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## Charles Pinckney National Historic Site Tree Inventory and Management Plan

## MAKING THE MOST OF YOUR INVENTORY MANAGEMENT PLAN

Those who operate a large business or institution understand how inventory impacts operations and budgeting. One must know what's there, how much or how many, and where it all is. But the task doesn't end there. To obtain the greatest benefit from inventory, owners or their designees must manage it. Are a company's tools, for example, old and defective, in need of repair, in short supply, or useless and taking up space that could be better occupied?

A good management plan will address these issues and keep the inventory current, in good condition, and functioning for the benefit and safety of those involved.

Managing trees on a large property can seem like an overwhelming task, but the same principles of inventory management apply. This inventory and management plan should provide managers the data they need to develop realistic budgets for their tree maintenance needs, and it will help make the Charles Pinckney National Historic Site landscape a safer and more beautiful environment.

The following tips will assist you in making the most of this document:

## Who's Who

Those who conducted the inventory and prepared this document are members of the Bartlett Inventory Solutions (BIS) team. They are also employees of Bartlett Tree Experts and operate from the Bartlett Tree Research Laboratories in Charlotte, North Carolina. Readers may interpret the terms "Bartlett Tree Experts," "Bartlett," "the BIS team," "the team," "we," and "our" as the Bartlett company and those who conducted the inventory and prepared this management plan.

## Subject Trees

In this document, the term "subject trees" refers (depending on context) to some or all of the 133 trees (some of them groupings of trees) included in the inventory.

## Definitions \& Bolded Terms

Some definitions or specifications are detailed within a given section to explain how readers should interpret certain terms or classifications. We have also appended a Glossary for other terms that appear throughout the document. The first reference to each of these terms appears in bold for the reader's convenience.

## How This Document is Organized

As usual, the Table of Contents provides an effective road map to document contents, but following it are a List of Tables and List of Maps that users will find helpful in locating specific findings, recommendations, or tree locations. Also, a handy outline appears on page 6 that introduces the order in which results, recommendations, and the Entire Inventory will appear. All tables, photos, maps, and diagrams have numbered captions for quick reference. Starting with the Introduction, pages are numbered consecutively up to the "Entire Inventory" at the back. So that it can stand alone as a main inventory document, the Entire Inventory starts over with page -1-.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In January, 2012, the Bartlett Inventory Solutions (BIS) Team from Bartlett Tree Experts conducted an inventory of trees in the Charles Pinckney National Historic Site landscape. We identified 133 trees or groupings of trees that included 14 different species. The attributes that we collected include tree latitude and longitude, size, age and condition class, and a visual assessment of tree structure, health, and vigor.
We conducted the attribute collection using a sub-meter accuracy Global Positioning Satellite Receiver (GPSr) device with an error-in-location potential of not greater than three meters.

Our recommendations for the subject trees over the next three-year period include:

## Pruning

Prune 17 trees ( $13 \%$ ) for safety, health, structure, and appearance. Pruning will comply with American National Standards Institute (ANSI) A300 for pruning and ANSI Z133.1 for safety.

## Removals

Remove 1 tree ( $<1 \%$ ) due to poor tree structure or health.

## Tree Risk Assessments

Provide tree risk assessments for 2 trees (1\%) to evaluate the impact of wood decay in stems and buttress roots that show potential for failure.

## Cabling \& Bracing

Inspect structural support systems in 1 tree ( $<1 \%$ ) to reduce risk of branch failure.

## Root Collar Excavations

Perform root collar excavations to 10 trees ( $8 \%$ ) to lower risk of damaging conditions such as girdling roots, basal cankers, masking of root decay and lower-stem decay, and predisposing trees to various insect and disease pests.

## Integrated Pest Management (IPM)

Implement Bartlett's IPM program to monitor pests and diseases on the subject trees. Treatments are therapeutic and preventive, and treatment timing is based on pest life cycle.

## Soil Samples

Collect soil samples throughout the landscape and submit them for analysis that includes presence of soil nutrients, pH , organic matter, and cation exchange capacity.

## Bulk Density Samples

Collect bulk density samples throughout the landscape to determine the extent of soil compaction.

## Root Invigoration

Perform Bartlett's patented Root Invigoration program on trees deemed as significant to the landscape to improve aeration and promote more efficient root growth, especially for high-value trees in disturbed areas.

## INTRODUCTION

In early winter of 2012, Bartlett Tree Experts preformed an inventory at the Charles Pinckney National Historic Site in Mount Pleasant, SC, of trees in the landscape. Team member Brandon Hogan visited the site on January 24 to conduct the inventory.

The inventory included

- identifying trees within the formal landscape and attaching to each tree a tag with assigned tag number. (Tags 1-133);
- Trees located within the formal landscape were selected for this inventory. Not all trees on the property were included in this inventory;
- identifying the trees' condition, health, and vigor;
- recommending risk evaluations and removals of appropriate trees;
- recommending pruning, soil management, and pest management treatments to promote tree safety, health, appearance, and longevity; and
- mapping the trees using GPSr hardware and Geographic Information System (GIS) software.

The methods and procedures we used to make the above determinations and recommendations are detailed in the following sections.

## GOALS \& OBJECTIVES

An effective management plan communicates clear goals and the specific objectives designed to carry out those goals. We intend "goal" to mean the overall aim or result we expect to achieve for the client in producing the inventory and management plan. The objectives are the specific actions taken or recommended to support goal completion. Table 1 below describes each goal and its corresponding objective(s).

| Troat |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Establish the tree inventory (per numbers agreed) on the Charles Pinckney National Historic Site. | Using Trimble GeoXT GPSr hardware and ArgGIS 9.3 software, collect data such as tree name, location, size, age class, and condition class. |
|  | Place tag on each tree inventoried. |
| Provide mechanism for managing inventory, recommendations, and related budget planning. | Provide map or maps of the inventoried trees to assist the client in managing property areas. |
|  | Submit a comprehensive management plan that documents and organizes findings and provides other resources to assist the client in efficient use of the information. |
| Maximize client understanding and implementation of management plan. | Include in management plan specific explanations and visuals related to plan recommendations. |
|  | Provide appended resources that address health, procedures, and standards related to tree care. |
|  | Make periodic contact with client to follow up and answer any questions about the management plan's contents. |
| Maximize immediate and long-term tree health and aesthetics. | Implement recommended plant-health-care program that uses <br> - integrated pest management <br> - soil management <br> - maintenance pruning |
| Manage immediate and longterm risk associated with trees in high-use areas. | Implement recommended risk-management measures that include <br> - risk-reduction pruning <br> - required removals <br> - tree structure evaluations |

## DATA COLLECTION \& TREE INSPECTION METHODOLOGY

In conducting the inventory, we used specialized equipment and software and followed specific procedures to determine tree characteristics, risk evaluations, and recommendations. The following explanation will assist the reader in interpreting the findings of this management plan.

