



ATTACHMENT

1

Lisa Cleveland <lisa005@gmail.com>

FW: Ravenswood Manor Park - tree pruning assessment

1 message

Peter Schlossman <pschlossman@lshchicago.com>
To: "stewardship@homerpark.org" <stewardship@homerpark.org>

Fri, May 18, 2012 at 1:08 PM

FYI -Peter

From: Scott, Jerome [mailto:jerome.scott@ChicagoParkDistrict.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 16, 2012 2:23 PM
To: Peter Schlossman
Cc: hicks.th@comcast.net; Schwerner, Adam
Subject: RE: Ravenswood Manor Park - tree pruning assessment

Dear Mr. Schlossman:

I share your hopes about quality pruning in the future for all Chicago Park District trees. Thank you for sending along Ms. Hicks's very detailed observations of the work our crew did at Ravenswood Manor Park (referenced hereafter as "the report").

There are several matters I would like to clarify briefly. The report notes several issues of poor pruning including 1) possible improper tool use, 2) removal of limbs larger than 50% of the tree diameter (which is a difficult wound to respond to, if you are the tree in question), and 3) a lack of crown thinning. The report includes more issues but I would like to respond to these three.

1. While the observation that the chainsaw cut left a jagged edge is accurate I disagree with the report and feel that the tree can and will respond to that wound as readily as if the cut were more precise. This is not a cavalier dismissal of the general issue of proper pruning cuts but an observation that this damage is more aesthetic than botanical. Please understand that the chainsaw needs to be in our pruning tool kit.
2. The removal of larger limbs, as the report notes, must be done with "great discretion." Implied in that comment is that such discretion was lacking in this case, something I wish I could contradict. I cannot. We are in a long-term training/protocol process to bring that level of discretion to our forestry staff but it seems to have been lacking here. Had this been just one cut (and not 10 plus cuts) I might have defended the tree trimmer as some such cuts need to be made (most commonly following weather or vehicle damage).
3. The thinning of the crown that the report recommends is standard arboriculture, desirable, and currently outside our general work protocols due to resource issues. We love it when our crews have the time to do this level of work (or our volunteers beat us to it) but we cannot incorporate this level of work into our systems right now.

I do not believe that the recent work is a death sentence for the trees involved. The trees will respond (albeit not completely) to the wounds and will continue to provide services for the park for many years. I've attached a mid-range shot of the trees in question, with the wounds too small to see and the overgrown crowns too far to assess.

Sincerely,

Jerome Scott

District Forester, Chicago Park District