ specimen ☑ indigenous ☑ protected by go	vernment agency							
TREE HEALTH							n de la composition d La composition de la	
Foliage color: Donmal						: exceller		
Epicormics? Y N Twig Dieba	ck? Y /K		□ poc	or 🗆 non	e		* **	
Foliage density: Anormal D s			Vigor	class: 🗆 e	excellent	⊠ average	☐ fair	□ poor
Leaf size: ⊠\normal □ smail						akes 🗆 v		□ signs
Annual shoot growth: ☐ excellen	t Ø∖average □] poor		-	<u> </u>	nt □ gua		
Major pests/diseases:		•	•					
SITE CONDITIONS					. John J.			, ₍₁₎ (1) (1)
Site character: Oresidence	commercial D in	dustrial 🗀 r		-	e D'natu	ral ∏wo	odland/for	:. 'est
Landscape type: □ parkway □		•			∃ shrub bo		ind break	
Irrigation: Ø none □ adequate	☐ inadequate			•		lifted? Y	_	
Recent site disturbance? Y	☐ construction					ine clearing		clearing
% dripline paved:	\ 10-25% 25-50			-	90 "	ino oleaning		
% dripline w/fill soil: 0%	10-25% 25-56							
% dripline grade lowered: 0%	10-25% 25-50							
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	hallow				□ alkaline	□ acidic aspect		l volume
Obstructions: ☐ lights ☐ signa ☐ adjacent vegetation ☐ other_		t 🗆 view	Overh	ead lines	□ undergr	round utilitie	s 🛘 tra	ffic
Exposure to wind: ⊠single tree ☐ area prone to windthrow	☐ below canopy	□ above ca	inopy [recently e	exposed	□ windward	d, canopy	edge
Prevailing wind direction:	<u> </u>	currence of s	inow/ice	storms: 5	never [⊐ seldom	☐ regula	irly .

)

TARGET	and the second of the second o	e grander		
		ic—⊟ pedestrian □ rec moved? Y N Can use	creation ☐ landscape l	⊐ hardscape
Occupancy: occasiona	il use 🔲 intermittent us	e 🗆 🗆 frequent use 🗀 c	onstant use	
	en e	and the second s		
				e a la companya de l
ROOT DEFECTS: Sus	pect root rot? Y N	lushroom/conk present?	Y/N ID:	
Exposed roots: Sever	e □ moderate □ lov	v Undermined: □ sever	re moderate low	and the same of th
•		•	Buttress wounded? Y	
Restricted root area: 🗆 :	severe D moderate	☐ low Potential for roof	t failure: 🗆 severe 💢 🗀	oderate 🗆 low
LEAN: de		stural Dunnatural D	self-corrected Soil heav	ing2 V N
	_			
		Y N Soil cracking? Y	N Lean severity: □ se	vere 🗆 moderate 🗆 iow
Compounding factors: _			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
CROWN DEFECTS: S =	severe, M = moderate, L	= low	٠.	
DEFECT	ROOT CROWN	TRUNK	SCAFFOLDS	BRANCHES
Poor taper				
Bow, sweep				
Co-dominants, forks				
Multiple attachments				<u> </u>
Included bark			-	
Excessive end weight				
Cracks/splits				
Hangers				
Girdling				
Wounds/seam				
Decay				
Cavity				
Conks/mushrooms				
Bleeding/sap flow				
Loose/cracked bark				
Nesting hole/bee hive				
Deadwood/stubs				
Borers/termites/ants				
Cankers/galls/burls				
Previous failure				
RECOMMENDED TR	•			
☐ restructure ☐ shape	ve part Li reduce end v	veight Licrown clean	□ thin □ raise canopy	crown reduce
Pest control:		Cable/Bra	ce:	
Other Activities: aera	te soil 🔲 remove fill soi			
Inspect further: ☐ root c Move target:? Y	rown decay ae Other:	rial 🗆 monitor Remov	re tree? Y (N) Replace t	ree? Y (N) o action required at this time
Effect on adjacent trees	: none bevaluate	Notification: □ owner	☐ manager ☐ governing	g agency Date:
Phon	为井亿			

