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
- ☐ Other

Report Date (Month/Day/Year): 07/11/1998

Check if the following apply to the report:

- ☐ Wetland and/or aquatic habitat
- ☐ 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

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 Temez 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.

Tree Number 11 - This Aleppo Pine has a small infestation of mistletoe.

Tree Numbers 12 and 13 - 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.

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

Tree Number 18 - 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:

Tree Number 1 - 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.

Tree Numbers 2, 3, 4, and 5 - 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.

Tree Numbers 12 and 13 - 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.

Tree Number 14 - 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.

Tree Number 15 - 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.

Tree Number 16 - 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.

Tree Number 20 - 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.

Tree Number 21 - 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.

Tree Number 22 - 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.

Tree Number 23 - 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.

Tree Number 24 - 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.

Notice -- 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.

Hand Tools -- 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.

Certification -- 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

FIELD EVALUATION FORM

Owner: _____ ☐ public ☒ private ☐ unknown ☐ other: _____

Site/Address: 10729 Citrus Drive **Thomas Guide:** Page: ____ Coordinate: ____

Date: June 27, 1998 **Inspector:** DC **Date of last inspection:** ? ☐ not previously inspected

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Tree #: 1 **Species:** ☐ *Quercus agrifolia* ☐ *Quercus lobata* ☒ other Sambucus Mexicana

# of trunks: 7 **dbH (inches):** 8, 2, 2, 2, 2, 1, 1 **Height (feet):** 9

Compass direction	N	NE	E	SE	S	SW	W	NW
Dripline (feet)	3	2	8	5	6	4	3	2
Clearance to canopy	6	5	7	5	6	5	4	4

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):** ____ %

Pruning history: ☐ crown cleaned ☐ excessively thinned ☐ topped ☐ crown raised ☐ pollarded ☐ crown reduced
☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/braced ☐ none ☒ multiple pruning events Approximate dates: ____ ☐ unknown

Special Value: ☐ specimen ☐ heritage/historic ☐ wildlife ☐ unusual ☐ street tree ☐ screen ☐ shade
☒ indigenous ☐ protected by government agency

TREE HEALTH

Foliage color: ☒ normal ☐ chlorotic ☐ necrotic

Epicormics? Y (N) **Twig Dieback?** (Y) N

Foliage density: ☐ normal ☒ sparse

Leaf size: ☐ normal ☒ small

Annual shoot growth: ☐ excellent ☐ average ☒ poor

Major pests/diseases: ____

Woundwood development: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ poor ☐ none

Vigor class: ☐ excellent ☐ average ☒ fair ☒ poor

Growth obstructions: ☐ stakes ☐ wire/ties ☐ signs ☐ cables ☐ curb/pavement ☐ guards ☐ other _____

SITE CONDITIONS

Site character: ☐ residence ☐ commercial ☐ industrial ☐ park ☐ open space ☒ natural ☐ woodland/forest

Landscape type: ☐ parkway ☐ raised bed ☐ container ☐ mound ☐ lawn ☐ shrub border ☐ wind break

Irrigation: ☒ none ☐ adequate ☐ inadequate ☐ excessive ☐ trunk wetted **Pavement lifted?** Y (N)

Recent site disturbance? Y (N) ☐ construction ☐ soil disturbance ☐ grade change ☐ line clearing ☐ site clearing

% 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 ☐ droughty ☐ saline ☐ alkaline ☐ acidic ☐ small volume
☐ disease center ☐ history of failure ☐ clay ☐ expansive ☒ slope 5 ° aspect E

Obstructions: ☐ lights ☐ signage ☐ line-of-sight ☐ view ☐ overhead lines ☐ underground utilities ☐ traffic
☒ adjacent vegetation ☐ other _____

Exposure to wind: ☐ single tree ☒ below canopy ☐ above canopy ☐ recently exposed ☐ windward, canopy edge
☐ area prone to windthrow

Prevailing wind direction: N **Occurrence of snow/ice storms:** ☒ never ☐ seldom ☐ regularly

FIELD EVALUATION FORM - PAGE 2 OF 2 Tree Number 1

TARGET

~~Use Under Tree~~: ☐ building ☐ parking ☐ traffic ☐ pedestrian ☐ recreation ☐ landscape ☐ hardscape
☐ small features ☐ utility lines **Can target be moved?** Y N **Can use be restricted?** Y N

~~Occupancy:~~ ☐ occasional use ☐ intermittent use ☐ frequent use ☐ constant use

TREE DEFECTS - Noted as applicable

ROOT DEFECTS: **Suspect root rot?** Y (N) **Mushroom/conk present?** Y (N) **ID:** _____

Exposed roots: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Undermined:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

Root pruned: _____ feet from trunk **Root area affected:** _____ % **Buttress wounded?** Y (N) **When:** _____

Restricted root area: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Potential for root failure:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

LEAN: _____ degrees from vertical ☐ natural ☐ unnatural ☐ self-corrected **Soil heaving?** Y N

Decay in plane of lean? Y N **Roots broken?** Y N **Soil cracking?** Y N **Lean severity:** ☐ severe ☐ 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 bark				
Nesting hole/bee hive				
Deadwood/stubs				L-M
Borers/termites/ants				
Cankers/galls/burls				
Previous failure				

RECOMMENDED TREATMENT

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 (N) **Replace tree?** Y (N)
Move target:? Y (N) **Other:** _____ ☐ no action required at this time

Effect on adjacent trees: ☐ none ☐ evaluate **Notification:** ☐ owner ☐ manager ☐ governing agency **Date:** _____

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Photo # 1

FIELD EVALUATION FORM

Owner: _____ ☐ public ☒ private ☐ unknown ☐ other: _____

Site/Address: _____ **Thomas Guide:** Page: ____ Coordinate: ____

Date: June 22, 1999 **Inspector:** DC **Date of last inspection:** ? ☐ not previously inspected

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Tree #: 2 **Species:** ☐ *Quercus agrifolia* ☐ *Quercus lobata* ☒ other *Pinus halepensis*

# of trunks: 2 **dbH (inches):** 15, 13 **Height (feet):** 22

Compass direction	N	NE	E	SE	S	SW	W	NW
Dripline (feet)	14	14	15	0	0	2	15	15
Clearance to canopy	15	15	12	0	0	10	12	14

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):** 95 %

Pruning history: ☐ crown cleaned ☐ excessively thinned ☐ topped ☐ crown raised ☐ pollarded ☐ crown reduced ☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/braced ☐ none ☐ multiple pruning events Approximate dates: — ☒ unknown

Special Value: ☐ specimen ☐ heritage/historic ☐ wildlife ☐ unusual ☐ street tree ☐ screen ☒ shade ☐ indigenous ☐ protected by government agency

TREE HEALTH

Foliage color: ☒ normal ☐ chlorotic ☐ necrotic

Epicormics? Y (N) **Twig Dieback?** Y (N)

Foliage density: ☒ normal ☐ sparse

Leaf size: ☒ normal ☐ small

Annual shoot growth: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ poor

Woundwood development: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ poor ☐ none

Vigor class: ☐ excellent ☐ average ☒ fair ☐ poor

Growth obstructions: ☐ stakes ☐ wire/ties ☐ signs ☐ cables ☐ curb/pavement ☐ guards ☐ other _____

Major pests/diseases: _____

SITE CONDITIONS

Site character: ☒ residence ☐ commercial ☐ industrial ☐ park ☒ open space ☐ natural ☐ woodland/forest

Landscape type: ☐ parkway ☐ raised bed ☐ container ☐ mound ☐ lawn ☐ shrub border ☐ wind break

Irrigation: ☒ none ☐ adequate ☐ inadequate ☐ excessive ☐ trunk wetted **Pavement lifted?** Y (N)

Recent site disturbance? Y (N) ☐ construction ☐ soil disturbance ☐ grade change ☐ line clearing ☐ site clearing

% 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 ☐ droughty ☐ saline ☐ alkaline ☐ acidic ☐ small volume ☐ disease center ☐ history of failure ☐ clay ☐ expansive ☒ slope 3 ° aspect N

Obstructions: ☐ lights ☐ signage ☐ line-of-sight ☐ view ☐ overhead lines ☐ underground utilities ☐ traffic ☒ adjacent vegetation ☐ other _____

Exposure to wind: ☐ single tree ☒ below canopy ☐ above canopy ☐ recently exposed ☐ windward, canopy edge ☐ area prone to windthrow

Prevailing wind direction: N **Occurrence of snow/ice storms:** ☒ never ☐ seldom ☐ regularly

FIELD EVALUATION FORM - PAGE 2 OF 2 Tree Number 2

TARGET

Use Under Tree: ☐ building ☒ parking ☒ traffic ☒ pedestrian ☐ recreation ☐ landscape ☐ hardscape ☐ small features ☐ utility lines **Can target be moved?** Y (N) **Can use be restricted?** Y (N)

Occupancy: ☒ occasional use ☐ intermittent use ☐ frequent use ☐ constant use

TREE DEFECTS - Noted as applicable

ROOT DEFECTS: **Suspect root rot?** Y (N) **Mushroom/conk present?** Y (N) **ID:** —

Exposed roots: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Undermined:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

Root pruned: — feet from trunk **Root area affected:** — % **Buttress wounded?** Y (N) **When:** —

Restricted root area: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Potential for root failure:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

LEAN: 30 degrees from vertical ☒ natural ☐ unnatural ☐ self-corrected **Soil heaving?** Y (N)

Decay in plane of lean? Y (N) **Roots broken?** Y (N) **Soil cracking?** Y (N) **Lean severity:** ☒ severe ☒ 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 bark				
Nesting hole/bee hive				
Deadwood/stubs				L-M
Borers/termites/ants				
Cankers/galls/burls				
Previous failure				

RECOMMENDED TREATMENT

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 (N) **Replace tree?** Y (N)
Move target:? Y (N) **Other:** — ☐ no action required at this time

Effect on adjacent trees: ☐ none ☒ evaluate **Notification:** ☐ owner ☐ manager ☐ governing agency **Date:** —

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Photo #2

FIELD EVALUATION FORM

Owner: _____ ☐ public ☒ private ☐ unknown ☐ other: _____

Site/Address: _____ **Thomas Guide:** Page: ____ Coordinate: ____

Date: June 27, 1998 **Inspector:** DG **Date of last inspection:** ? ☐ not previously inspected

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Tree #: 3 **Species:** ☐ *Quercus agrifolia* ☐ *Quercus lobata* ☒ other *Pinus halepensis*

# of trunks: 1 **dbH (inches):** 15 **Height (feet):** 22

Compass direction	N	NE	E	SE	S	SW	W	NW
Dripline (feet)	10	12	18	10	10	12	10	15
Clearance to canopy	20	18	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):** 95 %

Pruning history: ☐ crown cleaned ☐ excessively thinned ☐ topped ☐ crown raised ☐ pollarded ☐ crown reduced
☐ *flush cuts* ☐ *cabled/braced* ☐ *none* ☐ *multiple pruning events* *Approximate dates:* ____ ☒ *unknown*

Special Value: ☐ specimen ☐ heritage/historic ☐ wildlife ☐ unusual ☐ street tree ☐ screen ☒ shade
☐ indigenous ☐ protected by government agency

TREE HEALTH

Foliage color: ☒ normal ☐ chlorotic ☐ necrotic

Epicormics? Y (N) **Twig Dieback?** (Y) N

Foliage density: ☒ normal ☐ sparse

Leaf size: ☒ normal ☐ small

Annual shoot growth: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ poor

Woundwood development: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ poor ☐ none

Vigor class: ☐ excellent ☐ average ☒ fair ☐ poor

Growth obstructions: ☐ *stakes* ☐ *wire/ties* ☐ *signs* ☐ *cables* ☐ *curb/pavement* ☐ *guards* ☐ other _____

Major pests/diseases: ____

SITE CONDITIONS

Site character: ☒ residence ☐ commercial ☐ industrial ☐ park ☒ open space ☐ natural ☐ woodland/forest

Landscape type: ☐ parkway ☐ raised bed ☐ container ☐ mound ☐ lawn ☐ shrub border ☐ wind break

Irrigation: ☒ *none* ☐ *adequate* ☐ *inadequate* ☐ *excessive* ☐ *trunk wetted* **Pavement lifted?** Y (N)

Recent site disturbance? Y (N) ☐ construction ☐ soil disturbance ☐ grade change ☐ line clearing ☐ site clearing

% 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 ☐ droughty ☐ saline ☐ alkaline ☐ acidic ☐ small volume
☐ disease center ☐ history of failure ☐ clay ☐ expansive ☒ slope 3 ° aspect N

Obstructions: ☐ lights ☐ signage ☐ line-of-sight ☐ view ☐ overhead lines ☐ underground utilities ☐ traffic
☒ adjacent vegetation ☐ other ____

Exposure to wind: ☐ single tree ☒ below canopy ☐ above canopy ☐ recently exposed ☐ windward, canopy edge
☐ area prone to windthrow

Prevailing wind direction: N ***Occurrence of snow/ice storms:*** ☒ never ☐ seldom ☐ regularly

FIELD EVALUATION FORM - PAGE 2 OF 2 Tree Number 3

TARGET

Use Under Tree: ☐ building ☒ parking ☒ traffic ☒ pedestrian ☐ recreation ☐ landscape ☐ hardscape ☐ small features ☐ utility lines **Can target be moved?** Y (N) **Can use be restricted?** Y (N)

Occupancy: ☐ occasional use ☒ intermittent use ☐ frequent use ☐ constant use

TREE DEFECTS - Noted as applicable

ROOT DEFECTS: **Suspect root rot?** Y (N) **Mushroom/conk present?** Y (N) **ID:** —

Exposed roots: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Undermined:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

Root pruned: — feet from trunk **Root area affected:** — % **Buttress wounded?** Y (N) **When:** —

Restricted root area: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Potential for root failure:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

LEAN: 15 degrees from vertical ☒ natural ☐ unnatural ☐ self-corrected **Soil heaving?** Y (N)

Decay in plane of lean? Y (N) **Roots broken?** Y (N) **Soil cracking?** Y (N) **Lean severity:** ☐ severe ☒ 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 bark				
Nesting hole/bee hive				
Deadwood/stubs				L-M
Borers/termites/ants				
Cankers/galls/burls				
Previous failure				

RECOMMENDED TREATMENT

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 (N) **Replace tree?** Y (N)

Move target:? Y (N) **Other:** _____ ☐ no action required at this time

Effect on adjacent trees: ☐ none ☒ evaluate **Notification:** ☐ owner ☐ manager ☐ governing agency **Date:** _____

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Photo #3 Tree is on the left. Remove barbed wire embedded in trunk.

