File No. 220813 **Committee Item No.** 4
Board Item No. 29

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Land Use and Transportation Committee **Date** September 19, 2022

Board of Supervisors Meeting **Date** September 27, 2022

Cmte	Board	
☐	☐	**Motion**
☐	☐	**Resolution**
☒	X	**Ordinance**
☐	☐	**Legislative Digest**
☐	☐	**Budget and Legislative Analyst Report**
☐	☐	**Youth Commission Report**
☐	☐	**Introduction Form**
☐	☐	**Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report**
☐	☐	**MOU**
☐	☐	**Grant Information Form**
☐	☐	**Grant Budget**
☐	☐	**Subcontract Budget**
☐	☐	**Contract/Agreement**
☐	☐	**Form 126 – Ethics Commission**
☐	☐	**Award Letter**
☐	☐	**Application**
☐	☐	**Public Correspondence**
OTHER		**(Use back side if additional space is needed)**
☒	X	COB Memo 040722
☒	X	DOE Memo 121421 & UFC Reso No. 008-21-UFC
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	

Completed by: Erica Major **Date** September 15, 2022
Completed by: Erica Major **Date**

[Landmark Tree Designation - Cork Oak - 20th Street at Noe Street]

Ordinance designating the cork oak (Quercus suber) tree located at the public right-of-way on 20th Street at Noe Street as a landmark tree pursuant to the Public Works Code; making findings supporting the designation; and directing official acts in furtherance of the designation.

NOTE: **Unchanged Code text and uncodified text** are in plain Arial font.
Additions to Codes are in *single-underline italics Times New Roman font*.
Deletions to Codes are in ~~*strikethrough italics Times New Roman font*~~.
Board amendment additions are in double-underlined Arial font.
Board amendment deletions are in ~~strikethrough Arial font~~.
Asterisks (* * * *) indicate the omission of unchanged Code subsections or parts of tables.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Background and Findings.

(a) Public Works Code Section 810 establishes a procedure for the nomination, designation, and removal of landmark trees.

(b) The Board of Supervisors adopted landmark tree designation criteria in Resolution No. 440-06, codified in Public Works Code Section 810(f)(4), and subsequently amended the criteria in Resolution No. 63-09. Copies of these Resolutions are on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 100880, and are incorporated herein by reference.

(c) On October 4, 2021, the Interim Director of the Department of Public Works nominated the cork oak (Quercus suber) tree located at the public right-of-way on 20th Street at Noe Street for landmark status.

(d) The Urban Forestry Council examined the subject tree based on the adopted landmark tree designation criteria, including the tree's (1) rarity, (2) physical attributes, (3)

environmental benefits, and (4) cultural value. Based on these designation criteria, the Urban Forestry Council determined that the subject tree qualified as a landmark tree, and on December 10, 2021 adopted a resolution, Resolution File No. 2021-08-UFC, reflecting this determination. This resolution is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 220813, and is incorporated herein by reference. The Board adopts these findings as its own.

Section 2. Landmark Tree Designation. Based on the above-mentioned findings, the Board of Supervisors designates the cork oak (Quercus suber) tree located at the public right-of-way on 20th Street at Noe Street, as a landmark tree.

Section 3. Recording the Landmark Tree Designation. The Board of Supervisors directs the Department of Public Works to record the landmark designation of this tree located at the public right-of-way on 20th Street at Noe Street, and list the tree in the Department's Official Book of Landmark Trees.

Section 4. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after enactment. Enactment occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the ordinance unsigned or does not sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board of Supervisors overrides the Mayor's veto of the ordinance.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
DAVID CHIU, City Attorney

By: /s/ Christina Fletes-Romo
CHRISTINA FLETES-ROMO
Deputy City Attorney

n:\legana\as2022\2300004\01613755.docx

SF Environment
Our home. Our city. Our planet.
A Department of the City and County of San Francisco

London N. Breed
Mayor

Deborah O. Raphael
Director

December 14, 2021

Ms. Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

RE: San Francisco Urban Forestry Council vote to inform the Board of Supervisors that the Cork Oak *(Quercus suber)*, located on 20th Street at Noe Street meets the criteria for landmark tree status.

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

On October 4, 2021, the Urban Forestry Council received a Landmark Tree nomination from Carla Short, Interim Director of Public Works, for a cork oak (*Quercus suber*), located in the public right-of-way on 20th Street at Noe Street.