## Data Collection Equipment \& Attribute Data

The BIS team used the Trimble GeoXT global positioning system receiver (GPSr) hardware unit and accompanying ArgGIS 9.3 software. The attribute data we collected on site are listed below.

- botanical name and regional common name according to local ISA Chapter Tree Species List
- tree location based on GPS coordinate system
- tag number
- diameter at breast height (DBH)
- canopy radius
- age class
- height class
- condition class
- root zone infringement, based on dripline and estimated grayscape (e.g., sidewalks) impact on root zone
- infrastructure interaction (between trees and grayscape that may cause an undesirable condition)
- priority of general tree work (based on 3-year management plan)
- pruning
- need for and inspection of existing cables and braces
- need for and inspection of existing lightning protection
- need for tree hazard evaluations
- tree removals
- soil management recommendations
- pest management recommendations


## Specifications/Definitions

## Age Class

New Planting
Young
Semi-mature
Mature
Over-mature

## Height Class

Small
Medium
Large

## Condition Class

Dead

| Poor | Most of the canopy displays dieback and undesirable leaf color, <br> inappropriate leaf size or inadequate new growth. Tree or parts of tree are <br> in the process of failure. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Fair | Parts of canopy display undesirable leaf color, inappropriate leaf size, and <br> inadequate new growth. Parts of the tree are likely to fail. |
| Good | Tree health and condition are acceptable. |

## Priority of General Tree Work

Priority class recommendations are based on a three-year management plan that takes into consideration tree species, condition, location, age, and proximity to infrastructure. We intend that this rating system assist decision makers in prioritizing tree pruning, cabling and bracing, and tree lightning protection recommendations. Trees with a priority of 1 and a total Visual Tree Structure Analysis (VTSA) rating of 10 or higher are considered a critical risk (13-15) or high risk (10-12) and
should be addressed immediately. Prioritization does not take into account any budgetary or financial considerations.

Recommendations for Priorities 1, 2, and 3 are all based on observations by the inventory arborist. The following additional information clarifies each priority class:

Priority 1 To be addressed in years 1 or 2 of the management cycle. Priority 1 may include trees with large dead wood, structural defects, located in exposed sites, high aesthetic value, and/or parts that are currently negatively interacting with infrastructure, such as branches that touch buildings, interfere with signage or lighting, or obstruct pathways.
Priority 2 To be addressed in years 2 or 3 of the management cycle. Priority 2 may include trees with small dead wood, developing structural defects, located in semiexposed sites, moderate esthetic value, and/or parts that are anticipated to negatively interact with infrastructure, such as branches that touch buildings, interfere with signage or lighting, or obstruct pathways.
Priority 3 To be addressed in year 3 of the management cycle. Priority 3 may include trees with small dead wood, developing structural defects, located in lesser used sites, and/or parts that are anticipated to negatively interact with infrastructure, such as branches that rub on buildings, interfere with signage or lighting, or obstruct pathways.

## Pruning

Each of the following is a selective pruning technique to achieve the pruning goal described:
Clean Remove one or more of dead, diseased, and/or broken branches
Raise Provide vertical clearance
Thin Reduce density of live branches
Reduce Reduce height or spread
Structure Select live branches and stems to influence orientation, spacing, growth rate, strength of attachment, and ultimate size of branches and stems

## VTSA Inspection Methodology \& Risk Rating System

Bartlett's Visual Tree Structure Analysis system (VTSA) ranks the relative degree of risk for prioritizing remedial treatments when managing large tree populations. Bartlett's system uses two criteria: Failure Potential (FP) and Consequence of Failure (CoF). Failure potential considers the severity of defect, architecture, site exposure, and other biological, structural, and site factors that contribute to failure as observed from the ground. Consequence of failure factors in size of the defective plant part, target value, and frequency of use and potential for injury/loss should a failure occur as observed from the ground. The following tables describe the rating system in more detail:

Table 2: VTSA RATING SYSTEM - FAILURE POTENTIAL

| FAILURE POTENTIAL (FP) |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| RISK CATEGORY | DESCRIPTION | POINTS |
| Critical Risk | Failure imminent | 10 |
| High Risk | Failure likely, especially in storms | $7-9$ |
| Moderate Risk | Failure possible, especially in severe storms | $4-6$ |
| Low Risk | Failure unlikely | $1-3$ |

Table 3: VTSA RATING SYSTEM - CONSEQUENCE OF FAILURE

| CONSEQUENCE OF FAILURE (CoF) <br> These criteria consider potential for injury/loss should a failure occur based on <br> such factors as size of defective plant part, target value, and frequency of use. |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| RISK CATEGORY | DESCRIPTION | POINTS |  |
| Severe Consequence | High potential for injury/property loss | 5 |  |
| Moderate Consequence | Moderate potential for property loss and <br> low potential for injury | $3-4$ |  |
| Low Consequence | Low potential for any loss | $1-2$ |  |

The Total VTSA = Failure Potential + Consequence of Failure

Table 4: TOTAL VTSA

| TOTAL VISUAL TREE STRUCTURE ANALYSIS (VTSA) |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| RATING | RISK CATEGORY | DESCRIPTION |
| $13-15$ | Critical Risk | Failure imminent. Personal injury and/or <br> property damage inevitable. |
| $10-12$ | High risk | Failure likely, especially during storms. Personal injury <br> and/or property damage likely. |
| $7-9$ | Moderate Risk | Failure unlikely, and/or high risk of failure and low risk <br> of property damage/personal injury. |
| $<7$ | Low Risk | Failure unlikely and low risk of property damage. |

Pruning and structural support system procedures will reduce the risk of branch and leader failure to an acceptable level. We emphasize, however, that all large trees pose a certain degree of inherent risk and this evaluation does not preclude all possibility of failure especially during severe storms.

For those trees that the client considers hazardous and representing an immediate safety concern, we recommend placing a sign, tape, or other warning indicator near those trees until such time as the hazard can be remedied.