FIELD EVALUATION FORM

Owner: _____ ☐ public ☒ private ☐ unknown ☐ other: _____

Site/Address: _____ Thomas Guide: Page: ____ Coordinate: ____

Date: June 27, 1998 Inspector: DG Date of last inspection: ? ☐ not previously inspected

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Tree #: 4 Species: ☐ *Quercus agrifolia* ☐ *Quercus lobata* ☒ other *Pinus halepensis*

# of trunks: 1 dbH (inches): 13 Height (feet): 25

Compass direction	N	NE	E	SE	S	SW	W	NW
Dripline (feet)	6	2	0	14	20	18	12	2
Clearance to canopy	20	18	0	18	18	18	12	18

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): 95 %

Pruning history: ☐ crown cleaned ☐ excessively thinned ☐ topped ☐ crown raised ☐ pollarded ☐ crown reduced
☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/braced ☐ none ☐ multiple pruning events Approximate dates: _____ ☒ unknown

Special Value: ☐ specimen ☐ heritage/historic ☐ wildlife ☐ unusual ☐ street tree ☐ screen ☒ shade
☐ indigenous ☐ protected by government agency

TREE HEALTH

Foliage color: ☒ normal ☐ chlorotic ☐ necrotic

Epicormics? Y (N) Twig Dieback? (Y) N

Foliage density: ☒ normal ☐ sparse

Leaf size: ☒ normal ☐ small

Annual shoot growth: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ poor

Major pests/diseases: _____

Woundwood development: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ poor ☐ none

Vigor class: ☐ excellent ☐ average ☒ fair ☐ poor

Growth obstructions: ☐ stakes ☐ wire/ties ☐ signs ☐ cables ☐ curb/pavement ☐ guards ☐ other _____

SITE CONDITIONS

Site character: ☒ residence ☐ commercial ☐ industrial ☐ park ☒ open space ☐ natural ☐ woodland/forest

Landscape type: ☐ parkway ☐ raised bed ☐ container ☐ mound ☐ lawn ☐ shrub border ☐ wind break

Irrigation: ☒ none ☐ adequate ☐ inadequate ☐ excessive ☐ trunk wetted Pavement lifted? Y (N)

Recent site disturbance? Y (N) ☐ construction ☐ soil disturbance ☐ grade change ☐ line clearing ☐ site clearing

% 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 ☐ droughty ☐ saline ☐ alkaline ☐ acidic ☐ small volume
☐ disease center ☐ history of failure ☐ clay ☐ expansive ☒ slope 3 ° aspect N

Obstructions: ☐ lights ☐ signage ☐ line-of-sight ☐ view ☐ overhead lines ☐ underground utilities ☐ traffic
☐ adjacent vegetation ☐ other _____

Exposure to wind: ☐ single tree ☒ below canopy ☐ above canopy ☐ recently exposed ☐ windward, canopy edge
☐ area prone to windthrow

Prevailing wind direction: N Occurrence of snow/ice storms: ☒ never ☐ seldom ☐ regularly

FIELD EVALUATION FORM - PAGE 2 OF 2 Tree Number 4

TARGET

Use Under Tree: ☐ building ☐ parking ☐ traffic ☒ pedestrian ☐ recreation ☐ landscape ☐ hardscape ☐ small features ☐ utility lines **Can target be moved?** Y (N) **Can use be restricted?** Y (N)

Occupancy: ☐ occasional use ☒ intermittent use ☐ frequent use ☐ constant use

TREE DEFECTS - Noted as applicable

ROOT DEFECTS: **Suspect root rot?** Y (N) **Mushroom/conk present?** Y (N) **ID:** _____

Exposed roots: ☐ *severe* ☐ *moderate* ☐ *low* ***Undermined:*** ☐ *severe* ☐ *moderate* ☐ *low*

Root pruned: ____ feet from trunk **Root area affected:** ____ % **Buttress wounded?** Y (N) **When:** _____

Restricted root area: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Potential for root failure:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

LEAN: 18 degrees from vertical ☒ natural ☐ unnatural ☐ self-corrected **Soil heaving?** Y (N)

Decay in plane of lean? Y (N) **Roots broken?** Y (N) **Soil cracking?** Y (N) **Lean severity:** ☐ severe ☒ 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 bark				
Nesting hole/bee hive				
Deadwood/stubs				L-M
Borers/termites/ants				
Cankers/galls/burls				
Previous failure				

RECOMMENDED TREATMENT

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 (N) **Replace tree?** Y (N)
Move target:? Y (N) **Other:** _____ ☐ no action required at this time

Effect on adjacent trees: ☐ none ☒ evaluate **Notification:** ☐ owner ☐ manager ☐ governing agency **Date:** _____

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Photo #3 Tree is ~~on the right.~~ On the right

FIELD EVALUATION FORM

Owner: _____ ☐ public ☒ private ☐ unknown ☐ other: _____

Site/Address: _____ **Thomas Guide:** Page: ____ Coordinate: ____

Date: June 27, 1998 **Inspector:** DG **Date of last inspection:** ____? ☐ not previously inspected

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Tree #: 5 **Species:** ☐ *Quercus agrifolia* ☐ *Quercus lobata* ☒ other Juniperus ?

# of trunks: 1 **dbH (inches):** est. 13 **Height (feet):** 25

Compass direction	N	NE	E	SE	S	SW	W	NW
Dripline (feet) est.	8	12	~~8~~ 12	15	15	15	15	~~15~~ 8
Clearance to canopy	18	15	15	15	15	18	15	18

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):** 55 %

Pruning history: ☐ crown cleaned ☐ excessively thinned ☐ topped ☐ crown raised ☐ pollarded ☐ crown reduced
☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/braced ☐ none ☐ multiple pruning events Approximate dates: _____ ☒ unknown

Special Value: ☐ specimen ☐ heritage/historic ☐ wildlife ☐ unusual ☐ street tree ☐ screen ☒ shade
☐ indigenous ☐ protected by government agency

TREE HEALTH

Foliage color: ☒ normal ☐ chlorotic ☐ necrotic

Epicormics? Y (N) **Twig Dieback?** Y (N)

Foliage density: ☒ normal ☐ sparse

Leaf size: ☒ normal ☐ small

Annual shoot growth: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ poor

Major pests/diseases: _____

Woundwood development: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ poor ☐ none

Vigor class: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ fair ☐ poor

Growth obstructions: ☐ stakes ☐ wire/ties ☐ signs ☐ cables ☒ curb/pavement ☐ guards ☐ other _____

SITE CONDITIONS

Site character: ☒ residence ☐ commercial ☐ industrial ☐ park ☐ open space ☐ natural ☐ woodland/forest

Landscape type: ☒ parkway ☐ raised bed ☐ container ☐ mound ☐ lawn ☐ shrub border ☐ wind break

Irrigation: ☐ none ☒ adequate ☐ inadequate ☐ excessive ☐ trunk wetted **Pavement lifted?** Y (N)

Recent site disturbance? Y (N) ☐ construction ☐ soil disturbance ☐ grade change ☐ line clearing ☐ site clearing

% 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 ☐ droughty ☐ saline ☐ alkaline ☐ acidic ☐ small volume
☐ disease center ☐ history of failure ☐ clay ☐ expansive ☐ slope _____ ° aspect _____

Obstructions: ☐ lights ☐ signage ☐ line-of-sight ☐ view ☐ overhead lines ☐ underground utilities ☐ traffic
☒ adjacent vegetation ☐ other _____

Exposure to wind: ☐ single tree ☒ below canopy ☐ above canopy ☐ recently exposed ☐ windward, canopy edge
☐ area prone to windthrow

Prevailing wind direction: N **Occurrence of snow/ice storms:** ☒ never ☐ seldom ☐ regularly

FIELD EVALUATION FORM - PAGE 2 OF 2 Tree Number 5

TARGET

Use Under Tree: ☐ building ☒ parking ☒ traffic ☒ pedestrian ☐ recreation ☒ landscape ☐ hardscape ☐ small features ☐ utility lines **Can target be moved?** Y (N) **Can use be restricted?** Y (N)

Occupancy: ☐ occasional use ☐ intermittent use ☒ frequent use ☐ constant use

TREE DEFECTS - Noted as applicable

ROOT DEFECTS: **Suspect root rot?** Y (N) **Mushroom/conk present?** Y (N) **ID:** _____

Exposed roots: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Undermined:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

Root pruned: _____ feet from trunk **Root area affected:** _____% **Buttress wounded?** Y (N) **When:** _____

Restricted root area: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Potential for root failure:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

LEAN: _____ degrees from vertical ☐ natural ☐ unnatural ☐ self-corrected **Soil heaving?** Y N

Decay in plane of lean? Y N **Roots broken?** Y N **Soil cracking?** Y N **Lean severity:** ☐ severe ☐ 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 bark				
Nesting hole/bee hive				
Deadwood/stubs				L
Borers/termites/ants				
Cankers/galls/burls				
Previous failure				

RECOMMENDED TREATMENT

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 (N) **Replace tree?** Y (N)
Move target:? Y (N) **Other:** _____ ☒ no action required at this time

Effect on adjacent trees: ☐ none ☒ evaluate **Notification:** ☐ owner ☐ manager ☐ governing agency **Date:** _____

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

FIELD EVALUATION FORM

Owner: _____ ☐ public ☒ private ☐ unknown ☐ other: _____

Site/Address: _____ **Thomas Guide:** Page: ____ Coordinate: ____

Date: June 27, 1998 **Inspector:** DG **Date of last inspection:** ? ☐ not previously inspected

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Tree #: 6 **Species:** ☐ *Quercus agrifolia* ☐ *Quercus lobata* ☒ other *Pinus halepensis*

# of trunks: 1 **dbH (inches):** 26 **Height (feet):** 40

Compass direction	N	NE	E	SE	S	SW	W	NW
Dripline (feet)	18	15	25	20	22	22	25	18
Clearance to canopy	12	18	30	20	15	20	20	18

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):** 85 %

Pruning history: ☐ crown cleaned ☐ excessively thinned ☐ topped ☐ crown raised ☐ pollarded ☐ crown reduced
☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/braced ☐ none ☐ multiple pruning events Approximate dates: ____ ☒ unknown

Special Value: ☐ specimen ☒ heritage/historic ☐ wildlife ☐ unusual ☐ street tree ☐ screen ☒ shade
☐ indigenous ☐ protected by government agency

TREE HEALTH

Foliage color: ☒ normal ☐ chlorotic ☐ necrotic

Epicormics? Y (N) **Twig Dieback?** (N) N

Foliage density: ☒ normal ☐ sparse

Leaf size: ☒ normal ☐ small

Annual shoot growth: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ poor

Woundwood development: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ poor ☐ none

Vigor class: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ fair ☐ poor

Growth obstructions: ☐ stakes ☐ wire/ties ☐ signs ☐ cables ☐ curb/pavement ☐ guards ☐ other ____

Major pests/diseases: ____

SITE CONDITIONS

Site character: ☒ residence ☐ commercial ☐ industrial ☐ park ☐ open space ☐ natural ☐ woodland/forest

Landscape type: ☐ parkway ☐ raised bed ☐ container ☐ mound ☐ lawn ☐ shrub border ☐ wind break

Irrigation: ☒ *none* ☐ *adequate* ☐ *inadequate* ☐ *excessive* ☐ *trunk wetted* **Pavement lifted?** Y (N)

Recent site disturbance? Y (N) ☐ construction ☐ soil disturbance ☐ grade change ☐ line clearing ☐ site clearing

% 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 ☐ droughty ☐ saline ☐ alkaline ☐ acidic ☐ small volume
☐ disease center ☐ history of failure ☐ clay ☐ expansive ☐ slope ____ ° aspect ____

Obstructions: ☐ lights ☐ signage ☐ line-of-sight ☐ view ☐ overhead lines ☐ underground utilities ☐ traffic
☒ adjacent vegetation ☐ other ____

Exposure to wind: ☐ single tree ☐ below canopy ☒ above canopy ☐ recently exposed ☐ windward, canopy edge
☐ area prone to windthrow

Prevailing wind direction: N **Occurrence of snow/ice storms:** ☒ never ☐ seldom ☐ regularly

FIELD EVALUATION FORM - PAGE 2 OF 2 Tree Number 6

TARGET

Use Under Tree: ☐ building ☐ parking ☐ traffic ☒ pedestrian ☐ recreation ☐ landscape ☐ hardscape ☐ small features ☐ utility lines **Can target be moved?** Y (N) **Can use be restricted?** Y (N)

Occupancy: ☒ occasional use ☐ intermittent use ☐ frequent use ☐ constant use

TREE DEFECTS - Noted as applicable

ROOT DEFECTS: **Suspect root rot?** Y (N) **Mushroom/conk present?** Y (N) **ID:** _____

Exposed roots: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Undermined:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

Root pruned: _____ feet from trunk **Root area affected:** _____ % **Buttress wounded?** Y (N) **When:** _____

Restricted root area: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Potential for root failure:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

LEAN: 15 degrees from vertical ☒ natural ☐ unnatural ☐ self-corrected **Soil heaving?** Y (N)

Decay in plane of lean? Y (N) **Roots broken?** Y (N) **Soil cracking?** Y (N) **Lean severity:** ☐ severe ☒ 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 bark				
Nesting hole/bee hive				
Deadwood/stubs				L-M
Borers/termites/ants				
Cankers/galls/burls				
Previous failure				

RECOMMENDED TREATMENT

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 (N) **Replace tree?** Y (N)
Move target:? Y (N) **Other:** _____ ☐ no action required at this time

Effect on adjacent trees: ☐ none ☒ evaluate **Notification:** ☐ owner ☐ manager ☐ governing agency **Date:** _____

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Photo #5: Remove barbed wire embedded in trunk.