At their meeting on December 10, 2021, the Urban Forestry Council found that the tree meets the criteria for landmark tree status. The Council found that the cork oak (*Quercus suber*), in the public right-of-way on 20th Street at Noe Street meets the criteria for landmark status and approved Resolution File No. 2021-08-UFC. (Ayes: Vice Chair Crawford, Members Keller, Vaisset-Fauvel, Lacan, Polony, Xochitl Flores, Spigelman, Mike Sullivan, Potter, Nagle, Stringer, and Trang; Noes: None; Absent: Chair Sullivan, Hernandez-Gomez)

This letter and the enclosed materials from the December 10, 2021, Urban Forestry Council Meeting serve as written findings and nomination recommendations from the Urban Forestry Council.

If you have any questions, or would like additional information, I can be reached at 415-355-3733 or by email at peter.brastow@sfgov.org.

Sincerely,

Peter Brastow
Urban Forestry Council Coordinator

Enclosure:
Urban Forestry Council Hearing Explanatory Documents

[Resolution endorsing the cork oak (*Quercus suber)* tree at the 19th Street steps at Noe Street for landmark tree status]

Resolution endorsing the cork oak (*Quercus suber*) tree at the 19th Street steps at Noe Street (in the public right-of-way) for Landmark Status, pursuant to Public Works Code Section 810(b).

WHEREAS, Public Works Code, Article 16, Section 810 charges the Urban Forestry Council to evaluate nominated landmark trees using criteria approved by the Board of Supervisors; and,

WHEREAS, the cork (*Quercus suber*) tree at the 19th Street steps at Noe Street fulfills the Landmark Tree criteria developed by the Urban Forestry Council, including its physical attributes, environmental benefits, and cultural value; and,

WHEREAS, this tree provides social, environmental, and economic benefits to the property, neighborhood, and city; now, therefore be it,

RESOLVED, that the San Francisco Urban Forestry Council recommends this tree for landmark status to the Board of Supervisors and urges the Board of Supervisors to protect this tree as a landmark tree.

I hereby certify that this resolution was adopted at the Urban Forestry Council's regular meeting on December 10, 2021.

Peter Brastow, Urban Forestry Coordinator Andrew Sullivan, Council Chair

Vote: 12-0

Ayes:	Vice Chair Crawford, Member Vaisset-Fauvel, Member Lacan, Member Polony, Member Nagle, Member Xochitl-Flores, Member Sullivan, Member Stringer, Member Spigelman, Member Potter, Member Trang, Member Keller
Noes:	None
Absent:	Member Hernandez-Gomez, Chair Sullivan

SF Environment
Our home. Our city. Our planet.
A Department of the City and County of San Francisco

London N. Breed
Mayor

Deborah O. Raphael
Director

Urban Forestry Council Landmark Tree Committee Report

Submitted by Landmark Tree Committee Chair, Mike Sullivan on December 10, 2021

Committee members present at the November 04, 2021, Landmark Tree Ad Hoc Committee meeting: Damon Spigelman, Pam Nagle, Morgan Vaisset-Fauvel and Michael Sullivan

Address of nominated tree: 20th Street at Noe Street along the staircase in the public ROW.
Common name: Cork oak
Scientific name: *Quercus suber*

Summary

The Landmark Tree Committee recommends that the Urban Forestry Council approve this nomination and make the determination that this tree qualifies for landmark tree status. The nomination was supported by a vote of 4-0. The Committee supported this nomination based on the tree's physical attributes, environmental benefits and cultural and neighborhood value. The report below summarizes the Committee's discussion and criteria used in its decision.

Rarity

The tree is not particularly rare in San Francisco, but the size combined with the superior form and health is rare.

Physical Attributes

The characteristics that committee members stressed were the large size of the cork oak (its spreading crown), that it could be the largest in the city, its age, its aesthetically and structurally sound form, and its overall vigor and health.

Historical

The community reports that "the cork oak tree has been integral to the 20th Street/Hartford Street neighborhood and was witness to nearby community events for nearly 75 years."

Environmental

The community has identified numerous birds including ruby throated hummingbird, white crown sparrow, chestnut-backed chickadee, dark-eyed junco, barn owl, American robin, as well as blue belly lizard (western fence lizard).