## RESULTS \& RECOMMENDATIONS

In reviewing the results and recommendations, the reader will find useful the specifications and definitions detailed on page 3 above. We used the following categories to organize the results and recommendations, which are displayed in tables:

- Results
- Stand Dynamics - This characterizes the subject trees according to
- Condition Class
- Age Class
- Tree Groupings
- Tree Species Identified
- Tree Size per DBH
- Estimated Value
- Conditions or Defects Observed
- Recommendations
- Further Evaluation and Removal
- Pruning and Structural Support Systems by VTSA Rating and Priority
- Lightning Protection Systems
- Soil Management
- Pest Management
- Entire Inventory

Due to the length and detail of this table, we placed it last, under a major heading, for handy reference.

Where appropriate, we have included explanations, photos, drawings, or other information to illuminate the table contents.

## Stand Dynamics

## Condition Class

The breakdown of tree condition follows. We have color coded each class to correspond with condition-class colors represented in the maps.

Table 5: CONDITION CLASS BREAKDOWN

| Condition <br> Class | Quantity | \% of Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Good | 89 | $67 \%$ |
| Fair | 37 | $28 \%$ |
| Poor | 3 | $2 \%$ |
| Dead | 4 | $3 \%$ |

## Age Class

The breakdown of tree age class follows:
Table 6: AGE CLASS BREAKDOWN

| Age Class | Quantity | \% of Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Over-Mature | 4 | $3 \%$ |
| Mature | 84 | $63 \%$ |
| Semi-Mature | 44 | $33 \%$ |
| Young | 1 | $1 \%$ |

## Tree Groupings

The following table displays the tree that we recorded as a grouping:
Table 7: TREES RECORDED AS GROUPINGS

| Tag \# | Common | Type of Planting |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 125 | live oak | Multiple 2 |

## Tree Species Identified

Our inventory revealed 14 different species of trees, as detailed in the following table:
Table 8: TREE SPECIES IDENTIFIED

| Genus | Species | Common | Count | Percentage Distribution Total |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Betula | nigra | river birch | 1 | 0.75 |  |
| Carya | cordiformis | bitternut hickory | 3 | 2.26 |  |
|  | illinonensis | pecan | 14 | 10.53 |  |
| Carya Total |  |  | 17 | 12.78 |  |
| Castanea | mollissima | Chinese chestnut | 1 | 0.75 |  |
| Diospyros | virginiana | persimmon | 1 | 0.75 |  |
| llex | opaca | American holly | 1 | 0.75 |  |
| Juniperus | virginiana | eastern redcedar | 12 | 9.02 |  |
| Magnolia | grandiflora | Southern magnolia | 16 | 12.03 |  |
| Pinus | taeda | loblolly pine | 4 | 3.01 |  |
| Platanus | occidentalis | American sycamore | 1 | 0.75 |  |
| Prunus | communis | common pear | 3 | 2.26 |  |
| Quercus | nigra | water oak | 3 | 2.26 |  |
|  | pagoda | cherrybark oak | 1 | 0.75 |  |
|  | virginiana | live oak | 72 | 54.14 |  |
| Quercus Total |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grand Total |  |  | 76 | 57.14 |  |


Map 2: TREES BY AGE CLASS



## Tree Size (DBH)

The following chart illustrates numbers of trees according to size per DBH:

Table 9: TREE SIZE ACCORDING TO DBH


## Estimated Value

As part of the Bartlett inventory process, we have included an estimated value for each tree and a cumulative total for each individual tree inventoried. To calculate the estimated value, we use a
modified version ${ }^{1}$ of the Trunk Formula Method published by the Council of Tree and Landscape Appraisers in The Guide for Plant Appraisal, 9th Edition.

Our estimated value calcuation uses the following data fields in this formula:

Table 10: DATA FIELDS FOR DETERMINING ESTIMATED TREE VALUE

| Estimated <br> Value | Size, species factor, condition factor, and location value |
| :--- | :--- |
| Size | Based on tree DBH (4.5 feet above grade) |
| Species <br> Factor | Relative species desirability based on 100\% for the tree in that geographical <br> location. In most cases, species desirability ratings, published by the International <br> Society of Arboriculture, are used for adjustment. |
| Condition <br> Factor | Rating of the tree's structure and health based on 100\% |
| Location <br> Factor | Average rating for the site and the tree's contribution and placement, based on <br> $100 \%$ |

The cumulative total value ${ }^{2}$ for all trees inventoried is $\$ 2,721,252$. The following table lists the ten trees with the highest estimated values:

Table 11: TOP TEN TREES - HIGHEST ESTIMATED VALUE

| Tag \# | Common | Diameter | Estimated Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{3 5}$ | live oak | 64 | $\$ 68,988$ |
| $\mathbf{4 4}$ | live oak | 60 | $\$ 65,112$ |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | live oak | 57 | $\$ 61,959$ |
| $\mathbf{1 9}$ | live oak | 56 | $\$ 60,861$ |
| $\mathbf{1 1 7}$ | live oak | 50 | $\$ 53,783$ |
| $\mathbf{3 0}$ | live oak | 50 | $\$ 53,783$ |
| $\mathbf{3 3}$ | live oak | 50 | $\$ 53,783$ |
| $\mathbf{2 4}$ | live oak | 68 | $\$ 51,779$ |
| $\mathbf{1 2}$ | live oak | 48 | $\$ 51,236$ |
| $\mathbf{4 9}$ | live oak | 46 | $\$ 48,596$ |

${ }^{1}$ This version does not consider cost of purchase and installation of the largest available "like tree."
${ }^{2}$ Estimated cumulative total value is actually greater due to our methodology not taking into account individual trees within tree groupings.

## Map 4: TOP 10 TREES - HIGHEST ESTIMATED VALUE



## Conditions or Defects Observed

In this (results) section, we list in Table 12 trees on which we observed conditions, defects, or other structural issues. Figure 1 provides an example of a tree with a defect on the stem. We list in Table 13 trees on which we observed girdling roots (or the possibility).


Figure 1: Tree \#20 exhibiting a large cavity on the stem.