FIELD EVALUATION FORM

Owner: _____ ☐ public ☒ private ☐ unknown ☐ other: _____

Site/Address: _____ **Thomas Guide:** Page: ____ Coordinate: ____

Date: June 27, 1999 **Inspector:** DG **Date of last inspection:** ? ☐ not previously inspected

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Tree #: 7 **Species:** ☐ *Quercus agrifolia* ☐ *Quercus lobata* ☒ other *Pinus halepensis*

# of trunks: 1 **dbH (inches):** 12 **Height (feet):** 18

Compass direction	N	NE	E	SE	S	SW	W	NW
Dripline (feet)	12	0	0	0	10	15	12	12
Clearance to canopy	4	0	0	0	10	15	15	8

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):** 100 %

Pruning history: ☐ crown cleaned ☐ excessively thinned ☐ topped ☐ crown raised ☐ pollarded ☐ crown reduced ☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/braced ☐ none ☐ multiple pruning events Approximate dates: _____ ☒ unknown

Special Value: ☐ specimen ☐ heritage/historic ☐ wildlife ☐ unusual ☐ street tree ☐ screen ☐ shade ☐ indigenous ☐ protected by government agency

TREE HEALTH

Foliage color: ☒ normal ☐ chlorotic ☐ necrotic

Epicormics? Y (N) **Twig Dieback?** (Y) N

Foliage density: ☒ normal ☐ sparse

Leaf size: ☒ normal ☐ small

Annual shoot growth: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ poor

Major pests/diseases: _____

Woundwood development: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ poor ☐ none

Vigor class: ☐ excellent ☐ average ☒ fair ☐ poor

Growth obstructions: ☐ stakes ☐ wire/ties ☐ signs ☐ cables ☐ curb/pavement ☐ guards ☐ other _____

SITE CONDITIONS

Site character: ☒ residence ☐ commercial ☐ industrial ☐ park ☐ open space ☐ natural ☐ woodland/forest

Landscape type: ☐ parkway ☐ raised bed ☐ container ☐ mound ☐ lawn ☐ shrub border ☐ wind break

Irrigation: ☒ none ☐ adequate ☐ inadequate ☐ excessive ☐ trunk wetted **Pavement lifted?** Y (N)

Recent site disturbance? Y (N) ☐ construction ☐ soil disturbance ☐ grade change ☐ line clearing ☐ site clearing

% 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 ☐ droughty ☐ saline ☐ alkaline ☐ acidic ☐ small volume ☐ disease center ☐ history of failure ☐ clay ☐ expansive ☐ slope _____° aspect _____

Obstructions: ☐ lights ☐ signage ☐ line-of-sight ☐ view ☐ overhead lines ☐ underground utilities ☐ traffic ☒ adjacent vegetation ☐ other _____

Exposure to wind: ☐ single tree ☒ below canopy ☐ above canopy ☐ recently exposed ☐ windward, canopy edge ☐ area prone to windthrow

Prevailing wind direction: N **Occurrence of snow/ice storms:** ☒ never ☐ seldom ☐ regularly

FIELD EVALUATION FORM - PAGE 2 OF 2 Tree Number 7

TARGET

Use Under Tree: ☐ building ☐ parking ☐ traffic ☒ pedestrian ☐ recreation ☐ landscape ☐ hardscape ☐ small features ☐ utility lines **Can target be moved?** Y N **Can use be restricted?** Y N

Occupancy: ☒ occasional use ☐ intermittent use ☐ frequent use ☐ constant use

TREE DEFECTS - Noted as applicable

ROOT DEFECTS: **Suspect root rot?** Y (N) **Mushroom/conk present?** Y (N) **ID:** —

Exposed roots: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Undermined:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

Root pruned: — feet from trunk **Root area affected:** — % **Buttress wounded?** Y (N) **When:** —

Restricted root area: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Potential for root failure:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

LEAN: 50 degrees from vertical ☐ natural ☒ unnatural ☐ self-corrected **Soil heaving?** Y (N)

Decay in plane of lean? Y (N) **Roots broken?** Y (N) **Soil cracking?** Y (N) **Lean severity:** ☒ severe ☐ 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 bark				
Nesting hole/bee hive				
Deadwood/stubs				L-M
Borers/termites/ants				
Cankers/galls/burls				
Previous failure				

RECOMMENDED TREATMENT

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) N Maybe **Replace tree?** Y (N)

Move target:? Y (N) **Other:** — ☐ no action required at this time

Effect on adjacent trees: ☐ none ☒ evaluate **Notification:** ☐ owner ☐ manager ☐ governing agency **Date:** —

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Photo #6 Tree is on the left.

FIELD EVALUATION FORM

Owner: _____ ☐ public ☒ private ☐ unknown ☐ other: _____

Site/Address: _____ Thomas Guide: Page: ____ Coordinate: ____

Date: June 27, 1998 Inspector: DG Date of last inspection: ? ☐ not previously inspected

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Tree #: 8 Species: ☐ *Quercus agrifolia* ☐ *Quercus lobata* ☒ other *Pinus halepensis*

# of trunks: 1 dbH (inches): 13 Height (feet): 15

Compass direction	N	NE	E	SE	S	SW	W	NW
Dripline (feet)	7	15	0	0	0	0	0	10
Clearance to canopy	12	7	0	0	0	0	0	3

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): 85 %

Pruning history: ☐ crown cleaned ☐ excessively thinned ☒ topped ☐ crown raised ☐ pollarded ☐ crown reduced
☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/braced ☐ none ☒ multiple pruning events Approximate dates: _____ ☐ unknown

Special Value: ☐ specimen ☐ heritage/historic ☐ wildlife ☐ unusual ☐ street tree ☐ screen ☐ shade
☐ indigenous ☐ protected by government agency

TREE HEALTH

Foliage color: ☒ normal ☐ chlorotic ☐ necrotic

Epicormics? Y (N) Twig Dieback? (Y) N

Foliage density: ☒ normal ☐ sparse

Leaf size: ☒ normal ☐ small

Annual shoot growth: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ poor

Woundwood development: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ poor ☐ none

Vigor class: ☐ excellent ☐ average ☒ fair ☐ poor

Growth obstructions: ☐ stakes ☐ wire/ties ☐ signs ☐ cables ☐ curb/pavement ☐ guards ☐ other _____

Major pests/diseases: _____

SITE CONDITIONS

Site character: ☒ residence ☐ commercial ☐ industrial ☐ park ☐ open space ☐ natural ☐ woodland/forest

Landscape type: ☐ parkway ☐ raised bed ☐ container ☐ mound ☐ lawn ☐ shrub border ☐ wind break

Irrigation: ☒ none ☐ adequate ☐ inadequate ☐ excessive ☐ trunk wetted Pavement lifted? Y (N)

Recent site disturbance? Y (N) ☐ construction ☐ soil disturbance ☐ grade change ☐ line clearing ☐ site clearing

% 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 ☐ droughty ☐ saline ☐ alkaline ☐ acidic ☐ small volume
☐ disease center ☐ history of failure ☐ clay ☐ expansive ☒ slope 5 ° aspect NW

Obstructions: ☐ lights ☐ signage ☐ line-of-sight ☐ view ☐ overhead lines ☐ underground utilities ☐ traffic
☒ adjacent vegetation ☐ other _____

Exposure to wind: ☐ single tree ☒ below canopy ☐ above canopy ☐ recently exposed ☐ windward, canopy edge
☐ area prone to windthrow

Prevailing wind direction: N Occurrence of snow/ice storms: ☒ never ☐ seldom ☐ regularly

FIELD EVALUATION FORM - PAGE 2 OF 2 Tree Number 8

TARGET

Use Under Tree: ☐ building ☐ parking ☐ traffic ☒ pedestrian ☐ recreation ☐ landscape ☐ hardscape ☐ small features ☐ utility lines **Can target be moved?** Y (N) **Can use be restricted?** Y (N)

Occupancy: ☒ occasional use ☐ intermittent use ☐ frequent use ☐ constant use

TREE DEFECTS - Noted as applicable

ROOT DEFECTS: **Suspect root rot?** Y (N) **Mushroom/conk present?** Y (N) **ID:** —

Exposed roots: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Undermined:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

Root pruned: ____ feet from trunk **Root area affected:** ____ % **Buttress wounded?** Y (N) **When:** ____

Restricted root area: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Potential for root failure:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

LEAN: 12 degrees from vertical ☒ natural ☐ unnatural ☐ self-corrected **Soil heaving?** Y (N)

Decay in plane of lean? Y (N) **Roots broken?** Y (N) **Soil cracking?** Y (N) **Lean severity:** ☐ severe ☒ 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 bark				
Nesting hole/bee hive				
Deadwood/stubs				L-M
Borers/termites/ants				
Cankers/galls/burls				
Previous failure				

RECOMMENDED TREATMENT

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?** Maybe Y (N) **Replace tree?** Y (N)

Move target:? Y (N) **Other:** ____ ☐ no action required at this time

Effect on adjacent trees: ☐ none ☒ evaluate **Notification:** ☐ owner ☐ manager ☐ governing agency **Date:** ____

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Photo #6 Tree is on the right.

FIELD EVALUATION FORM

Owner: _____ ☐ public ☑ private ☐ unknown ☐ other: _____

Site/Address: _____ **Thomas Guide:** Page: ____ Coordinate: ____

Date: June 28, 1998 **Inspector:** DG **Date of last inspection:** ? ☐ not previously inspected

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Tree #: 9 **Species:** ☐ *Quercus agrifolia* ☐ *Quercus lobata* ☒ other *Pinus halepensis*

# of trunks: 1 **dbH (inches):** 15 **Height (feet):** 28

Compass direction	N	NE	E	SE	S	SW	W	NW
Dripline (feet) est.	20	12	15	20	12	8	8	15
Clearance to canopy	20	18	15	20	18	15	12	18

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):** 90 %

Pruning history: ☐ *crown cleaned* ☐ *excessively thinned* ☐ *topped* ☐ *crown raised* ☐ *pollarded* ☐ *crown reduced*
☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/braced ☐ none ☑ multiple pruning events Approximate dates: _____ ☐ unknown

Special Value: ☐ specimen ☐ heritage/historic ☐ wildlife ☐ unusual ☐ street tree ☐ screen ☐ shade
☐ *indigenous* ☐ *protected by government agency*

TREE HEALTH

Foliage color: ☑ normal ☐ chlorotic ☐ necrotic

Epicormics? Y (N) **Twig Dieback?** (Y) N

Foliage density: ☑ normal ☐ sparse

Leaf size: ☑ normal ☐ small

Annual shoot growth: ☐ excellent ☑ average ☐ poor

Woundwood development: ☐ excellent ☑ average ☐ poor ☐ none

Vigor class: ☐ excellent ☑ average ☐ fair ☐ poor

Growth obstructions: ☐ stakes ☐ wire/ties ☐ signs ☐ cables ☐ curb/pavement ☐ guards ☐ other _____

Major pests/diseases: _____

SITE CONDITIONS

Site character: ☑ residence ☐ commercial ☐ industrial ☐ park ☐ open space ☐ natural ☐ woodland/forest

Landscape type: ☐ parkway ☐ raised bed ☐ container ☐ mound ☐ lawn ☐ shrub border ☐ wind break

Irrigation: ☑ none ☐ adequate ☐ inadequate ☐ excessive ☐ trunk wetted **Pavement lifted?** Y (N)

Recent site disturbance? Y (N) ☐ *construction* ☐ *soil disturbance* ☐ *grade change* ☐ *line clearing* ☐ *site clearing*

% 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 ☐ droughty ☐ saline ☐ alkaline ☐ acidic ☐ small volume
☐ disease center ☐ history of failure ☐ clay ☐ expansive ☐ slope _____ ° aspect _____

Obstructions: ☐ lights ☐ signage ☐ line-of-sight ☐ view ☐ overhead lines ☐ underground utilities ☐ traffic
☑ adjacent vegetation ☐ other _____

Exposure to wind: ☐ single tree ☑ below canopy ☐ above canopy ☐ recently exposed ☐ windward, canopy edge
☐ area prone to windthrow

Prevailing wind direction: N ***Occurrence of snow/ice storms:*** ☑ never ☐ seldom ☐ regularly

FIELD EVALUATION FORM - PAGE 2 OF 2 Tree Number 9

TARGET

Use Under Tree: ☐ building ☐ parking ☐ traffic ☐ pedestrian ☐ recreation ☐ landscape ☐ hardscape ☐ small features ☐ utility lines **Can target be moved?** Y (N) **Can use be restricted?** Y (N)

Occupancy: ☒ occasional use ☐ intermittent use ☐ frequent use ☐ constant use

TREE DEFECTS - Noted as applicable

ROOT DEFECTS: **Suspect root rot?** Y (N) **Mushroom/conk present?** Y (N) **ID:** —

Exposed roots: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Undermined:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

Root pruned: — feet from trunk **Root area affected:** — % **Buttress wounded?** Y (N) **When:** —

Restricted root area: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Potential for root failure:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

LEAN: 30 degrees from vertical ☐ natural ☒ unnatural ☐ self-corrected **Soil heaving?** Y (N)

Decay in plane of lean? Y (N) **Roots broken?** Y (N) **Soil cracking?** Y (N) **Lean severity:** ☒ severe ☐ 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 bark				
Nesting hole/bee hive				
Deadwood/stubs				L-M
Borers/termites/ants				
Cankers/galls/burls				
Previous failure				

RECOMMENDED TREATMENT

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 (N) **Replace tree?** Y (N)
Move target:? Y (N) **Other:** _____ ☐ no action required at this time

Effect on adjacent trees: ☐ none ☒ evaluate **Notification:** ☐ owner ☐ manager ☐ governing agency **Date:** _____

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Photo #7 Remove broken stub on top of trunk.