Cultural

The local community submitted a petition with 50 signatures in support of recommending the tree for Landmark status. The tree anchors a well-established ornamental garden that is tended by the neighborhood.

City and County of San Francisco
Department of the Environment
Urban Forestry Council

MEETING MINUTES DRAFT

Friday, December 10, 2021, 8:30 a.m.
Remote meeting via web conference

Refer to the "Remote Access to Information and Participation" section below for instructions.

Council Members: Andrew Sullivan (Chair), Nicholas Crawford (Vice Chair, San Francisco Public Works), Jillian Keller, Morgan Vaisset-Fauvel, Igor Lacan, Ildiko Polony, Pamela Nagle, Edgar Xochitl Flores, Mike Sullivan, Damon Spigelman (San Francisco Public Utilities Commission), Oscar Hernandez-Gomez (San Francisco Planning Department), Tai Trang (Port of San Francisco), Spencer Potter (Recreation and Parks Department), and Lew Stringer (Presidio Trust)

Order of Business
Public comment will be taken before the Council takes action on any item.

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call.**

Present: Vice Chair Crawford, Member Keller, Member Vaisset-Fauvel, Member Lacan, Member Polony, Member Nagle, Member Xochitl-Flores, Member Sullivan, Member Stringer, Member Spigelman, Member Potter, Member Trang
Excused: Chair Sullivan
Absent: Member Hernandez-Gomez

2. **Chair's Welcome and Land Acknowledgement.** (Discussion)

   No Public Comment

3. **Review and vote on whether to approve Resolution File 2021-04-UFC, Resolution Making Findings to Allow Teleconferenced Meetings Under California Government Code Section 54953(e)**. Speaker: Peter Brastow, Urban Forestry Council Coordinator (Explanatory Document: Resolution File 2021-04-UFC) (Discussion and Action) The Council will consider adoption of a resolution making findings that newly enacted Government Code Section 54953(e) requires in order to allow the Council to hold meetings remotely, as currently required under local law, without complying with infeasible Brown Act requirements.

   Upon a motion from Member Lacan and seconded by Member Nagle, the resolution was approved.

   There was no public comment.

(Ayes: Member Keller, Vice Chair Crawford, Member Vaisset-Fauvel, Member Lacan, Member Polony, Member Nagle, Member Xochitl-Flores, Member Sullivan, Member Stringer, Member Spigelman, Member Potter; Excused: Chair Sullivan, Member Trang; Absent: Member Hernandez-Gomez)

4. **Adoption of Minutes of the October 26, 2021, Urban Forestry Council Regular Meeting.** (Explanatory Document: October 26, 2021, Draft Minutes) (Discussion and Possible Action)

   Upon a motion from Vice Chair Crawford and seconded by Member Sullivan, the minutes were approved unanimously.

   There was no public comment.

   (Ayes: Member Keller, Vice Chair Crawford, Member Vaisset-Fauvel, Member Lacan, Member Polony, Member Nagle, Member Xochitl-Flores, Member Sullivan, Member Stringer, Member Spigelman, Member Potter; Excused: Chair Sullivan, Member Trang; Absent: Member Hernandez-Gomez)

5. **General Public Comment**: Members of the public may address the Council on matters that are within the Council's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda.

   There was no public comment.

6. **Review and vote on approving the 2021 Annual Urban Forest Report.** Speaker: Peter Brastow, San Francisco Environment Urban Forestry Council Coordinator (Explanatory Document: Draft 2021 Annual Urban Forest Report) (Discussion and Possible Action)

   Vice Chair Crawford explained that Public Works had not yet submitted their data, in part, due to losing responsible staff. He suggested continuing the item to the January meeting of the Council.

   Member Trang joined the meeting late due to technical difficulties.

   Upon a motion by Vice Chair Crawford and a second by Member Polony, the Council voted unanimously to continue the item to the January meeting.

   (Ayes: Member Keller, Vice Chair Crawford, Member Vaisset-Fauvel, Member Lacan, Member Polony, Member Nagle, Member Xochitl-Flores, Member Sullivan, Member Stringer, Member Spigelman, Member Potter, Member Trang; Excused: Chair Sullivan; Absent: Member Hernandez-Gomez)

   There was no public comment.