Table 12: LIST OF TREES WITH CONDITIONS, DEFECTS, OR OTHER STRUCTURAL ISSUES.

| Tag <br> \# | Common | DBH | Condition or <br> Defect |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | Southern <br> magnolia | 42 | Deadwood >2 <br> inches |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | Southern <br> magnolia | 42 | Cavity(s) - crown |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | Southern <br> magnolia | 22 | Wound(s) - stem |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | , live oak | 42 | Wound(s) - crown |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | Southern <br> magnolia | 21 | Co-dominant <br> stems |
| 9 | live oak | 38 | Wound(s) - stem |
| 15 | American holly | 16 | Sweep |
| 16 | live oak | 54 | Cavity(s) - stem |
| 19 | live oak | 56 | Cavity(s) - stem |
| 19 | live oak | 56 | Cavity(s)- root |


| $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Tag} \\ \# \end{gathered}$ | Common | DBH | Condition or Defect |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | flare |
| 20 | live oak | 42 | Cavity(s) - stem |
| 23 | live oak | 52 | Cavity(s) - stem |
| 23 | live oak | 52 | Conk/Mushroom |
| 24 | live oak | 68 | Cavity(s) - crown |
| 24 | live oak | 68 | Conk/Mushroom |
| 25 | bitternut hickory | 17 | Uneven crown |
| 26 | bitternut hickory | 17 | Uneven crown |
| 27 | live oak | 34 | Uneven crown |
| 29 | live oak | 60 | Cavity(s) - stem |
| 33 | live oak | 50 | Cavity(s) - stem |


| Tag <br> $\#$ | Common | DBH | Condition or <br> Defect |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 43 | live oak | 34 | Wounds(s) - stem |
| 47 | water oak | 13 | Co-dominant <br> stems |
| 50 | live oak | 44 | Cavity(s) - crown |
| 53 | live oak | 58 | Cavity(s) - stem |
| 53 | live oak | 58 | Wound(s) - stem |
| 58 | live oak | 20 | Uneven crown |
| 67 | loblolly pine | 24 | Wound(s) - stem |
| 72 | pecan | 22 | Conk/Mushroom |
| 73 | pecan | 30 | Cavity(s) - stem |
| 82 | live oak | 38 | Cavity(s) - stem |


| Tag <br> $\#$ | Common | DBH | Condition or <br> Defect |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 99 | eastern <br> redcedar | 25 | Wound(s) - stem |
| 100 | eastern <br> redcedar | 24 | Wound(s) - stem |
| $\mathbf{1 1 6}$ | live oak | 48 | Wound(s) - stem |
| 118 | live oak | 37 | Wound(s) - stem |
| 118 | live oak | 37 | Wound(s) - crown |
| 121 | live oak | 46 | Uneven crown |
| $\mathbf{1 2 1}$ | live oak | 46 | Wound(s) - stem |
| 123 | Southern <br> magnolia | 22 | Cavity(s) - stem |

Table 13: TREES WITH GIRDLING ROOT PRESENT
During the inventory no trees were identified as having girdling roots. Ten trees were identified as being in need of root collar excavations. Root collar disorders can cause serious health and structural problems for trees and should be addressed. Please see the "soil management" section of this document for more information.

## Further Evaluation \& Removal

This section begins our coverage of recommendations. As part of the inventory process, the BIS team conducts a visual inspection of each tree from the ground. In this type of examination, the inspector can determine whether some aspect of tree structure or health indicates that a more comprehensive tree structure evaluation is needed to more thoroughly evaluate tree condition and risk of failure. Figure 2 provides an example of a tree defect that merits further evaluation. The presence of large, open wounds to the stem indicates that there may be a risk of failure.


Figure 2: Stem wound on Tree \#284 necessitates further evaluation to more thoroughly assess the risk of failure.

In such cases, we may recommend climbing inspections, examination of the root system using a compressed-air tool (that avoids damage to roots and underground utilities), and one or more of the following: resistance drilling; the IML Resistograph, a precision drilling instrument that provides graphical output (preferred drilling method); or sound-wave examinations that produce estimates of decay percentages in targeted areas. The goal is to use the appropriate method to evaluate impact of wood decay in stems and buttress roots that show potential for failure and to determine presence and condition of the root system.

Once we complete such evaluations, we can then recommend appropriate measures, such as remediation, maintenance, or removal. (A technical report on tree structure evaluation appears in the Appendix.)

The trees listed in Table 14 below met the conditions for further evaluation.
Table 14: TREES RECOMMENDED FOR FURTHER EVALUATION

| Tag \# | Common | Diameter | Evaluation Type |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | Southern magnolia | 38 | Drill Stem |
| $\mathbf{8 2}$ | live oak | 38 | Drill Stem |
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In some cases, our visual inspection was adequate to determine need for removal. The trees listed in Table 15 are recommended for removal.

Table 15: TREES RECOMMENDED FOR REMOVAL

| Tag \# | Common | DBH | GTW Priority | Total Risk Rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 123 | Southern magnolia | 22 | 1 Priority | 10 |

## Live Oaks (Quercus virginiana)

Live oaks are one of the most recognizable and beautiful trees in the south. Their majestic form and strong wood has made them a desirable and useful tree since the first European settlers arrived in the area four centuries ago. Live oaks are extremely resilient trees, being able to tolerate hurricane force winds and heavy rains which strike throughout their native range. As a result, defects that might be cause for serious concern or even removal in other species are not as significant for these trees. There is a strong desire to preserve the large live oaks on the site because of their historical significance. This desire must be weighed against the need to provide a safe environment for visitors to enjoy the site. Each one of the live oaks identified as having large cavities or wounds on the trunk (see table 12) should be inspected annually by a qualified arborist to evaluate any change in the tree's structural integrity. Should a tree be deemed hazardous or need to be removed in the future, leaving a 'spar' or portion of the trunk in place to provide a habitat for wildlife and preserve the original layout of the property is an acceptiable option.


Figure 3: Two dead live oak tree 'spars' left in place for wildlife habitat, aesthetic appeal, and historic significance


## Pruning \& Structural Support Systems

A commonly offered service among tree companies, pruning trees is one of the most poorly executed practices by tree workers who lack training in the basics of tree biology. "Lion's tailing," topping, and flush cuts are a few examples, and these can lead to hazardous conditions over time.

Because this practice is so misunderstood, and because specific standards exist to perform pruning correctly, the BIS team decided to include some explanation in the main body of this management plan.

Tree owners and tree-care practitioners should always keep in mind that any pruning cut is a wound. Informed tree-care professionals have learned to manage that wounding to preserve the health, safety, and integrity of the tree.

## Improper Pruning Practices

A few of the most common pruning abuses are

- Lion's Tailing - pruning that removes interior branches along the stem and scaffold branches. This encourages poor branch taper, poor wind load distribution, and risk of branch failure. It also deprives the tree of foliage it needs to produce photosynthates. See Figure 4.
- Topping - pruning cuts that reduce a tree's size by using heading cuts that shorten branches to a predetermined size. This also deprives the tree of adequate foliage. See Figure 5.
- Flush Cuts - pruning cut through the branch collar, flush against the trunk or parent stem, causing unnecessary injury. See Figure 6.
- Using Climbing Spikes Inappropriately - Using climbing spikes on a healthy tree, for example, wounds healthy stem tissues and can lead to infection by fungal pathogens.