FIELD EVALUATION FORM

Owner: _____ ☐ public ☑ private ☐ unknown ☐ other: _____

Site/Address: _____ Thomas Guide: Page: ____ Coordinate: ____

Date: June 28, 1998 Inspector: OG Date of last inspection: _____ ☐ not previously inspected

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Tree #: 10 Species: ☐ *Quercus agrifolia* ☐ *Quercus lobata* ☑ other *Pinus halepensis*

# of trunks: 1 dbH (inches): 23 Height (feet): 28

Compass direction	N	NE	E	SE	S	SW	W	NW
Dripline (feet) est.	12	25	22	28	12	6	0	0
Clearance to canopy	10	22	18	20	12	15	0	0

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): 90 %

Pruning history: ☐ crown cleaned ☐ excessively thinned ☑ topped ☐ crown raised ☐ pollarded ☐ crown reduced
☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/braced ☐ none ☑ multiple pruning events Approximate dates: _____ ☐ unknown

Special Value: ☐ specimen ☐ heritage/historic ☐ wildlife ☐ unusual ☐ street tree ☐ screen ☑ shade
☐ indigenous ☐ protected by government agency

TREE HEALTH

Foliage color: ☑ normal ☐ chlorotic ☐ necrotic

Epicormics? Y (N) Twig Dieback? (Y) N

Foliage density: ☑ normal ☐ sparse

Leaf size: ☑ normal ☐ small

Annual shoot growth: ☐ excellent ☑ average ☐ poor

Woundwood development: ☐ excellent ☑ average ☐ poor ☐ none

Vigor class: ☐ excellent ☑ average ☐ fair ☐ poor

Growth obstructions: ☐ stakes ☐ wire/ties ☐ signs ☐ cables ☐ curb/pavement ☐ guards ☐ other _____

Major pests/diseases: _____

SITE CONDITIONS

Site character: ☑ residence ☐ commercial ☐ industrial ☐ park ☐ open space ☐ natural ☐ woodland/forest

Landscape type: ☐ parkway ☐ raised bed ☐ container ☐ mound ☐ lawn ☐ shrub border ☐ wind break

Irrigation: ☑ none ☐ adequate ☐ inadequate ☐ excessive ☐ trunk wetted Pavement lifted? Y (N)

Recent site disturbance? Y (N) ☐ construction ☐ soil disturbance ☐ grade change ☐ line clearing ☐ site clearing

% 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 ☐ droughty ☐ saline ☐ alkaline ☐ acidic ☐ small volume
☐ disease center ☐ history of failure ☐ clay ☐ expansive ☐ slope _____ ° aspect _____

Obstructions: ☐ lights ☐ signage ☐ line-of-sight ☐ view ☐ overhead lines ☐ underground utilities ☐ traffic
☑ adjacent vegetation ☐ other _____

Exposure to wind: ☐ single tree ☑ below canopy ☑ above canopy ☐ recently exposed ☐ windward, canopy edge
☐ area prone to windthrow

Prevailing wind direction: N Occurrence of snow/ice storms: ☑ never ☐ seldom ☐ regularly

FIELD EVALUATION FORM - PAGE 2 OF 2 Tree Number 10

TARGET

Use Under Tree: ☐ building ☐ parking ☐ traffic ☐ pedestrian ☐ recreation ☐ landscape ☐ hardscape ☐ small features ☐ utility lines **Can target be moved?** Y (N) **Can use be restricted?** Y (N)

Occupancy: ☒ occasional use ☐ intermittent use ☐ frequent use ☐ constant use

TREE DEFECTS - Noted as applicable

ROOT DEFECTS: **Suspect root rot?** Y (N) **Mushroom/conk present?** Y (N) **ID:** —

Exposed roots: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Undermined:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

Root pruned: — feet from trunk **Root area affected:** — % **Buttress wounded?** Y (N) **When:** —

Restricted root area: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Potential for root failure:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

LEAN: 30 degrees from vertical ☒ natural ☐ unnatural ☐ self-corrected **Soil heaving?** Y (N)

Decay in plane of lean? Y (N) **Roots broken?** Y (N) **Soil cracking?** Y (N) **Lean severity:** ☐ severe ☒ 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 bark				
Nesting hole/bee hive				
Deadwood/stubs				
Borers/termites/ants				
Cankers/galls/burls				
Previous failure				

RECOMMENDED TREATMENT

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 (N) **Replace tree?** Y (N)
Move target:? Y (N) **Other:** — ☐ no action required at this time

Effect on adjacent trees: ☐ none ☒ evaluate **Notification:** ☐ owner ☐ manager ☐ governing agency **Date:** —

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Photo #

FIELD EVALUATION FORM

Owner: _____ ☐ public ☒ private ☐ unknown ☐ other: _____

Site/Address: _____ Thomas Guide: Page: ____ Coordinate: ____

Date: June 28, 1998 Inspector: DG Date of last inspection: ? ☐ not previously inspected

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Tree #: 11 Species: ☐ *Quercus agrifolia* ☐ *Quercus lobata* ☒ other *Pinus halepensis*

# of trunks: 1 dbH (inches): 23 Height (feet): 55

Compass direction	N	NE	E	SE	S	SW	W	NW
Dripline (feet) est.	20	15	20	35	30	15	20	25
Clearance to canopy	35	35	40	30	15	20	20	30

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): 95 %

Pruning history: ☐ crown cleaned ☐ excessively thinned ☐ topped ☐ crown raised ☐ pollarded ☐ crown reduced ☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/braced ☐ none ☐ multiple pruning events Approximate dates: _____ ☒ unknown

Special Value: ☐ specimen ☐ heritage/historic ☐ wildlife ☐ unusual ☐ street tree ☐ screen ☒ shade ☐ indigenous ☐ protected by government agency

TREE HEALTH

Foliage color: ☒ normal ☐ chlorotic ☐ necrotic

Epicormics? Y (N) Twig Dieback? (Y) N

Foliage density: ☒ normal ☐ sparse

Leaf size: ☒ normal ☐ small

Annual shoot growth: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ poor

Woundwood development: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ poor ☐ none

Vigor class: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ fair ☐ poor

Growth obstructions: ☐ stakes ☐ wire/ties ☐ signs ☐ cables ☐ curb/pavement ☐ guards ☐ other _____

Major pests/diseases: _____

SITE CONDITIONS

Site character: ☒ residence ☐ commercial ☐ industrial ☐ park ☐ open space ☐ natural ☐ woodland/forest

Landscape type: ☐ parkway ☐ raised bed ☐ container ☐ mound ☐ lawn ☐ shrub border ☐ wind break

Irrigation: ☒ none ☐ adequate ☐ inadequate ☐ excessive ☐ trunk wetted Pavement lifted? Y (N)

Recent site disturbance? Y (N) ☐ construction ☐ soil disturbance ☐ grade change ☐ line clearing ☐ site clearing

% 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 ☐ droughty ☐ saline ☐ alkaline ☐ acidic ☐ small volume ☐ disease center ☐ history of failure ☐ clay ☐ expansive ☒ slope 5 ° aspect N

Obstructions: ☐ lights ☐ signage ☐ line-of-sight ☐ view ☐ overhead lines ☐ underground utilities ☐ traffic ☒ adjacent vegetation ☐ other _____

Exposure to wind: ☐ single tree ☐ below canopy ☒ above canopy ☐ recently exposed ☐ windward, canopy edge ☐ area prone to windthrow

Prevailing wind direction: N Occurrence of snow/ice storms: ☒ never ☐ seldom ☐ regularly

FIELD EVALUATION FORM - PAGE 2 OF 2 Tree Number 11

TARGET

Use Under Tree: ☐ building ☐ parking ☐ traffic ☐ pedestrian ☐ recreation ☐ landscape ☐ hardscape ☐ small features ☐ utility lines **Can target be moved?** Y (N) **Can use be restricted?** Y (N)

Occupancy: ☒ occasional use ☐ intermittent use ☐ frequent use ☐ constant use

TREE DEFECTS - Noted as applicable

ROOT DEFECTS: **Suspect root rot?** Y (N) **Mushroom/conk present?** Y (N) **ID:** —

Exposed roots: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Undermined:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

Root pruned: — feet from trunk **Root area affected:** — % **Buttress wounded?** Y (N) **When:** —

Restricted root area: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Potential for root failure:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

LEAN: 28 degrees from vertical ☒ natural ☐ unnatural ☐ self-corrected **Soil heaving?** Y (N)

Decay in plane of lean? Y (N) **Roots broken?** Y (N) **Soil cracking?** Y (N) **Lean severity:** ☒ severe ☐ 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 bark				
Nesting hole/bee hive				
Deadwood/stubs				L-M
Borers/termites/ants				
Cankers/galls/burls		Mistletoe L-M		
Previous failure				

RECOMMENDED TREATMENT

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 (N) **Replace tree?** Y (N)
Move target:? Y (N) **Other:** — ☐ no action required at this time

Effect on adjacent trees: ☐ none ☒ evaluate **Notification:** ☐ owner ☐ manager ☐ governing agency **Date:** —

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Photo # 14. Mistletoe photo # 15

FIELD EVALUATION FORM

Owner: _____ ☐ public ☒ private ☐ unknown ☐ other: _____

Site/Address: _____ **Thomas Guide:** Page: ____ Coordinate: ____

Date: June 28, 1998 **Inspector:** DG **Date of last inspection:** ? ☐ not previously inspected

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Tree #: 12 **Species:** ☐ *Quercus agrifolia* ☐ *Quercus lobata* ☒ other Fraxinus velutina

# of trunks: 1 **dbH (inches):** 10 **Height (feet):** 18

Compass direction	N	NE	E	SE	S	SW	W	NW
Dripline (feet)	10	6	8	6	5	12	10	15
Clearance to canopy	12	10	5	5	5	8	7	12

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):** ____%

Pruning history: ☐ crown cleaned ☐ excessively thinned ☒ topped ☐ crown raised ☐ pollarded ☐ crown reduced ☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/braced ☐ none ☒ multiple pruning events Approximate dates: ____ ☐ unknown

Special Value: ☐ specimen ☐ heritage/historic ☐ wildlife ☐ unusual ☐ street tree ☐ screen ☐ shade ☐ indigenous ☐ protected by government agency

TREE HEALTH

Foliage color: ☒ normal ☒ chlorotic ☐ necrotic

Epicormics? (Y) N **Twig Dieback?** (Y) N

Foliage density: ☐ normal ☒ sparse

Leaf size: ☒ normal ☐ small

Annual shoot growth: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☒ poor

Woundwood development: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ poor ☐ none

Vigor class: ☐ excellent ☐ average ☒ fair ☐ poor

Growth obstructions: ☐ stakes ☐ wire/ties ☐ signs ☐ cables ☒ curb/pavement ☐ guards ☐ other ____

Major pests/diseases: _____

SITE CONDITIONS

Site character: ☒ residence ☐ commercial ☐ industrial ☐ park ☐ open space ☐ natural ☐ woodland/forest

Landscape type: ☐ parkway ☐ raised bed ☐ container ☐ mound ☐ lawn ☐ shrub border ☐ wind break

Irrigation: ☐ none ☐ adequate ☐ inadequate ☐ excessive ☐ trunk wetted **Pavement lifted?** Y (N)

Recent site disturbance? Y (N) ☐ construction ☐ soil disturbance ☐ grade change ☐ line clearing ☐ site clearing

% 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 ☐ droughty ☐ saline ☐ alkaline ☐ acidic ☐ small volume ☐ disease center ☐ history of failure ☐ clay ☐ expansive ☐ slope ____° aspect ____

Obstructions: ☐ lights ☐ signage ☐ line-of-sight ☐ view ☐ overhead lines ☐ underground utilities ☐ traffic ☒ adjacent vegetation ☐ other ____

Exposure to wind: ☐ single tree ☒ below canopy ☐ above canopy ☐ recently exposed ☐ windward, canopy edge ☐ area prone to windthrow

Prevailing wind direction: N **Occurrence of snow/ice storms:** ☒ never ☐ seldom ☐ regularly

FIELD EVALUATION FORM - PAGE 2 OF 2 Tree Number 12

TARGET

Use Under Tree: ☒ building ☐ parking ☒ traffic ☒ pedestrian ☐ recreation ☐ landscape ☐ hardscape
☐ small features ☐ utility lines **Can target be moved?** Y (N) **Can use be restricted?** Y (N)

Occupancy: ☒ occasional use ☐ intermittent use ☐ frequent use ☐ constant use

TREE DEFECTS - Noted as applicable

ROOT DEFECTS: **Suspect root rot?** Y (N) **Mushroom/conk present?** Y (N) **ID:** _____

Exposed roots: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Undermined:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

Root pruned: _____ feet from trunk **Root area affected:** _____ % **Buttress wounded?** Y (N) **When:** _____

Restricted root area: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Potential for root failure:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

LEAN: 12 degrees from vertical ☒ natural ☐ unnatural ☐ self-corrected **Soil heaving?** Y (N)

Decay in plane of lean? Y (N) **Roots broken?** Y (N) **Soil cracking?** Y (N) **Lean severity:** ☐ severe ☒ 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				L
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 TREATMENT

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) N **Replace tree?** Y (N)
Move target:? Y (N) **Other:** _____ ☐ no action required at this time

Effect on adjacent trees: ☐ none ☒ evaluate **Notification:** ☐ owner ☐ manager ☐ governing agency **Date:** _____

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS Planter is too small for a tree, esp. as Ash.
Photos 16 and 17. Tree is on the left. Leaves showing signs of Ash Anthracnose; not serious. Ugly tree.