7. **Review and vote on approval of Resolution File 2021-05-UFC commending Matthew Stephen's service to the Urban Forestry Council.** (Explanatory Document: Draft Resolution 2021-05-UFC) (Discussion and Possible Action)

   Vice Chair Crawford read the resolution and added his appreciation of Matthew Stephen's insights on technology and tools.

Matthew Stephens expressed his appreciation for his time on the Council, and expressed confidence in his successor, Spencer Potter, for his new role on the Council.

The resolution was approved unanimously.

(Ayes: Member Keller, Vice Chair Crawford, Member Vaisset-Fauvel, Member Lacan, Member Polony, Member Nagle, Member Xochitl-Flores, Member Sullivan, Member Stringer, Member Spigelman, Member Potter; Excused: Chair Sullivan, Member Trang; Absent: Member Hernandez-Gomez)

There was no public comment.

8. **Review and vote on approval of Resolution File 2021-06-UFC commending Blake Troxel's service to the Urban Forestry Council.** (Explanatory Document: Draft Resolution 2021-06-UFC) (Discussion and Possible Action)

Vice Chair Crawford read the resolution.
Member Nagle emphasized Blake's thoughtful and analytical contributions and expressed.
Member Sullivan discussed how Blake always brought great new content to working group meetings.
Member Stringer discussed Blake's innovation and collaboration at the Presidio Trust.
Member Vaisset-Fauvel seconded the "force of nature" description.
Vice Chair Crawford said that Blake's fan club is probably growing to more parts of the country and wished him well.

The resolution was approved unanimously.

(Ayes: Member Keller, Vice Chair Crawford, Member Vaisset-Fauvel, Member Lacan, Member Polony, Member Nagle, Member Xochitl-Flores, Member Sullivan, Member Stringer, Member Spigelman, Member Potter, Member Trang; Excused: Chair Sullivan; Absent: Member Hernandez-Gomez)

There was no public comment.

9. **Discussion and vote on approval of Resolution File 2021-07-UFC in support of San Francisco's 2021 Climate Action Plan.** Speaker: Ildiko Polony, Urban Forestry Council Member (Explanatory Document: Draft Resolution 2021-07-UFC SF Climate Action Plan) (Discussion and Action)

Member Polony introduced the resolution by discussing the 2021 San Francisco Climate Action Plan, its purpose and process and the relationship between the resolution and society's response to climate change. She discussed the UFC's role in climate action, including how the UFC's strategic plan goals area reflected in the Healthy Ecosystems Chapter.

Member Polony proceeded to read the resolution.

Member Sullivan, who is also a member of the Commission on the Environment, discussed his support for the Climate Action Plan and the resolution supporting it.

Member Vaisset-Fauvel discussed his concern that planting trees is not going to save the climate. He said that it will help us suffer less.

Member Xochitl discussed his support for the resolution and pushing in the direction of policy change.

Member Stringer discussed his support for the resolution and the plan's language around biodiversity and the balance that it strikes between mitigation and local social and ecological health.

Member Potter discussed and expressed his gratitude for Peter Brastow's work in his role as the Biodiversity Coordinator for getting the Healthy Ecosystems Chapter in place. Member Potter also discussed wanting to acknowledge tensions in the implementation of the plan and mentioned the gas-powered equipment bans as an example as it relates to executing urban forestry.

Member Lacan discussed his concern that trees are in the Healthy Ecosystems Chapter.

Member Vaisset-Fauvel had to leave the meeting.

Public Comment: Marie Dunsmore from District 8 discussed the Climate Action Plan and her support and also her concern about the community paying the capital costs of sidewalk landscaping and also the reality on the ground of trees dying and being removed.

The resolution was approved unanimously.

(Ayes: Member Keller, Vice Chair Crawford, Member Vaisset-Fauvel, Member Lacan, Member Polony, Member Nagle, Member Xochitl-Flores, Member Sullivan, Member Stringer, Member Spigelman, Member Potter, Member Trang; Excused: Chair Sullivan; Absent: Member Hernandez-Gomez)

10. **Hearing on nomination for Landmark Tree Status of the Cork Oak (*Quercus suber*), located on 20th Street at Noe Street, San Francisco, CA 94114.** The Council will hold a hearing to determine whether the tree nominated at the above location meets the criteria for designation as a landmark tree to forward findings to the Board of Supervisors. (Explanatory Documents: Resolution File No. 2021-08-UFC, Nomination Form, Sullivan Evaluation, Nagle Evaluation, Keller Evaluation, Spigelman Evaluation, Vaisset-Fauvel Evaluation, Landmark Tree Committee Report.) (Discussion and Action)

Peter Brastow introduced the item and Member Sullivan (Chair of the Landmark Tree Committee) reported on the unanimity on support for the tree at the Committee.