Figure 5: Examples of topping


Figure 4: Black oval indicates general area of excessive foliage removal


Figure 6: Examples of flush cuts

## Correct Pruning Practices

For specific standards on pruning practices, readers will find ANSI Standards on this topic in the Appendix. We have, however, included below some key pruning categories and diagrams to illuminate the goal of each.

## Cleaning

Selective pruning to remove one or more of the following parts: dead, diseased, and/or broken branches.


Figure 7: Illustration of crown cleaning

## Raising

Selectively pruning to provide vertical clearance.


Figure 8: Illustration of crown rasing

## Thinning

Selective pruning to reduce density of live branches.


Figure 9: Illustration of thinning

## Reducing (Reduction Pruning)

Selective pruning to reduce height or spread.


Figure 10: Illustration of reduction purning

## Structural

Selective pruning of live branches and stems to influence orientation, spacing, growth rate, strength of attachment, and ultimate size of branches and stems.


Figure 11: Illustration of structural pruning

We recommended pruning on the following trees:
Table 16: TREES RECOMMENDED FOR PRUNING

| Tag \# | Common | Diameter | GTW Priority | Pruning Type | Total Risk Rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | Southern magnolia | 21 | 1 Priority | CLEAN | 10 |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | Southern magnolia | 42 | 1 Priority | CLEAN |  |
| 42 | live oak | 44 | 1 Priority | CLEAN |  |
| 47 | water oak | 13 | 1 Priority | RAISE |  |
| 47 | water oak | 13 | 1 Priority | STRUCTURE |  |
| 55 | live oak | 5 | 1 Priority | STRUCTURE |  |
| 38 | loblolly pine | 18 | 2 Priority | CLEAN |  |
| 39 | loblolly pine | 18 | 2 Priority | CLEAN |  |
| 43 | live oak | 34 | 2 Priority | RAISE |  |
| 45 | live oak | 38 | 2 Priority | RAISE |  |
| 48 | live oak | 13 | 3 Priority | RAISE |  |
| 60 | live oak | 10 | 3 Priority | STRUCTURE |  |
| 62 | live oak | 8 | 3 Priority | STRUCTURE |  |
| 63 | live oak | 8 | 3 Priority | STRUCTURE |  |
| 64 | live oak | 8 | 3 Priority | STRUCTURE |  |
| 93 | live oak | 10 | 3 Priority | STRUCTURE |  |
| $\mathbf{1 1 3}$ | live oak | 8 | 3 Priority | STRUCTURE |  |
| 114 | live oak | 6 | 3 Priority | STRUCTURE |  |


When

## Structural Support Systems

Cabling and bracing are structural support systems that can reduce risk of failure by limiting movement of stems or branches in certain situations. Examples include co-dominant stems or overextended branches with heavy foliage loads. Often cabling and bracing are combined with pruning to lighten the load on these branches or stems.

We recommend that the following tree have the existing cable systems inspected:
Table 17: TREES RECOMMENDED FOR STRUCTURAL SUPPORT SYSTEMS

| Tag \# | Common | DBH | GTW Priority | GTW Type |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 1 5}$ | eastern redcedar | 40 | 1 Priority | CABLE - INSPECT |



Figure 12: Tree number 115 shown with existing cable system

## Soil Management

Urban soils (as opposed to forest soils) are often mixed with the byproducts of construction activities that build our foundations, driveways, streets, parking lots, and other structures and grayscapes. This material compromises the physical, chemical, and biological properties that create healthy soils. Bartlett Tree Experts recommends several procedures and treatments that address soil quality. We address some of these below.

## Soil Testing

Collecting soil samples and having them tested helps determine nutrients that may be lacking, unfavorable soil pH values, and adequacy of soil organic matter. Following laboratory test results, we can implement a prescription fertilization program to balance soil chemistry and optimize conditions for plant growth.

## Mulch Application

Proper mulching provides many benefits to trees and shrubs. It moderates soil temperatures, reduces soil moisture loss, reduces soil compaction, provides nutrients, and improves soil structure. This practice results in more root growth and healthier plants. Mulch is frequently applied incorrectly, so we recommend that readers inspect the technical report on mulch application guidelines that appears in the Appendix. Figure 13 illustrates root growth density under grass versus mulch.


Figure 13: Example of root density under grass versus mulch

## Bulk Density

Compacted soils are regrettably common in the urban setting. A bulk density test, which requires an undisturbed core sample, measures the level of soil compaction. Arborists can use the results to diagnose problems or to determine what size holes to dig for planting. If soil density exceeds a measured threshold for a given soil type and tree species, we recommend Bartlett's Root Invigoration program.

## Root Invigoration

The aim of Bartlett's patented Root lnvigoration Program is to improve soil conditions by addressing soil compaction and promoting efficient root growth, especially for high-value trees in disturbed areas. The process includes taking soil samples to determine what nutrients are deficient, performing a root collar excavation, "air-tilling" a portion of the root zone to find fine roots, incorporating organic matter, fertilizing (based on soil sample), and applying mulch. The area of the root system treated can vary by tree. For the Root Invigoration Program to be successful, proper watering techniques must be employed after the process is complete.

## Root Collar Excavation

Excavating the root collar is necessary for trees whose buttress roots are covered by excess soil or mulch. Buried root collars can contribute to tree health problems, including girdling roots (See, again, Table 13), basal cankers, and masking root and lower stem decay. We have supplied a technical report on root collar disorders in the Appendix.

Figures 14,15 , and 16 provide examples of some of the above issues.


Figure 15: No root flare is visible at the tree's base. The root collar is buried.