FIELD EVALUATION FORM

Owner: _____ ☐ public ☒ private ☐ unknown ☐ other: _____

Site/Address: _____ Thomas Guide: Page: ____ Coordinate: ____

Date: June 28, 1998 Inspector: DG Date of last inspection: ? ☐ not previously inspected

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Tree #: 13 Species: ☐ *Quercus agrifolia* ☐ *Quercus lobata* ☒ other *Fraxinus velutina 'Modesto'*

# of trunks: 2 dbH (inches): 14, 12 Height (feet): 18

Compass direction	N	NE	E	SE	S	SW	W	NW
Dripline (feet) est.	15	15	15	~~18~~ 8	2	0	15	15
Clearance to canopy	12	12	12	12	12	0	12	12

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): ____ %

Pruning history: ☐ crown cleaned ☐ excessively thinned ☒ topped ☐ crown raised ☐ pollarded ☐ crown reduced
☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/braced ☐ none ☒ multiple pruning events Approximate dates: _____ ☐ unknown

Special Value: ☐ specimen ☐ heritage/historic ☐ wildlife ☐ unusual ☐ street tree ☐ screen ☐ shade
☐ *indigenous* ☐ *protected by government agency*

TREE HEALTH

Foliage color: ☒ normal ☒ chlorotic ☐ necrotic

Epicormics? Y N Twig Dieback? Y N

Foliage density: ☒ normal ☐ sparse

Leaf size: ☒ normal ☐ small

Annual shoot growth: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ poor

Woundwood development: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ poor ☐ none

Vigor class: ☐ excellent ☐ average ☒ fair ☐ poor

Growth obstructions: ☐ stakes ☐ wire/ties ☐ signs ☐ cables ☒ curb/pavement ☐ guards ☐ other _____

Major pests/diseases: _____

SITE CONDITIONS

Site character: ☒ residence ☐ commercial ☐ industrial ☐ park ☐ open space ☐ natural ☐ woodland/forest

Landscape type: ☐ parkway ☐ raised bed ☐ container ☐ mound ☐ lawn ☐ shrub border ☐ wind break

Irrigation: ☒ none ☐ adequate ☐ inadequate ☐ excessive ☐ trunk wetted Pavement lifted? Y N

Recent site disturbance? Y N ☐ construction ☐ soil disturbance ☐ grade change ☐ line clearing ☐ site clearing

% 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 ☐ droughty ☐ saline ☐ alkaline ☐ acidic ☐ small volume
☐ disease center ☐ history of failure ☐ clay ☐ expansive ☐ slope _____ ° aspect _____

Obstructions: ☐ lights ☐ signage ☐ line-of-sight ☐ view ☐ overhead lines ☐ underground utilities ☐ traffic
☒ adjacent vegetation ☐ other _____

Exposure to wind: ☐ single tree ☒ below canopy ☐ above canopy ☐ recently exposed ☐ windward, canopy edge
☐ area prone to windthrow

Prevailing wind direction: N Occurrence of snow/ice storms: ☒ never ☐ seldom ☐ regularly

FIELD EVALUATION FORM - PAGE 2 OF 2 Tree Number 13

TARGET

Use Under Tree: ☒ building ☐ parking ☒ traffic ☒ pedestrian ☐ recreation ☒ landscape ☒ hardscape ☐ small features ☐ utility lines **Can target be moved?** Y (N) **Can use be restricted?** Y (N)

Occupancy: ☒ occasional use ☐ intermittent use ☒ frequent use ☐ constant use

TREE DEFECTS - Noted as applicable

ROOT DEFECTS: **Suspect root rot?** Y (N) **Mushroom/conk present?** Y (N) **ID:** —

Exposed roots: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Undermined:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

Root pruned: — feet from trunk **Root area affected:** — % **Buttress wounded?** Y (N) **When:** —

Restricted root area: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Potential for root failure:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

LEAN: 15 degrees from vertical ☒ natural ☐ unnatural ☐ self-corrected **Soil heaving?** Y (N)

Decay in plane of lean? Y (N) **Roots broken?** Y (N) **Soil cracking?** Y (N) **Lean severity:** ☐ severe ☒ 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				L
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 TREATMENT

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) N **Replace tree?** Y (N)
Move target:? Y (N) **Other:** — ☐ no action required at this time

Effect on adjacent trees: ☐ none ☒ evaluate **Notification:** ☐ owner ☐ manager ☐ governing agency **Date:** —

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Tree shows signs of Ash Anthracnose.

Photos 16 and 17. Tree is on the right. Ugly tree.
Planter is too small for this tree.

FIELD EVALUATION FORM

Owner: _____ ☐ public ☒ private ☐ unknown ☐ other: _____

Site/Address: Citrus Dr. Thomas Guide: Page: ____ Coordinate: ____

Date: July 11, 1998 Inspector: DG Date of last inspection: ____ ☐ not previously inspected

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Tree #: 19 Species: ☐ *Quercus agrifolia* ☐ *Quercus lobata* ☒ other Eucalyptus globulus

# of trunks: 10 dbH (inches): est. 31, 16, 12, 8, 8, 7, 7, 2, 2 Height (feet): 45

Compass direction	N	NE	E	SE	S	SW	W	NW
Dripline (feet) est.	8	10	15	20	20	20	22	15
Clearance to canopy	10	3	12	15	20	25	20	25

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): ____%

Pruning history: ☐ crown cleaned ☐ excessively thinned ☒ topped ☐ crown raised ☐ pollarded ☐ crown reduced ☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/braced ☐ none ☐ multiple pruning events Approximate dates: ____ ☐ unknown

Special Value: ☐ specimen ☒ heritage/historic ☐ wildlife ☐ unusual ☐ street tree ☐ screen ☐ shade ☐ indigenous ☒ protected by government agency

TREE HEALTH

Foliage color: ☒ normal ☐ chlorotic ☐ necrotic

Epicormics? Y (N) Twig Dieback? Y (N)

Foliage density: ☒ normal ☐ sparse

Leaf size: ☒ normal ☐ small

Annual shoot growth: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ poor

Woundwood development: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ poor ☐ none

Vigor class: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ fair ☐ poor

Growth obstructions: ☐ stakes ☐ wire/ties ☐ signs ☐ cables ☒ curb/pavement ☐ guards ☐ other _____

Major pests/diseases: _____

SITE CONDITIONS

Site character: ☒ residence ☐ commercial ☐ industrial ☐ park ☐ open space ☒ natural ☐ woodland/forest

Landscape type: ☐ parkway ☐ raised bed ☐ container ☐ mound ☐ lawn ☐ shrub border ☒ wind break

Irrigation: ☒ none ☐ adequate ☐ inadequate ☐ excessive ☐ trunk wetted Pavement lifted? Y (N)

Recent site disturbance? Y (N) ☐ construction ☐ soil disturbance ☐ grade change ☐ line clearing ☐ site clearing

% 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 ☐ droughty ☐ saline ☐ alkaline ☐ acidic ☐ small volume ☐ disease center ☐ history of failure ☐ clay ☐ expansive ☒ slope 10 ~~~~ ° aspect ~~~~ E

Obstructions: ☐ lights ☐ signage ☐ line-of-sight ☐ view ☐ overhead lines ☐ underground utilities ☐ traffic ☒ adjacent vegetation ☐ other _____

Exposure to wind: ☐ single tree ☐ below canopy ☒ above canopy ☐ recently exposed ☐ windward, canopy edge ☐ area prone to windthrow

Prevailing wind direction: E Occurrence of snow/ice storms: ☒ never ☐ seldom ☐ regularly

FIELD EVALUATION FORM - PAGE 2 OF 2 Tree Number 14

TARGET

Use Under Tree: ☐ building ☒ parking ☒ traffic ☒ pedestrian ☐ recreation ☐ landscape ☐ hardscape ☐ small features ☐ utility lines **Can target be moved?** Y N **Can use be restricted?** Y N

Occupancy: ☐ occasional use ☒ intermittent use ☐ frequent use ☐ constant use

TREE DEFECTS - Noted as applicable

ROOT DEFECTS: **Suspect root rot?** Y (N) **Mushroom/conk present?** Y (N) **ID:** ~

Exposed roots: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Undermined:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

Root pruned: ~ feet from trunk **Root area affected:** ~ % **Buttress wounded?** Y (N) **When:** ~

Restricted root area: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Potential for root failure:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

LEAN: ~ degrees from vertical ☐ natural ☐ unnatural ☐ self-corrected **Soil heaving?** Y N

Decay in plane of lean? Y N **Roots broken?** Y N **Soil cracking?** Y N **Lean severity:** ☐ severe ☐ 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	due to topping →	L-M	L-M	L-M
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		L-M		
Cankers/galls/burls				
Previous failure				

RECOMMENDED TREATMENT

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. (barbed wire) ☐ fertilize/water

Inspect further: ☐ root crown ☐ decay ☐ aerial ☒ monitor **Remove tree?** Y (N) **Replace tree?** Y (N)
Move target:? Y (N) **Other:** ~ ☐ no action required at this time

Effect on adjacent trees: ☐ none ☒ evaluate **Notification:** ☐ owner ☐ manager ☐ governing agency **Date:** ~

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

FIELD EVALUATION FORM

Owner: _____ ☐ public ☑ private ☐ unknown ☐ other: _____

Site/Address: _____ Thomas Guide: Page: ____ Coordinate: ____

Date: July 11, 1998 Inspector: JK Date of last inspection: _____ ☐ not previously inspected

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Tree #: 15 Species: ☐ *Quercus agrifolia* ☐ *Quercus lobata* ☒ other Eucalyptus globulus

# of trunks: 3 dbH (inches): est. 28, 11, 10 Height (feet): 70

Compass direction	N	NE	E	SE	S	SW	W	NW
Dripline (feet) est.	15	10	12	19	22	30	30	30
Clearance to canopy	40	40	15	18	30	30	40	40

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): ____ %

Pruning history: ☐ crown cleaned ☐ excessively thinned ☐ topped ☐ crown raised ☐ pollarded ☐ crown reduced ☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/braced ☑ none ☐ multiple pruning events Approximate dates: ____ ☐ unknown

Special Value: ☑ specimen ☑ heritage/historic ☐ wildlife ☐ unusual ☐ street tree ☐ screen ☑ shade ☐ indigenous ☑ protected by government agency

TREE HEALTH

Foliage color: ☑ normal ☐ chlorotic ☐ necrotic

Epicormics? Y (N) Twig Dieback? Y (N)

Foliage density: ☑ normal ☐ sparse

Leaf size: ☑ normal ☐ small

Annual shoot growth: ☐ excellent ☑ average ☐ poor

Woundwood development: ☐ excellent ☑ average ☐ poor ☐ none

Vigor class: ☐ excellent ☑ average ☐ fair ☐ poor

Growth obstructions: ☐ stakes ☐ wire/ties ☐ signs ☐ cables ☑ curb/pavement ☐ guards ☐ other _____

Major pests/diseases: _____

SITE CONDITIONS

Site character: ☑ residence ☐ commercial ☐ industrial ☐ park ☐ open space ☐ natural ☐ woodland/forest

Landscape type: ☐ parkway ☐ raised bed ☐ container ☐ mound ☐ lawn ☐ shrub border ☑ wind break

Irrigation: ☑ none ☐ adequate ☐ inadequate ☐ excessive ☐ trunk wetted Pavement lifted? Y (N)

Recent site disturbance? Y (N) ☐ construction ☐ soil disturbance ☐ grade change ☐ line clearing ☐ site clearing

% 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 ☐ droughty ☐ saline ☐ alkaline ☐ acidic ☐ small volume ☐ disease center ☐ history of failure ☐ clay ☐ expansive ☑ slope 10 ° aspect E

Obstructions: ☐ lights ☐ signage ☐ line-of-sight ☐ view ☐ overhead lines ☐ underground utilities ☐ traffic ☑ adjacent vegetation ☐ other _____

Exposure to wind: ☐ single tree ☐ below canopy ☑ above canopy ☐ recently exposed ☐ windward, canopy edge ☐ area prone to windthrow

Prevailing wind direction: E Occurrence of snow/ice storms: ☑ never ☐ seldom ☐ regularly

FIELD EVALUATION FORM - PAGE 2 OF 2 Tree Number 15

TARGET

Use Under Tree: ☐ building ☑ parking ☑ traffic ☑ pedestrian ☐ recreation ☐ landscape ☐ hardscape ☐ small features ☐ utility lines **Can target be moved?** Y (N) **Can use be restricted?** Y (N)

Occupancy: ☐ occasional use ☑ intermittent use ☐ frequent use ☐ constant use

TREE DEFECTS - Noted as applicable

ROOT DEFECTS: **Suspect root rot?** Y (N) **Mushroom/conk present?** Y (N) **ID:** —

Exposed roots: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Undermined:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

Root pruned: — feet from trunk **Root area affected:** — % **Buttress wounded?** Y (N) **When:** —

Restricted root area: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Potential for root failure:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

LEAN: — degrees from vertical ☐ natural ☐ unnatural ☐ self-corrected **Soil heaving?** Y N

Decay in plane of lean? Y N **Roots broken?** Y N **Soil cracking?** Y N **Lean severity:** ☐ severe ☐ 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 bark				
Nesting hole/bee hive				
Deadwood/stubs				L-M
Borers/termites/ants				
Cankers/galls/burls				
Previous failure				