Vice Chair Crawford reminded the Council of the role of Landmark Trees and how trees in the public right-of-way are great candidates since they are visible to the public and not otherwise affecting anyone's private property rights.

Member Lacan moved to approve and seconded by Member Sullivan.

Public Comment: Dave Dea, the lead gardener at the tree's garden, discussed the beauty of the tree and that it is an anchor plant for the whole garden.

The resolution passed unanimously.

(Ayes: Member Keller, Vice Chair Crawford, Member Lacan, Member Polony, Member Nagle, Member Xochitl-Flores, Member Sullivan, Member Stringer, Member Spigelman, Member Potter,

Member Trang; Excused: Chair Sullivan, Member Vaisset-Fauvel; Absent: Member Hernandez-Gomez)

11. Committee Reports: (Discussion)
Planning & Funding Committee. Igor Lacan, Committee Chair.
Landmark Tree Ad Hoc Committee. Mike Sullivan, Committee Chair.

Committee Chair Lacan reported on Brian Quinn's presentation regarding cost-sharing opportunity for LiDAR data flight.
Committee Chair Sullivan discussed that in addition to the cork oak, a couple more Landmark Tree nominations have come in that may be agendized for January 6th committee meeting.

Public comment: Marie Dunsmore, an electrical engineer, discussed that LiDAR can be used to differentiate among tree types. Spectral type LiDAR data can do an even better job of tree identification (90% vs. 60%)

12. Staff Report. Peter Brastow, Urban Forestry Coordinator, San Francisco Department of the Environment (Discussion)

Peter Brastow discussed a meeting with Supervisor Chan's office re landmarking the McAllister buckeye. Peter discussed the coast live oak missing tree data being completed by an SF Environment intern. He discussed that the process of getting major developments before the UFC has not made any progress, and that the UFC has not had the Strategic Plan on the agenda for a while.

There was no public comment.

13. Urban Forestry Council Member Announcements. (Discussion)

Vice Chair Crawford discussed that CalTrans is supporting the street tree nursery at 5th and Harrison, that they will be putting that in writing by the end of 2021.
He also discussed that during a recent Board of Supervisors meeting, a commenter reminded the Board about the role of the UFC regarding supporting the Board with information and expertise.

There was no public comment.

14. New Business/Future Agenda Items. (Discussion and Possible Action)

Peter Brastow discussed mention of the street tree nursery; the City of LA forester; the Cal Academy study of landscape plants.
Vice Chair Crawford discussed deferring to Chair Sullivan and that we have a lighter agenda at the next meeting to be able to spend time on the annual report. Peter Brastow mentioned that the nominated Landmark trees may be on the January agenda as well.

There was no public comment.

15. Adjournment.

The next meeting of the Urban Forestry Council is scheduled for Friday, January 28, 2022, at 8:30 a.m. In compliance with the San Francisco Health Officer's Order No. C19-07c, directing all individuals to "shelter in place", Public meetings, panels and other advisory bodies will continue on a remote

conferencing basis only. Find out about upcoming deadlines, public hearings, and meetings. Search the SFEnvironronment.org website archived minutes and agenda.

Remote Access to Information and Participation

This meeting will be held remotely using video conferencing, through the WebEx Meetings platform, and by telephone for members of the public who are unable to attend using computers or smart devices.

Attending the Meeting: Watch or Listen

Members of the public have the following options for attending the meeting:

Option 1: Watch the meeting using a computer or smart device by clicking on the following link:

https://ccsf.webex.com/ccsf/onstage/g.php?MTID=e8e30f0aba317f6ba1439f9237f5f06d4

- If you are able to and would like to watch via your computer, please follow these instructions: i) Click on the link above; ii) Enter your first name, last name, and email address if desired; iii) Click "Join by Browser" (directly beneath the "Join Now" button);
- If you are able to watch via your smart mobile device: i) Download the Webex Meetings application; ii) Click on the link above; iii) Click "Join"; iv) Enter your name and email; v) Click "Ready to Join".