Figure 14: Example of exposed root collar


Figure 16: Example of improper mulch application, know as "volcano mulch"

The following trees are recommended for root collar excavations:

Table 18: TREES RECOMMENDED FOR ROOT COLLAR EXCAVATIONS

| Tag \# | Common | DBH |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 37 | Southern magnolia | 27 |
| 39 | loblolly pine | 18 |
| 40 | live oak | 31 |
| 47 | water oak | 13 |
| 54 | live oak | 16 |
| 55 | live oak | 5 |
| 108 | live oak | 16 |
| 109 | live oak | 18 |
| 114 | live oak | 6 |
| 119 | live oak | 8 |
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## Pest Management

No pests or diseases were identified during the inventory. However, the BIS team still recommends an Integrated Pest Management (IPM) Program for trees in the formal landscape. An IPM program monitors for potentially damaging insects, diseases and cultural problems that are often seasonal and were not evident during our inventory visits. These pests include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Aphids - on a variety of species
- Boring Insects - on a variety of tree species
- Caterpillar Defoliators - on a variety of tree species, especially oak
- Oak Wilt - on oak
- Suspected Phytophthora Root Rot and Canker - on a variety of tree species
- Scale Insects - on a variety of tree species, especially oak
- Spider Mites - on a variety of tree species

Table 19: TREES RECOMMENDED FOR IPM PROGRAM
No pest or diseases were identified during the inventory.

## Historic Live Oaks

During the inventory a line of live oaks planted during the $19^{\text {th }}$ century to create an entryway from Long Point Road to the property was identified by staff at the site. The map below shows this line of trees.

Map 9: HISTORIC LIVE OAKS IDENTIFIED BY CPNHS STAFF


## Entire Inventory Follows

ENTIRE INVENTORY

| Tag \# | Genus | Species | Common | DBH | Age Class | Height | Canopy Radius | Condition | GTW <br> Priority | Estimated Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Magnolia | grandiflora | Southern magnolia | 42 | Mature | Large (>35') | 20 | Fair | 1 Priority | \$29,122 |
| 2 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 38 | Semi-mature | Large (>35') | 20 | Good |  | \$37,100 |
| 3 | Magnolia | grandiflora | Southern magnolia | 21 | Semi-mature | Large (>35') | 20 | Good | 1 Priority | \$11,450 |
| 4 | Magnolia | grandiflora | Southern magnolia | 22 | Semi-mature | Large (>35') | 20 | Good |  | \$12,567 |
| 5 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 42 | Mature | Large (>35') | 30 | Fair |  | \$30,739 |
| 6 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 57 | Mature | Large (>35') | 30 | Good |  | \$61,959 |
| 7 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 14 | Semi-mature | Medium (16 to 35') | 20 | Good |  | \$5,372 |
| 8 | Magnolia | grandiflora | Southern magnolia | 21 | Semi-mature | Large (>35') | 20 | Good |  | \$11,450 |
| 9 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 38 | Mature | Large (>35') | 30 | Fair |  | \$26,500 |
| 10 | Magnolia | grandiflora | Southern magnolia | 38 | Mature | Large (>35') | 25 | Good |  | \$35,147 |
| 11 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 38 | Mature | Medium (16 to 35') | 30 | Good |  | \$37,100 |
| 12 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 48 | Mature | Large (>35') | 35 | Good |  | \$51,236 |
| 13 | Magnolia | grandiflora | Southern magnolia | 26 | Mature | Large (>35') | 25 | Good |  | \$17,552 |
| 14 | Magnolia | grandiflora | Southern magnolia | 36 | Mature | Large (>35') | 25 | Good |  | \$32,203 |
| 15 | llex | opaca | American holly | 16 | Mature | Medium (16 to 35') | 20 | Good |  | \$6,647 |
| 16 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 54 | Mature | Large (>35') | 35 | Fair |  | \$41,854 |
| 17 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 44 | Over-mature | Small (<15') | 10 | Dead |  | \$0 |
| 18 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 48 | Over-mature | Small (<15') | 15 | Dead |  | \$0 |
| 19 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 56 | Mature | Large (>35') | 35 | Good |  | \$60,861 |
| 20 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 42 | Mature | Large (>35') | 30 | Fair |  | \$30,739 |
| 21 | Magnolia | grandiflora | Southern magnolia | 19 | Semi-mature | Large (>35') | 20 | Good |  | \$9,373 |
| 22 | Magnolia | grandiflora | Southern magnolia | 20 | Semi-mature | Large (>35') | 20 | Good |  | \$10,386 |
| 23 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 52 | Mature | Large (>35') | 35 | Fair |  | \$40,168 |
| 24 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 68 | Mature | Large (>35') | 35 | Fair |  | \$51,779 |
| 25 | Carya | cordiformis | bitternut hickory | 17 | Semi-mature | Medium (16 to 35') | 20 | Good |  | \$6,253 |
| 26 | Carya | cordiformis | bitternut hickory | 17 | Semi-mature | Medium (16 to 35') | 20 | Good |  | \$6,253 |
| 27 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 34 | Mature | Medium (16 to 35') | 30 | Fair |  | \$21,993 |


| Tag \# | Genus | Species | Common | DBH | Age Class | Height | Canopy Radius | Condition | GTW <br> Priority | Estimated Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 28 | Carya | cordiformis | bitternut hickory | 22 | Semi-mature | Large (>35') | 20 | Fair |  | \$7,480 |
| 29 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 60 | Mature | Large (>35') | 35 | Fair |  | \$46,508 |
| 30 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 50 | Mature | Large (>35') | 30 | Good |  | \$53,783 |
| 31 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 44 | Mature | Large (>35') | 30 | Good |  | \$45,862 |
| 32 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 44 | Mature | Large (>35') | 30 | Good |  | \$45,862 |
| 33 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 50 | Mature | Large (>35') | 30 | Good |  | \$53,783 |
| 34 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 30 | Mature | Large (>35') | 25 | Good |  | \$24,666 |
| 35 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 64 | Mature | Large (>35') | 30 | Good |  | \$68,988 |
| 36 | Magnolia | grandiflora | Southern magnolia | 34 | Mature | Large (>35') | 20 | Good |  | \$29,170 |
| 37 | Magnolia | grandiflora | Southern magnolia | 27 | Semi-mature | Large (>35') | 20 | Good |  | \$18,928 |
| 38 | Pinus | taeda | loblolly pine | 18 | Semi-mature | Large (>35') | 15 | Fair | 2 Priority | \$5,341 |
| 39 | Pinus | taeda | loblolly pine | 18 | Semi-mature | Large (>35') | 15 | Fair | 2 Priority | \$5,341 |
| 40 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 31 | Mature | Large (>35') | 25 | Good |  | \$25,813 |
| 41 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 31 | Over-mature | Small (<15') | 10 | Dead |  | \$0 |
| 42 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 44 | Mature | Large (>35') | 30 | Good | 1 Priority | \$45,862 |
| 43 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 34 | Mature | Large (>35') | 25 | Good | 2 Priority | \$30,791 |
| 44 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 60 | Mature | Large (>35') | 35 | Good |  | \$65,112 |
| 45 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 38 | Mature | Large (>35') | 30 | Good | 2 Priority | \$37,100 |
| 46 | Magnolia | grandiflora | Southern magnolia | 22 | Semi-mature | Large (>35') | 20 | Good |  | \$12,567 |
| 47 | Quercus | nigra | water oak | 13 | Semi-mature | Medium (16 to 35') | 20 | Good | 1 Priority | \$3,413 |
| 48 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 13 | Semi-mature | Medium (16 to 35') | 20 | Good | 3 Priority | \$4,632 |
| 49 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 46 | Mature | Large (>35') | 30 | Good | 3 Priority | \$48,596 |
| 50 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 44 | Mature | Large (>35') | 35 | Good |  | \$45,862 |
| 51 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 48 | Over-mature | Small (<15') | 10 | Dead |  | \$0 |
| 52 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 37 | Mature | Large (>35') | 25 | Fair |  | \$25,398 |
| 53 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 58 | Mature | Large (>35') | 30 | Fair |  | \$45,024 |
| 54 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 16 | Semi-mature | Medium (16 to 35') | 15 | Good |  | \$7,016 |
| 55 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 5 | Young | Small (<15') | 10 | Good | 1 Priority | \$685 |
| 56 | Castanea | mollissima | Chinese Chestnut | 14 | Mature | Small (<15') | 15 | Good |  | \$2,544 |
| 57 | Quercus | pagoda | cherrybark oak | 24 | Semi-mature | Large (>35') | 20 | Fair |  | \$8,308 |