RECOMMENDED TREATMENT

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 (N) **Replace tree?** Y (N)
Move target:? Y (N) **Other:** — ☒ no action required at this time

Effect on adjacent trees: ☐ none ☒ evaluate **Notification:** ☐ owner ☐ manager ☐ governing agency **Date:** —

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Photo # 4

FIELD EVALUATION FORM

Owner: _____ ☐ public ☒ private ☐ unknown ☐ other: _____

Site/Address: _____ **Thomas Guide:** Page: ____ Coordinate: ____

Date: July 11, 1998 **Inspector:** DC **Date of last inspection:** _____ ☐ not previously inspected

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Tree #: 16 **Species:** ☐ *Quercus agrifolia* ☐ *Quercus lobata* ☒ other Eucalyptus globulus

# of trunks: 4 **dbH (inches):** 54, 10, 10, 2 **Height (feet):** 60

Compass direction	N	NE	E	SE	S	SW	W	NW
Dripline (feet) est.	15	20	25	30	30	25	22	20
Clearance to canopy	~~30~~ 28	30	35	25	30	30	35	30

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):** ____%

Pruning history: ☐ crown cleaned ☐ excessively thinned ☐ topped ☐ crown raised ☐ pollarded ☐ crown reduced ☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/braced ☒ none ☐ multiple pruning events Approximate dates: _____ ☐ unknown

Special Value: ☒ specimen ☒ heritage/historic ☐ wildlife ☐ unusual ☐ street tree ☐ screen ☐ shade ☐ indigenous ☒ protected by government agency

TREE HEALTH

Foliage color: ☒ normal ☐ chlorotic ☐ necrotic

Epicormics? Y (N) **Twig Dieback?** Y (N)

Foliage density: ☒ normal ☐ sparse

Leaf size: ☒ normal ☐ small

Annual shoot growth: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ poor

Woundwood development: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ poor ☐ none

Vigor class: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ fair ☐ poor

Growth obstructions: ☐ stakes ☐ wire/ties ☐ signs ☐ cables ☒ curb/pavement ☐ guards ☐ other _____

Major pests/diseases: _____

SITE CONDITIONS

Site character: ☒ residence ☐ commercial ☐ industrial ☐ park ☐ open space ☒ natural ☐ woodland/forest

Landscape type: ☐ parkway ☐ raised bed ☐ container ☐ mound ☐ lawn ☐ shrub border ☒ wind break

Irrigation: ☒ none ☐ adequate ☐ inadequate ☐ excessive ☐ trunk wetted **Pavement lifted?** Y (N)

Recent site disturbance? Y (N) ☐ construction ☐ soil disturbance ☐ grade change ☐ line clearing ☐ site clearing

% 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 ☐ droughty ☐ saline ☐ alkaline ☐ acidic ☐ small volume ☐ disease center ☐ history of failure ☐ clay ☐ expansive ☒ slope 10 % ° aspect E

Obstructions: ☐ lights ☐ signage ☐ line-of-sight ☐ view ☐ overhead lines ☐ underground utilities ☐ traffic ☒ adjacent vegetation ☐ other _____

Exposure to wind: ☐ single tree ☐ below canopy ☒ above canopy ☐ recently exposed ☐ windward, canopy edge ☐ area prone to windthrow

Prevailing wind direction: E **Occurrence of snow/ice storms:** ☒ never ☐ seldom ☐ regularly

FIELD EVALUATION FORM - PAGE 2 OF 2 Tree Number 16

TARGET

Use Under Tree: ☐ building ☑ parking ☑ traffic ☑ pedestrian ☐ recreation ☐ landscape ☐ hardscape ☐ small features ☐ utility lines **Can target be moved?** Y (N) **Can use be restricted?** Y (N)

Occupancy: ☐ occasional use ☑ intermittent use ☐ frequent use ☐ constant use

TREE DEFECTS - Noted as applicable

ROOT DEFECTS: **Suspect root rot?** Y (N) **Mushroom/conk present?** Y (N) **ID:** _____

Exposed roots: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Undermined:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

Root pruned: _____ feet from trunk **Root area affected:** _____ % **Buttress wounded?** Y (N) **When:** _____

Restricted root area: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Potential for root failure:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

LEAN: _____ degrees from vertical ☐ natural ☐ unnatural ☐ self-corrected **Soil heaving?** Y N

Decay in plane of lean? Y N **Roots broken?** Y N **Soil cracking?** Y N **Lean severity:** ☐ severe ☐ 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 bark				
Nesting hole/bee hive				
Deadwood/stubs				L-M
Borers/termites/ants				
Cankers/galls/burls				
Previous failure				

RECOMMENDED TREATMENT

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 (N) **Replace tree?** Y (N)
Move target:? Y (N) **Other:** _____ ☑ no action required at this time

Effect on adjacent trees: ☐ none ☑ evaluate **Notification:** ☐ owner ☐ manager ☐ governing agency **Date:** _____

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Photo #5

FIELD EVALUATION FORM

Owner: _____ ☐ public ☒ private ☐ unknown ☐ other: _____

Site/Address: _____ Thomas Guide: Page: ____ Coordinate: ____

Date: July 11, 1998 Inspector: D.C. Date of last inspection: _____ ☐ not previously inspected

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Tree #: 17 Species: ☐ *Quercus agrifolia* ☐ *Quercus lobata* ☒ other Eucalyptus globulos

# of trunks: 1 dbH (inches): 31 Height (feet): 50

Compass direction	N	NE	E	SE	S	SW	W	NW
Dripline (feet) est.	12	0	0	0	28	32	25	12
Clearance to canopy	28	6	0	0	32	22	15	20

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): ____ %

Pruning history: ☐ crown cleaned ☐ excessively thinned ☐ topped ☐ crown raised ☐ pollarded ☐ crown reduced
☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/braced ☒ none ☐ multiple pruning events Approximate dates: _____ ☐ unknown

Special Value: ☒ specimen ☒ heritage/historic ☐ wildlife ☐ unusual ☐ street tree ☐ screen ☐ shade
☐ indigenous ☒ protected by government agency

TREE HEALTH

Foliage color: ☒ normal ☐ chlorotic ☐ necrotic

Epicormics? Y (N) Twig Dieback? Y (N)

Foliage density: ☒ normal ☐ sparse

Leaf size: ☒ normal ☐ small

Annual shoot growth: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ poor

Woundwood development: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ poor ☐ none

Vigor class: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ fair ☐ poor

Growth obstructions: ☐ stakes ☐ wire/ties ☐ signs ☐ cables ☐ curb/pavement ☐ guards ☐ other _____

Major pests/diseases: _____

SITE CONDITIONS

Site character: ☒ residence ☐ commercial ☐ industrial ☐ park ☐ open space ☐ natural ☐ woodland/forest

Landscape type: ☐ parkway ☐ raised bed ☐ container ☐ mound ☐ lawn ☐ shrub border ☒ wind break

Irrigation: ☒ none ☐ adequate ☐ inadequate ☐ excessive ☐ trunk wetted Pavement lifted? Y (N)

Recent site disturbance? Y (N) ☐ construction ☐ soil disturbance ☐ grade change ☐ line clearing ☐ site clearing

% 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 ☐ droughty ☐ saline ☐ alkaline ☐ acidic ☐ small volume
☐ disease center ☐ history of failure ☐ clay ☐ expansive ☒ slope 5 ° aspect E

Obstructions: ☐ lights ☐ signage ☐ line-of-sight ☐ view ☐ overhead lines ☐ underground utilities ☐ traffic
☒ adjacent vegetation ☐ other _____

Exposure to wind: ☐ single tree ☐ below canopy ☒ above canopy ☐ recently exposed ☐ windward, canopy edge
☐ area prone to windthrow

Prevailing wind direction: E Occurrence of snow/ice storms: ☒ never ☐ seldom ☐ regularly

FIELD EVALUATION FORM - PAGE 2 OF 2 Tree Number 17

TARGET

Use Under Tree: ☐ building ☐ parking ☒ traffic ☒ pedestrian ☐ recreation ☐ landscape ☐ hardscape ☐ small features ☐ utility lines **Can target be moved?** Y (N) **Can use be restricted?** Y (N)

Occupancy: ☐ occasional use ☒ intermittent use ☐ frequent use ☐ constant use

TREE DEFECTS - Noted as applicable

ROOT DEFECTS: **Suspect root rot?** Y (N) **Mushroom/conk present?** Y (N) **ID:** —

Exposed roots: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Undermined:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

Root pruned: — feet from trunk **Root area affected:** — % **Buttress wounded?** Y (N) **When:** —

Restricted root area: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Potential for root failure:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

LEAN: 10 degrees from vertical ☒ natural ☐ unnatural ☐ self-corrected **Soil heaving?** Y (N)

Decay in plane of lean? Y (N) **Roots broken?** Y (N) **Soil cracking?** Y (N) **Lean severity:** ☐ severe ☒ 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 bark				
Nesting hole/bee hive				
Deadwood/stubs				L-M
Borers/termites/ants				
Cankers/galls/burls				
Previous failure				

RECOMMENDED TREATMENT

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 (N) **Replace tree?** Y (N)
Move target:? Y (N) **Other:** _____ ☒ no action required at this time

Effect on adjacent trees: ☐ none ☒ evaluate **Notification:** ☐ owner ☐ manager ☐ governing agency **Date:** _____

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Photo #6

FIELD EVALUATION FORM

Owner: _____ ☐ public ☒ private ☐ unknown ☐ other: _____

Site/Address: _____ **Thomas Guide:** Page: ____ Coordinate: ____

Date: 7/6/1998 **Inspector:** DC **Date of last inspection:** ____ ☐ not previously inspected

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Tree #: 18 **Species:** ☐ *Quercus agrifolia* ☐ *Quercus lobata* ☒ other Eucalyptus globulus

# of trunks: 2 **dbH (inches):** 26, 9 **Height (feet):** EC

Compass direction	N	NE	E	SE	S	SW	W	NW
Dripline (feet) est.	3	6	0	30	15	10	20	20
Clearance to canopy	6	12	0	30	20	10	40	20

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):** ____%

Pruning history: ☐ crown cleaned ☐ excessively thinned ☐ topped ☐ crown raised ☐ pollarded ☐ crown reduced
☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/braced ☒ none ☐ multiple pruning events Approximate dates: ____ ☐ unknown

Special Value: ☒ specimen ☐ heritage/historic ☐ wildlife ☐ unusual ☐ street tree ☐ screen ☐ shade
☐ *indigenous* ☒ *protected by government agency*

TREE HEALTH

Foliage color: ☒ normal ☐ chlorotic ☐ necrotic

Epicormics? Y (N) **Twig Dieback?** Y (N)

Foliage density: ☒ normal ☐ sparse

Leaf size: ☒ normal ☐ small

Annual shoot growth: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ poor

Major pests/diseases: _____

Woundwood development: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ poor ☐ none

Vigor class: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ fair ☐ poor

Growth obstructions: ☐ stakes ☐ wire/ties ☐ signs ☐ cables ☒ curb/pavement ☐ guards ☐ other _____

SITE CONDITIONS

Site character: ☒ residence ☐ commercial ☐ industrial ☐ park ☐ open space ☐ natural ☐ woodland/forest

Landscape type: ☐ parkway ☐ raised bed ☐ container ☐ mound ☐ lawn ☐ shrub border ☒ wind break

Irrigation: ☒ none ☐ adequate ☐ inadequate ☐ excessive ☐ trunk wetted **Pavement lifted?** Y (N)

Recent site disturbance? Y (N) ☐ construction ☐ soil disturbance ☐ grade change ☐ line clearing ☐ site clearing

% 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 ☐ droughty ☐ saline ☐ alkaline ☐ acidic ☐ small volume
☐ disease center ☐ history of failure ☐ clay ☐ expansive ☒ slope 10 ° aspect E

Obstructions: ☐ *lights* ☐ *signage* ☐ *line-of-sight* ☐ *view* ☐ *overhead lines* ☐ *underground utilities* ☐ *traffic*
☒ adjacent vegetation ☐ other _____

Exposure to wind: ☐ single tree ☐ below canopy ☒ above canopy ☐ recently exposed ☐ windward, canopy edge
☐ area prone to windthrow

Prevailing wind direction: E **Occurrence of snow/ice storms:** ☒ never ☐ seldom ☐ regularly

FIELD EVALUATION FORM - PAGE 2 OF 2 Tree Number 15

TARGET

Use Under Tree: ☐ building ☒ parking ☒ traffic ☒ pedestrian ☐ recreation ☐ landscape ☐ hardscape
☐ small features ☐ utility lines **Can target be moved?** Y (N) **Can use be restricted?** Y (N)

Occupancy: ☐ occasional use ☒ intermittent use ☐ frequent use ☐ constant use

TREE DEFECTS - Noted as applicable

ROOT DEFECTS: **Suspect root rot?** Y (N) **Mushroom/conk present?** Y (N) **ID:** —

Exposed roots: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Undermined:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

Root pruned: — feet from trunk **Root area affected:** — % **Buttress wounded?** Y (N) **When:** —

Restricted root area: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Potential for root failure:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

LEAN: 15 degrees from vertical ☒ natural ☐ unnatural ☐ self-corrected **Soil heaving?** Y (N)

Decay in plane of lean? Y (N) **Roots broken?** Y (N) **Soil cracking?** Y (N) **Lean severity:** ☐ severe ☒ 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 bark				
Nesting hole/bee hive				
Deadwood/stubs				L-M
Borers/termites/ants				
Cankers/galls/burls				
Previous failure				

RECOMMENDED TREATMENT

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 (N) **Replace tree?** Y (N)
Move target:? Y (N) **Other:** — ☒ no action required at this time