Owner: Dublic	D private □ L	ınknown [other:		<u></u>
Site/Address:	Thom	as Guide: F	Page:	Coordin	ate:
Date: July 1998 Inspector: Do Date of la	st inspection:		🖸 no	t previousl	y inspected
TREE CHARACTERISTICS	· .:	٠٠٠			
Tree #: 24 Species: Quercus agrifolia Que		other <u></u>	1.200 P)	:1/e	
# of trunks: dbH (inches):	7//		Heigh	it (feet):	<u> 78 </u>
	E S	sw	W	NW	
	7	28	75	72-	
Form: □ generally symmetric □ major asymmetry □ major asym			□ stag-head		
Crown class: □ dominant		.p			
Age class: ☐ young ☐ semi-mature ☑ mature ☐ over-mature		ve crown rat	tio (conifers	s only):	- %
Pruning history: □ crown cleaned □ excessively thinned □ top	-		ollarded D		
☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/braced ☐ multiple pruning ever					unknown
Special Value: ☐ specimen					
TREE HEALTH					
Foliage color: ☑ normal ☐ chlorotic ☐ necrotic	Woundwood de			_	
Epicormics? Y N Twig Dieback? Y N	□ poor □ no	ne		~ •	`
Foliage density: ☑ normal □ sparse	Vigor class: □	excellent	☑ average	🗆 fair ု	□ poor
Leaf size: □ normal □ small	Growth obstru				3 signs
Annual shoot growth: □ excellent #Baverage □ poor	O other		_		
Major pests/diseases:					<u> </u>
SITE CONDITIONS		F			ann, no
Site character: pcresidence □ commercial □ industrial □ pa	rk 🛮 open spa	ce 💆 natu	ral 🗆 woo	dland/fores	st
Landscape type: ☐ parkway ☐ raised bed ☐ container ☐ mo	ound 🗀 lawn	□ shrub bo	rder 🛚 wir	nd break	
Irrigation: ∠ none □ adequate □ inadequate □ excessive	☐ trunk wetted	Pavement	lifted? Y	N.	
Recent site disturbance? Y	nce 🛮 grade ch	nange 🗆 li	ne clearing	□ site cl	earing
% dripline paved: 10-25% 25-50% 50-75%	75-100%				
% dripline w/fill soil: \(\left(0\) \right(10-25\) 25-50\% 50-75\%	75-100%				•
% dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75%	75-100%				
Soil problems: ☐ drainage ☐ shallow ☐ compacted ☐ droug ☐ disease center ☐ history of failure ☐ clay ☐ expansive ☐	ihty □ saline □ slope	🛘 alkaline	☐ acidic aspect	□ smail v	olume
Obstructions: ☐ lights ☐ signage ☐ line-of-sight ☐ view ☐ ☐ adjacent vegetation ☐ other	overhead lines	undergr	ound utilities	traffi	c
Exposure to wind: ☐ single tree ☐ below canopy Ø above can ☐ area prone to windthrow	opy 🗆 recently	exposed	□ windward,	, canopy ed	ige
Prevailing wind direction: Occurrence of sn	ow/ice storms:)	never [] seldom	□ regularly	,

		•		
TARGET	and the second of the second o		. , .	the second secon
	ling □ parking □ traffi lity lines Can target be r		creation Mandscape be restricted? Y	Ø hardscape
	al use			•
	oted as applicable	/		
TREE DEI LOTO - N	oted as applicable	and the second of the second		All Communications of the Communication of the Comm
	spect root rot? Y (N) M		•	
•	re □ moderate □ low feet from trunk Root a	•		والمستحدد والمستحد الأراث
Restricted root area:	severe moderate	low Potential for roo	t failure: □ severe □ n	noderate 🗆 low
LEAN:de	egrees from vertical 🛛 na	atural 🗆 unnatural 🗆	self-corrected Soil hea	ving? Y N
Decay in plane of lean?	Y N Roots broken?	N Soil cracking? Y	N Lean severity: □ se	evere 🛘 moderate 🗘 low
Compounding factors:				
CROWN DEFECTS: S =	severe, M = moderate, L =	= low		
DEFECT	ROOT CROWN	TRUNK	SCAFFOLDS	BRANCHES
Poor taper				
Bow, sweep				
Co-dominants, forks				
Multiple attachments				
included bark				
Excessive end weight				
Cracks/splits				
Hangers				
Girdling				
Wounds/seam				
Decay				
Cavity	· ' · · · ·			
Conks/mushrooms				
Bleeding/sap flow				
Loose/cracked bank		· .		\ \ \
Nesting hole/bee hive				
Deadwood stubs				L-M/ L-M
Borers/termites/ants				
Cankers/galls/burls				
Previous failure		· · ·	 	
RECOMMENDED TO	REATMENT ive part	eioht □ crown clean	☐ thin ☐ raise canopy	□ crown reduce
☐ restructure ☐ shape		· ·		-
Pest control:		Cable/Bra	ace:	
Other Activities: ☐ aera	ite soil 🔲 remove fill soil	☐ remove irrigation/pla	inting	tc. 🛘 fertilize/water
Inspect further: ☐ root of Move target:? Y	crown 🗆 decay 🗆 aeri Other:	ial Smonitor Remov	/e tree? YN Replace	tree? YAP no action required at this time
Effect on adjacent trees	s: ☐ none s: ☐ evaluate	Notification: ☐ 'owner	☐ manager ☐ governir	ng agency Date:
ADDITIONAL COM	nents 010 # 13	The state of the subsection of the state of	ka ang sa	