| Tag \# | Genus | Species | Common | DBH | Age Class | Height | Canopy Radius | Condition | GTW <br> Priority | Estimated Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 58 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 20 | Semi-mature | Medium (16 to 35') | 20 | Good |  | \$10,963 |
| 59 | Quercus | nigra | water oak | 20 | Semi-mature | Large (>35') | 20 | Good |  | \$8,078 |
| 60 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 10 | Semi-mature | Small (<15') | 15 | Good | 3 Priority | \$2,741 |
| 61 | Platanus | occidentalis | American sycamore | 12 | Semi-mature | Medium (16 to 35') | 15 | Good |  | \$2,493 |
| 62 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 8 | Semi-mature | Medium (16 to 35') | 15 | Good | 3 Priority | \$1,754 |
| 63 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 8 | Semi-mature | Medium (16 to 35') | 15 | Good | 3 Priority | \$1,754 |
| 64 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 8 | Semi-mature | Medium (16 to 35') | 15 | Good | 3 Priority | \$1,754 |
| 65 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 36 | Mature | Large (>35') | 25 | Good |  | \$33,992 |
| 66 | Carya | illinonensis | pecan | 24 | Mature | Large (>35') | 20 | Fair |  | \$9,495 |
| 67 | Pinus | taeda | loblolly pine | 24 | Mature | Large (>35') | 20 | Good |  | \$13,294 |
| 68 | Magnolia | grandiflora | Southern magnolia | 34 | Mature | Large (>35') | 20 | Good |  | \$29,170 |
| 69 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 44 | Mature | Large (>35') | 35 | Good |  | \$45,862 |
| 70 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 32 | Mature | Large (>35') | 30 | Good |  | \$27,496 |
| 71 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 30 | Mature | Large (>35') | 30 | Good |  | \$24,666 |
| 72 | Carya | illinonensis | pecan | 22 | Mature | Medium (16 to 35') | 20 | Fair |  | \$7,979 |
| 73 | Carya | illinonensis | pecan | 30 | Mature | Large (>35') | 20 | Fair |  | \$14,837 |
| 74 | Carya | illinonensis | pecan | 32 | Mature | Large (>35') | 20 | Fair |  | \$16,539 |
| 75 | Carya | illinonensis | pecan | 18 | Semi-mature | Large (>35') | 20 | Fair |  | \$5,341 |
| 76 | Carya | illinonensis | pecan | 32 | Mature | Large (>35') | 20 | Fair |  | \$16,539 |
| 77 | Carya | illinonensis | pecan | 24 | Mature | Large (>35') | 20 | Fair |  | \$9,495 |
| 78 | Carya | illinonensis | pecan | 22 | Mature | Large (>35') | 20 | Fair |  | \$7,979 |
| 79 | Juniperus | virginiana | eastern redcedar | 17 | Semi-mature | Medium (16 to 35') | 20 | Good |  | \$5,836 |
| 80 | Quercus | nigra | water oak | 14 | Semi-mature | Medium (16 to 35') | 20 | Good |  | \$3,958 |
| 81 | Magnolia | grandiflora | Southern magnolia | 24 | Mature | Large (>35') | 20 | Good |  | \$14,955 |
| 82 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 38 | Mature | Large (>35') | 30 | Fair |  | \$26,500 |
| 83 | Diospyros | virginiana | persimmon | 10 | Semi-mature | Medium (16 to 35') | 15 | Fair |  | \$1,236 |
| 84 | Prunus | communis | common pear | 5 | Semi-mature | Small (<15') | 10 | Poor |  | \$201 |
| 85 | Carya | illinonensis | pecan | 18 | Semi-mature | Large (>35') | 20 | Fair |  | \$5,341 |
| 86 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 33 | Mature | Medium (16 to 35') | 30 | Good |  | \$29,155 |