Effect on adjacent trees: ☐ none ☒ evaluate **Notification:** ☐ owner ☐ manager ☐ governing agency **Date:** —

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Photo #7 Tree branches interfering with tree West of this one

FIELD EVALUATION FORM

Owner: _____ ☐ public ☒ private ☐ unknown ☐ other: _____

Site/Address: _____ **Thomas Guide:** Page: ____ Coordinate: ____

Date: July 11, 1999 **Inspector:** DG **Date of last inspection:** ____ ☐ not previously inspected

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Tree #: 19 **Species:** ☐ *Quercus agrifolia* ☐ *Quercus lobata* ☒ other Eucalyptus globulus

# of trunks: 1 **dbH (inches):** 31 **Height (feet):** 60

Compass direction	N	NE	E	SE	S	SW	W	NW
Dripline (feet) est.	30	28	35	35	32	15	15	20
Clearance to canopy	45	40	50	15	40	40	50	40

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):** ____%

Pruning history: ☐ crown cleaned ☐ excessively thinned ☐ topped ☐ crown raised ☐ pollarded ☐ crown reduced ☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/braced ☒ none ☐ multiple pruning events Approximate dates: _____ ☐ unknown

Special Value: ☒ specimen ☒ heritage/historic ☐ wildlife ☐ unusual ☐ street tree ☐ screen ☐ shade ☐ indigenous ☒ protected by government agency

TREE HEALTH

Foliage color: ☒ normal ☐ chlorotic ☐ necrotic

Epicormics? Y (N) **Twig Dieback?** Y (N)

Foliage density: ☒ normal ☐ sparse

Leaf size: ☒ normal ☐ small

Annual shoot growth: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ poor

Woundwood development: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ poor ☐ none

Vigor class: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ fair ☐ poor

Growth obstructions: ☐ stakes ☐ wire/ties ☐ signs ☐ cables ☐ curb/pavement ☐ guards ☐ other _____

Major pests/diseases: _____

SITE CONDITIONS

Site character: ☒ residence ☐ commercial ☐ industrial ☐ park ☐ open space ☒ natural ☐ woodland/forest

Landscape type: ☐ parkway ☐ raised bed ☐ container ☐ mound ☐ lawn ☐ shrub border ☒ wind break

Irrigation: ☒ none ☐ adequate ☐ inadequate ☐ excessive ☐ trunk wetted **Pavement lifted?** Y (N)

Recent site disturbance? Y (N) ☐ construction ☐ soil disturbance ☐ grade change ☐ line clearing ☐ site clearing

% 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 ☐ droughty ☐ saline ☐ alkaline ☐ acidic ☐ small volume ☐ disease center ☐ history of failure ☐ clay ☐ expansive ☒ slope 10 ° aspect E

Obstructions: ☐ lights ☐ signage ☐ line-of-sight ☐ view ☐ overhead lines ☐ underground utilities ☐ traffic ☒ adjacent vegetation ☐ other _____

Exposure to wind: ☐ single tree ☐ below canopy ☒ above canopy ☐ recently exposed ☐ windward, canopy edge ☐ area prone to windthrow

Prevailing wind direction: E **Occurrence of snow/ice storms:** ☒ never ☐ seldom ☐ regularly

FIELD EVALUATION FORM - PAGE 2 OF 2 Tree Number 19

TARGET

Use Under Tree: ☐ building ☒ parking ☐ traffic ☒ pedestrian ☐ recreation ☐ landscape ☐ hardscape
☐ small features ☐ utility lines **Can target be moved?** Y (N) **Can use be restricted?** Y (N)

Occupancy: ☐ occasional use ☒ intermittent use ☐ frequent use ☐ constant use

TREE DEFECTS - Noted as applicable

ROOT DEFECTS: **Suspect root rot?** Y (N) **Mushroom/conk present?** Y (N) **ID:** _____

Exposed roots: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Undermined:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

Root pruned: _____ feet from trunk **Root area affected:** _____ % **Buttress wounded?** Y (N) **When:** _____

Restricted root area: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Potential for root failure:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

LEAN: 15 degrees from vertical ☒ natural ☐ unnatural ☐ self-corrected **Soil heaving?** Y (N)

Decay in plane of lean? Y (N) **Roots broken?** Y (N) **Soil cracking?** Y (N) **Lean severity:** ☐ severe ☒ 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 bark				
Nesting hole/bee hive				
Deadwood/stubs				L
Borers/termites/ants				
Cankers/galls/burls				
Previous failure				

RECOMMENDED TREATMENT

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 (N) **Replace tree?** Y (N)
Move target:? Y (N) **Other:** _____ ☒ no action required at this time

Effect on adjacent trees: ☐ none ☒ evaluate **Notification:** ☐ owner ☐ manager ☐ governing agency **Date:** _____

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Photo #8

FIELD EVALUATION FORM

Owner: _____ ☐ public ☒ private ☐ unknown ☐ other: _____

Site/Address: _____ **Thomas Guide:** Page: ____ Coordinate: ____

Date: Jul 11, 1998 **Inspector:** DG **Date of last inspection:** — ☐ *not previously inspected*

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Tree #: 20 **Species:** ☐ *Quercus agrifolia* ☐ *Quercus lobata* ☒ other *Eucalyptus globulus*

# of trunks: 1 **dbH (inches):** 39 **Height (feet):** 60

Compass direction	N	NE	E	SE	S	SW	W	NW
Dripline (feet) est.	38	30	25	35	32	25	25	30
Clearance to canopy	45	40	30	40	22	30	30	35

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):** ____ %

Pruning history: ☐ crown cleaned ☐ excessively thinned ☐ topped ☐ crown raised ☐ pollarded ☐ crown reduced ☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/braced ☒ none ☐ multiple pruning events Approximate dates: _____ ☐ unknown

Special Value: ☒ specimen ☒ heritage/historic ☐ wildlife ☐ unusual ☐ street tree ☐ screen ☐ shade ☐ indigenous ☐ protected by government agency

TREE HEALTH

Foliage color: ☒ normal ☐ chlorotic ☐ necrotic

Epicormics? Y (N) **Twig Dieback?** Y (N)

Foliage density: ☒ *normal* ☐ *sparse*

Leaf size: ☒ normal ☐ small

Annual shoot growth: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ poor

Major pests/diseases: —

Woundwood development: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ poor ☐ none

Vigor class: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ fair ☐ poor

Growth obstructions: ☐ stakes ☐ wire/ties ☐ signs ☐ cables ☒ curb/pavement ☐ guards ☐ other _____

SITE CONDITIONS

Site character: ☒ residence ☐ commercial ☐ industrial ☐ park ☐ open space ☒ natural ☐ woodland/forest

Landscape type: ☐ parkway ☐ raised bed ☐ container ☐ mound ☐ lawn ☐ shrub border ☒ wind break

Irrigation: ☒ none ☐ adequate ☐ inadequate ☐ excessive ☐ trunk wetted **Pavement lifted?** Y (N)

Recent site disturbance? Y (N) ☐ construction ☐ soil disturbance ☐ grade change ☐ line clearing ☐ site clearing

% 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 ☐ droughty ☐ saline ☐ alkaline ☐ acidic ☐ small volume ☐ disease center ☐ history of failure ☐ clay ☐ expansive ☒ slope 10 ° aspect E

Obstructions: ☐ lights ☐ signage ☐ line-of-sight ☐ view ☐ overhead lines ☐ underground utilities ☐ traffic ☒ adjacent vegetation ☐ other _____

Exposure to wind: ☐ single tree ☐ below canopy ☒ above canopy ☐ recently exposed ☐ windward, canopy edge ☐ area prone to windthrow

Prevailing wind direction: E **Occurrence of snow/ice storms:** ☒ never ☐ seldom ☐ regularly

FIELD EVALUATION FORM - PAGE 2 OF 2 Tree Number 20

TARGET

Use Under Tree: ☐ building ☒ parking ☒ traffic ☒ pedestrian ☐ recreation ☐ landscape ☐ hardscape
☐ small features ☐ utility lines **Can target be moved?** Y (N) **Can use be restricted?** Y (N)

Occupancy: ☐ occasional use ☒ intermittent use ☐ frequent use ☐ constant use

TREE DEFECTS - Noted as applicable

ROOT DEFECTS: **Suspect root rot?** Y (N) **Mushroom/conk present?** Y (N) **ID:** _____

Exposed roots: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Undermined:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

Root pruned: _____ feet from trunk **Root area affected:** _____ % **Buttress wounded?** Y (N) **When:** _____

Restricted root area: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Potential for root failure:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

LEAN: _____ degrees from vertical ☐ natural ☐ unnatural ☐ self-corrected **Soil heaving?** Y N

Decay in plane of lean? Y N **Roots broken?** Y N **Soil cracking?** Y N **Lean severity:** ☐ severe ☐ 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 bark				
Nesting hole/bee hive				
Deadwood/stubs				L
Borers/termites/ants				
Cankers/galls/burls				
Previous failure				

RECOMMENDED TREATMENT

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 (N) **Replace tree?** Y (N)
Move target:? Y (N) **Other:** _____ ☒ no action required at this time

Effect on adjacent trees: ☐ none ☒ evaluate **Notification:** ☐ owner ☐ manager ☐ governing agency **Date:** _____

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Photo # 9

FIELD EVALUATION FORM

Owner: _____ ☐ public ☒ private ☐ unknown ☐ other: _____

Site/Address: _____ **Thomas Guide:** Page: ____ Coordinate: ____

Date: July 11, 1998 **Inspector:** KC **Date of last inspection:** _____ ☐ not previously inspected

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Tree #: 21 **Species:** ☐ *Quercus agrifolia* ☐ *Quercus lobata* ☒ other *Eucalyptus leucoxylon*

# of trunks: 2 **dbH (inches):** 24,12 **Height (feet):** 70

Compass direction	N	NE	E	SE	S	SW	W	NW
Dripline (feet)	20	15	18	20	32	C	C	C
Clearance to canopy	30	25	28	40	30	C	C	C

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):** ____ %

Pruning history: ☐ crown cleaned ☐ excessively thinned ☐ topped ☐ crown raised ☐ pollarded ☐ crown reduced
☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/braced ☒ none ☐ multiple pruning events Approximate dates: _____ ☐ unknown

Special Value: ☒ specimen ☒ heritage/historic ☐ wildlife ☐ unusual ☐ street tree ☐ screen ☐ shade
☐ indigenous ☒ protected by government agency

TREE HEALTH

Foliage color: ☒ normal ☐ chlorotic ☐ necrotic

Epicormics? Y (N) **Twig Dieback?** Y (N)

Foliage density: ☒ normal ☐ sparse

Leaf size: ☒ normal ☐ small

Annual shoot growth: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ poor

Woundwood development: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ poor ☐ none

Vigor class: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ fair ☐ poor

Growth obstructions: ☐ stakes ☐ wire/ties ☐ signs ☐ cables ☒ curb/pavement ☐ guards ☐ other _____

Major pests/diseases: _____

SITE CONDITIONS

Site character: ☒ *residence* ☐ *commercial* ☐ *industrial* ☐ *park* ☐ *open space* ☐ *natural* ☐ *woodland/forest*

Landscape type: ☐ parkway ☐ raised bed ☐ container ☐ mound ☐ lawn ☐ shrub border ☒ wind break

Irrigation: ☒ *none* ☐ *adequate* ☐ *inadequate* ☐ *excessive* ☐ *trunk wetted* **Pavement lifted?** Y (N)

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:	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 ☐ droughty ☐ saline ☐ alkaline ☐ acidic ☐ small volume
☐ disease center ☐ history of failure ☐ clay ☐ expansive ☐ slope _____ ° aspect _____

Obstructions: ☐ lights ☐ signage ☐ line-of-sight ☐ view ☐ overhead lines ☐ underground utilities ☐ traffic
☒ adjacent vegetation ☐ other _____

Exposure to wind: ☐ single tree ☐ below canopy ☒ above canopy ☐ recently exposed ☐ windward, canopy edge
☐ area prone to windthrow

Prevailing wind direction: E ***Occurrence of snow/ice storms:*** ☒ *never* ☐ *seldom* ☐ *regularly*

FIELD EVALUATION FORM - PAGE 2 OF 2 Tree Number 21

TARGET

Use Under Tree: ☐ building ☒ parking ☒ traffic ☒ pedestrian ☐ recreation ☐ landscape ☐ hardscape
☐ small features ☐ utility lines **Can target be moved?** Y (N) **Can use be restricted?** Y (N)

Occupancy: ☐ occasional use ☒ intermittent use ☐ frequent use ☐ constant use

TREE DEFECTS - Noted as applicable

ROOT DEFECTS: **Suspect root rot?** Y (N) **Mushroom/conk present?** Y (N) **ID:** —

Exposed roots: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Undermined:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

Root pruned: — feet from trunk **Root area affected:** —% **Buttress wounded?** Y (N) **When:** —

Restricted root area: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Potential for root failure:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

LEAN: — degrees from vertical ☐ natural ☐ unnatural ☐ self-corrected **Soil heaving?** Y N

Decay in plane of lean? Y N **Roots broken?** Y N **Soil cracking?** Y N **Lean severity:** ☐ severe ☐ 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 bark				
Nesting hole/bee hive				
Deadwood/stubs				L
Borers/termites/ants				
Cankers/galls/burls				
Previous failure				

RECOMMENDED TREATMENT

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 (N) **Replace tree?** Y (N)
Move target:? Y (N) **Other:** — ☒ no action required at this time

Effect on adjacent trees: ☐ none ☒ evaluate **Notification:** ☐ owner ☐ manager ☐ governing agency **Date:** —