| Tag \# | Genus | Species | Common | DBH | Age Class | Height | Canopy Radius | Condition | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { GTW } \\ \text { Priority } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Estimated Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 87 | Carya | illinonensis | pecan | 18 | Semi-mature | Large ( $>35^{\prime}$ ) | 15 | Fair |  | \$5,341 |
| 88 | Prunus | communis | common pear | 10 | Mature | Small (<15') | 10 | Poor |  | \$804 |
| 89 | Prunus | communis | common pear | 10 | Mature | Small (<15') | 10 | Poor |  | \$804 |
| 90 | Carya | illinonensis | pecan | 24 | Mature | Large (>35') | 20 | Fair |  | \$9,495 |
| 91 | Carya | illinonensis | pecan | 25 | Mature | Large (>35') | 20 | Fair |  | \$10,303 |
| 92 | Carya | illinonensis | pecan | 24 | Mature | Large (>35') | 20 | Fair |  | \$9,495 |
| 93 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 10 | Semi-mature | Small (<15') | 15 | Good | 3 Priority | \$2,741 |
| 94 | Juniperus | virginiana | eastern redcedar | 26 | Mature | Medium (16 to 35') | 20 | Good |  | \$13,651 |
| 95 | Juniperus | virginiana | eastern redcedar | 25 | Mature | Medium (16 to 35') | 20 | Good |  | \$12,621 |
| 96 | Juniperus | virginiana | eastern redcedar | 30 | Mature | Medium (16 to 35') | 20 | Good |  | \$18,175 |
| 97 | Juniperus | virginiana | eastern redcedar | 32 | Mature | Medium (16 to 35') | 20 | Good |  | \$20,260 |
| 98 | Juniperus | virginiana | eastern redcedar | 26 | Mature | Medium (16 to 35') | 20 | Good |  | \$13,651 |
| 99 | Juniperus | virginiana | eastern redcedar | 25 | Mature | Medium (16 to 35') | 20 | Fair |  | \$9,015 |
| 100 | Juniperus | virginiana | eastern redcedar | 24 | Mature | Medium (16 to 35') | 20 | Good |  | \$11,632 |
| 101 | Juniperus | virginiana | eastern redcedar | 26 | Mature | Medium (16 to 35') | 20 | Good |  | \$13,651 |
| 102 | Juniperus | virginiana | eastern redcedar | 24 | Mature | Medium (16 to 35') | 20 | Good |  | \$11,632 |
| 103 | Juniperus | virginiana | eastern redcedar | 28 | Mature | Medium (16 to 35') | 20 | Good |  | \$15,832 |
| 104 | Magnolia | grandiflora | Southern magnolia | 28 | Mature | Medium (16 to 35') | 25 | Good |  | \$20,356 |
| 105 | Carya | illinonensis | pecan | 30 | Mature | Large (>35') | 20 | Fair |  | \$14,837 |
| 106 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 16 | Semi-mature | Medium (16 to 35') | 15 | Good |  | \$7,016 |
| 107 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 15 | Semi-mature | Medium (16 to 35') | 15 | Good |  | \$6,166 |
| 108 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 16 | Semi-mature | Medium (16 to 35') | 15 | Good |  | \$7,016 |
| 109 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 18 | Semi-mature | Medium (16 to 35') | 15 | Good |  | \$8,880 |
| 110 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 16 | Semi-mature | Medium (16 to 35') | 15 | Good |  | \$7,016 |
| 111 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 16 | Semi-mature | Medium (16 to 35') | 15 | Good |  | \$7,016 |
| 112 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 13 | Semi-mature | Medium (16 to 35') | 15 | Good |  | \$4,632 |
| 113 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 8 | Semi-mature | Medium (16 to 35') | 15 | Good | 3 Priority | \$1,754 |
| 114 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 6 | Semi-mature | Small (<15') | 10 | Good | 3 Priority | \$987 |
| 115 | Juniperus | virginiana | eastern redcedar | 40 | Mature | Medium (16 to 35') | 25 | Good | 1 Priority | \$29,558 |
| 116 | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 48 | Mature | Large (>35') | 35 | Fair |  | \$36,597 |


| Tag\# | Genus | Species | Common | DBH | Age Class | Height | Canopy <br> Radius | Condition | GTW <br> Priority | Estimated <br> Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 1 7}$ | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 50 | Mature | Large $\left(>35^{\prime}\right)$ | 35 | Good |  | $\$ 53,783$ |
| $\mathbf{1 1 8}$ | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 37 | Mature | Large $\left(>35^{\prime}\right)$ | 25 | Good |  | $\$ 35,558$ |
| $\mathbf{1 1 9}$ | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 8 | Semi-mature | Medium ( $\left(16\right.$ to $\left.35^{\prime}\right)$ | 15 | Good |  | $\$ 1,754$ |
| $\mathbf{1 2 0}$ | Betula | nigra | river birch | 12 | Semi-mature | Medium ( 16 to $\left.35^{\prime}\right)$ | 15 | Good |  | $\$ 3,323$ |
| $\mathbf{1 2 1}$ | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 46 | Mature | Large $\left(>35^{\prime}\right)$ | 35 | Fair |  | $\$ 34,712$ |
| $\mathbf{1 2 2}$ | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 44 | Mature | Large $\left(>35^{\prime}\right)$ | 30 | Fair |  | $\$ 32,759$ |
| $\mathbf{1 2 3}$ | Magnolia | grandiflora | Southern magnolia | 22 | Mature | Large $\left(>35^{\prime}\right)$ | 20 | Fair | 1 Priority | $\$ 8,976$ |
| $\mathbf{1 2 4}$ | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 36 | Mature | Large $\left(>35^{\prime}\right)$ | 25 | Fair |  | $\$ 24,280$ |
| $\mathbf{1 2 5}$ | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 28 | Mature | Large $\left(>35^{\prime}\right)$ | 25 | Good |  | $\$ 21,487$ |
| $\mathbf{1 2 6}$ | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 36 | Mature | Large $\left(>35^{\prime}\right)$ | 25 | Good |  | $\$ 33,992$ |
| $\mathbf{1 2 7}$ | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 34 | Mature | Large $\left(>35^{\prime}\right)$ | 30 | Good |  | $\$ 30,791$ |
| $\mathbf{1 2 8}$ | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 34 | Mature | Large $\left(>35^{\prime}\right)$ | 35 | Good |  | $\$ 30,791$ |
| $\mathbf{1 2 9}$ | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 40 | Mature | Large $\left(>35^{\prime}\right)$ | 35 | Good |  | $\$ 40,114$ |
| $\mathbf{1 3 0}$ | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 44 | Mature | Large $\left(>35^{\prime}\right)$ | 35 | Good |  | $\$ 45,862$ |
| $\mathbf{1 3 1}$ | Pinus | taeda | loblolly pine | 30 | Mature | Large $\left(>35^{\prime}\right)$ | 20 | Good |  | $\$ 20,771$ |
| $\mathbf{1 3 2}$ | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 44 | Mature | Large $\left(>35^{\prime}\right)$ | 30 | Good |  | $\$ 45,862$ |
| $\mathbf{1 3 3}$ | Quercus | virginiana | live oak | 44 | Mature | Large $\left(>35^{\prime}\right)$ | 30 | Good |  | $\$ 45,862$ |

## LIST OF APPENDED ITEMS

## Technical Reports

ANSI A300 (Part 1) - 2008 Pruning
Maintenance Pruning Program
Monitor IPM Program
Mulch Application Guidelines
Root Collar Disorders
Tree Structure Evaluation

Glossary