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Photo # 10

FIELD EVALUATION FORM

Owner: _____ ☐ public ☒ private ☐ unknown ☐ other: _____

Site/Address: _____ Thomas Guide: Page: ____ Coordinate: ____

Date: Jul 11 1998 Inspector: DC Date of last inspection: _____ ☐ not previously inspected

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Tree #: 22 Species: ☐ *Quercus agrifolia* ☐ *Quercus lobata* ☒ other *Phoenix Canariensis*

# of trunks: 1 dbH (inches): _____ Height (feet): 28

Compass direction	N	NE	E	SE	S	SW	W	NW
Dripline (feet)	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
Clearance to canopy	8	10	9	0	10	10	10	0

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): ____ %

Pruning history: ☐ crown cleaned ☐ excessively thinned ☐ topped ☐ crown raised ☐ pollarded ☐ crown reduced
☐ *flush cuts* ☐ *cabled/braced* ☒ *none* ☐ *multiple pruning events* *Approximate dates:* _____ ☐ *unknown*

Special Value: ☐ *specimen* ☒ *heritage/historic* ☐ *wildlife* ☐ *unusual* ☐ *street tree* ☐ *screen* ☐ *shade*
☐ indigenous ☒ protected by government agency

TREE HEALTH

Foliage color: ☒ normal ☐ chlorotic ☐ necrotic

Epicormics? Y (N) Twig Dieback? Y (N)

Foliage density: ☒ normal ☐ sparse

Leaf size: ☒ normal ☐ small

Annual shoot growth: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ poor

Woundwood development: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ poor ☐ none

Vigor class: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ fair ☐ poor

Growth obstructions: ☐ stakes ☐ wire/ties ☐ signs ☐ *cables* ☒ *curb/pavement* ☐ *guards* ☐ other ____

Major pests/diseases: ____

SITE CONDITIONS

Site character: ☒ residence ☐ commercial ☐ industrial ☐ park ☐ open space ☐ natural ☐ woodland/forest

Landscape type: ☐ parkway ☐ raised bed ☐ container ☐ mound ☐ lawn ☐ shrub border ☐ wind break

Irrigation: ☒ none ☐ adequate ☐ inadequate ☐ excessive ☐ trunk wetted Pavement lifted? Y (N)

Recent site disturbance? Y (N) ☐ construction ☐ soil disturbance ☐ grade change ☐ line clearing ☐ site clearing

% 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 ☐ droughty ☐ saline ☐ alkaline ☐ acidic ☐ small volume
☐ disease center ☐ history of failure ☐ clay ☐ expansive ☐ slope ____ ° aspect ____

Obstructions: ☐ lights ☐ signage ☐ line-of-sight ☐ view ☐ overhead lines ☐ underground utilities ☐ traffic
☒ adjacent vegetation ☐ other ____

Exposure to wind: ☐ single tree ☐ below canopy ☒ above canopy ☐ recently exposed ☐ windward, canopy edge
☐ area prone to windthrow

Prevailing wind direction: E Occurrence of snow/ice storms: ☒ never ☐ seldom ☐ regularly

FIELD EVALUATION FORM - PAGE 2 OF 2 Tree Number 22

TARGET

Use Under Tree: ☐ building ☒ parking ☒ traffic ☒ pedestrian ☐ recreation ☐ landscape ☐ hardscape ☐ small features ☐ utility lines **Can target be moved?** Y (N) **Can use be restricted?** Y (N)

Occupancy: ☐ occasional use ☐ intermittent use ☒ frequent use ☐ constant use

TREE DEFECTS - Noted as applicable

ROOT DEFECTS: **Suspect root rot?** Y (N) **Mushroom/conk present?** Y (N) **ID:** —

Exposed roots: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Undermined:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

Root pruned: ~ feet from trunk **Root area affected:** ____ % **Buttress wounded?** Y (N) **When:** —

Restricted root area: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Potential for root failure:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

LEAN: ~ degrees from vertical ☐ natural ☐ unnatural ☐ self-corrected **Soil heaving?** Y N

Decay in plane of lean? Y N **Roots broken?** Y N **Soil cracking?** Y N **Lean severity:** ☐ severe ☐ 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 bark				
Nesting hole/bee hive				
Deadwood/stubs				L Fronds
Borers/termites/ants				
Cankers/galls/burls				
Previous failure				

RECOMMENDED TREATMENT

Prune: ☐ remove defective part ☐ reduce end weight ☒ crown clean (dead fronds) ☐ 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 (N) **Replace tree?** Y (N)
Move target:? Y (N) **Other:** ____ ☐ no action required at this time

Effect on adjacent trees: ☐ none ☒ evaluate **Notification:** ☐ owner ☐ manager ☐ governing agency **Date:** ____

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Photo # 11

FIELD EVALUATION FORM

Owner: _____ ☐ public ☑ private ☐ unknown ☐ other: _____

Site/Address: _____ **Thomas Guide:** Page: ____ Coordinate: ____

Date: July 11, 1998 **Inspector:** MC **Date of last inspection:** _____ ☐ not previously inspected

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Tree #: 23 **Species:** ☐ *Quercus agrifolia* ☐ *Quercus lobata* ☑ other Schinus molle

# of trunks: 3 **dbH (inches):** 16, 12, 2 **Height (feet):** 25

Compass direction	N	NE	E	SE	S	SW	W	NW
Dripline (feet)	18	20	22	20	18	15	25	18
Clearance to canopy	15	15	18	12	12	12	15	20

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):** ____ %

Pruning history: ☐ crown cleaned ☐ excessively thinned ☐ topped ☐ crown raised ☐ pollarded ☐ crown reduced
☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/braced ☑ none ☐ multiple pruning events Approximate dates: _____ ☐ unknown

Special Value: ☑ specimen ☒ heritage/historic ☐ wildlife ☐ unusual ☐ street tree ☐ screen ☐ shade
☐ indigenous ☒ protected by government agency

TREE HEALTH

Foliage color: ☑ normal ☐ chlorotic ☐ necrotic

Epicormics? Y (N) **Twig Dieback?** Y (N)

Foliage density: ☑ normal ☐ sparse

Leaf size: ☒ normal ☐ small

Annual shoot growth: ☐ excellent ☑ average ☐ poor

Major pests/diseases: _____

Woundwood development: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ poor ☐ none

Vigor class: ☐ excellent ☑ average ☐ fair ☐ poor

Growth obstructions: ☐ stakes ☐ wire/ties ☐ signs ☐ cables ☐ curb/pavement ☐ guards ☐ other _____

SITE CONDITIONS

Site character: ☐ residence ☐ commercial ☐ industrial ☐ park ☐ open space ☒ natural ☐ woodland/forest

Landscape type: ☐ parkway ☐ raised bed ☐ container ☐ mound ☐ lawn ☐ shrub border ☐ wind break

Irrigation: ☒ none ☐ adequate ☐ inadequate ☐ excessive ☐ trunk wetted **Pavement lifted?** Y (N)

Recent site disturbance? Y (N) ☐ construction ☐ soil disturbance ☐ grade change ☐ line clearing ☐ site clearing

% 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* ☐ *droughty* ☐ *saline* ☐ *alkaline* ☐ *acidic* ☐ *small volume*
☐ disease center ☐ history of failure ☐ clay ☐ expansive ☐ slope ____ ° aspect ____

Obstructions: ☐ lights ☐ signage ☐ line-of-sight ☐ view ☐ overhead lines ☐ underground utilities ☐ traffic
☐ adjacent vegetation ☐ other _____

Exposure to wind: ☒ single tree ☐ below canopy ☐ above canopy ☐ recently exposed ☐ windward, canopy edge
☐ area prone to windthrow

Prevailing wind direction: E **Occurrence of snow/ice storms:** ☒ never ☐ seldom ☐ regularly

FIELD EVALUATION FORM - PAGE 2 OF 2 Tree Number 23

TARGET

Use Under Tree: ☐ building ☐ parking ☐ traffic ☐ pedestrian ☐ recreation ☐ landscape ☐ hardscape ☐ small features ☐ utility lines **Can target be moved?** Y N **Can use be restricted?** Y N

Occupancy: ☐ occasional use ☐ intermittent use ☐ frequent use ☐ constant use

TREE DEFECTS - Noted as applicable

ROOT DEFECTS: **Suspect root rot?** Y (N) **Mushroom/conk present?** Y (N) **ID:** —

Exposed roots: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Undermined:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

Root pruned: ____ feet from trunk **Root area affected:** ____ % **Buttress wounded?** Y (N) **When:** ____

Restricted root area: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Potential for root failure:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

LEAN: ____ degrees from vertical ☐ natural ☐ unnatural ☐ self-corrected **Soil heaving?** Y N

Decay in plane of lean? Y N **Roots broken?** Y N **Soil cracking?** Y N **Lean severity:** ☐ severe ☐ 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 bark				
Nesting hole/bee hive				
Deadwood/stubs				L
Borers/termites/ants				
Cankers/galls/burls				
Previous failure				

RECOMMENDED TREATMENT

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 (N) **Replace tree?** Y (N)
Move target:? Y (N) **Other:** ____ ☒ no action required at this time

Effect on adjacent trees: ☐ none ☒ evaluate **Notification:** ☐ owner ☐ manager ☐ governing agency **Date:** ____

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Photo #12

FIELD EVALUATION FORM

Owner: _____ ☐ public ☒ private ☐ unknown ☐ other: _____

Site/Address: _____ **Thomas Guide:** Page: ____ Coordinate: ____

Date: Jul. 14, 1998 **Inspector:** DC **Date of last inspection:** _____ ☐ not previously inspected

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Tree #: 24 **Species:** ☐ *Quercus agrifolia* ☐ *Quercus lobata* ☒ other Schinus molle

# of trunks: 6 **dbH (inches):** 17, 14, 13, 12, 12, 11 **Height (feet):** 28

Compass direction	N	NE	E	SE	S	SW	W	NW
Dripline (feet)	20	25	24	25	24	24	20	22
Clearance to canopy	18	15	10	18	15	12	15	12

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):** ____%

Pruning history: ☐ *crown cleaned* ☐ *excessively thinned* ☐ *topped* ☐ *crown raised* ☐ *pollarded* ☐ *crown reduced*
☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/braced ☒ none ☐ multiple pruning events Approximate dates: ____ ☒ unknown

Special Value: ☐ specimen ☒ heritage/historic ☐ wildlife ☐ unusual ☐ street tree ☐ screen ☐ shade
☐ indigenous ☒ protected by government agency

TREE HEALTH

Foliage color: ☒ normal ☐ chlorotic ☐ necrotic

Epicormics? Y (N) **Twig Dieback?** Y (N)

Foliage density: ☒ normal ☐ sparse

Leaf size: ☒ normal ☐ small

Annual shoot growth: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ poor

Woundwood development: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ poor ☐ none

Vigor class: ☐ excellent ☒ average ☐ fair ☐ poor

Growth obstructions: ☐ stakes ☐ wire/ties ☐ signs ☐ cables ☐ curb/pavement ☐ guards ☐ other _____

Major pests/diseases: _____

SITE CONDITIONS

Site character: ☒ *residence* ☐ *commercial* ☐ *industrial* ☐ *park* ☐ *open space* ☒ *natural* ☐ *woodland/forest*

Landscape type: ☐ parkway ☐ raised bed ☐ container ☐ mound ☐ lawn ☐ shrub border ☐ wind break

Irrigation: ☒ *none* ☐ *adequate* ☐ *inadequate* ☐ *excessive* ☐ *trunk wetted* **Pavement lifted?** Y (N)

Recent site disturbance? Y (N) ☐ construction ☐ soil disturbance ☐ grade change ☐ line clearing ☐ site clearing

% 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 ☐ droughty ☐ saline ☐ alkaline ☐ acidic ☐ small volume
☐ disease center ☐ history of failure ☐ clay ☐ expansive ☐ slope ____° aspect ____

Obstructions: ☐ lights ☐ signage ☐ line-of-sight ☐ view ☐ overhead lines ☐ underground utilities ☐ traffic
☐ adjacent vegetation ☐ other _____

Exposure to wind: ☐ single tree ☐ below canopy ☒ above canopy ☐ recently exposed ☐ windward, canopy edge
☐ area prone to windthrow

Prevailing wind direction: E ***Occurrence of snow/ice storms:*** ☒ never ☐ seldom ☐ regularly

FIELD EVALUATION FORM - PAGE 2 OF 2 Tree Number 24

TARGET

Use Under Tree: ☒ building ☐ parking ☐ traffic ☒ pedestrian ☐ recreation ☒ landscape ☐ hardscape
☐ small features ☐ utility lines **Can target be moved?** Y (N) **Can use be restricted?** Y (N)

Occupancy: ☐ occasional use ☐ intermittent use ☒ frequent use ☐ constant use

TREE DEFECTS - Noted as applicable

ROOT DEFECTS: **Suspect root rot?** Y (N) **Mushroom/conk present?** Y (N) **ID:** _____

Exposed roots: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Undermined:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

Root pruned: _____ feet from trunk **Root area affected:** _____ % **Buttress wounded?** Y (N) **When:** _____

Restricted root area: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low **Potential for root failure:** ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

LEAN: _____ degrees from vertical ☐ natural ☐ unnatural ☐ self-corrected **Soil heaving?** Y N

Decay in plane of lean? Y N **Roots broken?** Y N **Soil cracking?** Y N **Lean severity:** ☐ severe ☐ 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 bark				
Nesting hole/bee hive				
Deadwood/stubs				L-M / L-M
Borers/termites/ants				
Cankers/galls/burls				
Previous failure				

RECOMMENDED TREATMENT

Prune: ☒ remove stubs 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 (N) **Replace tree?** Y (N)
Move target:? Y (N) **Other:** _____ ☐ no action required at this time

Effect on adjacent trees: ☐ none ☒ evaluate **Notification:** ☐ owner ☐ manager ☐ governing agency **Date:** _____

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Photo #13