Option 2: Join the meeting by phone if you do not have access to a computer or smart device.
Dial: **415-655-0001** and then enter the Access Code: **2492 221 4696**

Participating During Public Comment

Members of the public will have opportunities to participate during public comment. The public is asked to wait for the particular agenda item before making a comment on that item. Comments will be addressed in the order they are received. When the moderator announces that the Committee is taking public comment, members of the public can:

Participate over the phone by pressing *3 (this step is very important, as it will activate the "Raise Hand" icon in the Participant window).

Depending on the number of people also in line ahead of you, you may have to wait before it is your opportunity to speak. When it is your turn, you will be notified that your line has been unmuted, and it will be your opportunity to speak. Your line will be muted again when your allotted time expires.

In accordance with Governor Gavin Newsom's statewide order for all residents to "Stay at Home" - and the numerous local and state proclamations, orders and supplemental directions - aggressive directives have been issued to slow down and reduce the spread of the COVID-19 virus. Copies of explanatory documents are available, 1) on the Urban Forestry Council webpage https://sfenvironment.org/about/taskforce/urban-forestry-council; or (2) upon request to the Urban Forestry Coordinator, at telephone number 415-355-3733, or via e-mail at peter.brastow@sfgov.org.

Important Information

The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices.

Public Comment

At this time, members of the public may address the Committee on items of interest that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Committee but are not on today's agenda, including to request items they may wish to be on a future agenda. Public comment will be taken following each agendized item. Each member of the public may address the Committee for up to three minutes, unless otherwise announced by the Chair. If it is demonstrated that the comments by the public will exceed 15 minutes, the Chair may continue Public Comment to another time during the meeting.

NOTE: Persons unable to attend the meeting may submit to the Committee, by the time the proceedings begin, written comments regarding the agenda items above. These comments will be made a part of the official public record and shall be brought to the attention of Committee Members. Any written comments should be sent to: Commission Affairs Manager, Department of the Environment, peter.brastow@sfgov.org, by 5:00 p.m. on the day prior to the hearing. Written public comment received by the Council will be posted as an attachment to the minutes.

The Brown Act forbids the Committee from taking action or discussing any item or issue not appearing on the posted agenda. This rule applies to issues raised in public comment as well. In response to public comment, not on an agendized item, the Committee is limited to:
1. Briefly responding to statements made or questions posed by members of the public, or
2. Request staff to report back on a matter at a subsequent meeting, or
3. Directing staff to place the item or issue on a future agenda (Government Code Section 54954.2(a).)

Disability Access

The Urban Forestry Council meetings will be held virtually. The Committee meeting rooms are closed.

The following services are available on request 48 hours prior to the meeting; except for Monday meetings, for which the deadline shall be 4:00 p.m. of the last business day of the preceding week: For American sign language interpreters or the use of a reader during a meeting, a sound enhancement system, and/or alternative formats of the agenda and minutes, please contact the Department of Environment at (415) 355-3733 or peter.brastow@sfgov.org to make arrangements for the accommodation. Late requests will be honored, if possible.

In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical-based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals. Individuals with chemical sensitivity or related disabilities should call the Mayor's Office on Disability at (415) 554-6789 or (415) 554-6799 (TTY) for additional information.

Language Access

Per the Language Access Ordinance (Chapter 91 of the San Francisco Administrative Code), Chinese, Spanish and or Filipino (Tagalog) interpreters will be available upon requests. Meeting Minutes may be translated, if requested, after they have been adopted by the Commission. Assistance in additional languages may be honored whenever possible. To request assistance with these services please contact the Commission Affairs Manager at 415-355-3700 or peter.brastow@sfgov.org, at least 48 hours in advance of the hearing. Late requests will be honored if possible.

語言服務

根據語言服務條例(三藩市行政法典第91章)，中文、西班牙語和/或菲律賓語（泰加洛語）傳譯人員在收到要求後將會提供傳譯服務。翻譯版本的會議記錄可在委員會通過後透過要求而提供。其他語言協助在可能的情況下也將可提供。上述的要求

，請於會議前最少48小時致電 415-355-3709或電郵至 peter.brastow@sfgov.org 向委員會秘書提出。逾期提出的請求，若可能的話，亦會被考慮接納。

Acceso A Idioma

De acuerdo con la Ordenanza de Acceso a Idiomas "Language Access Ordinance" (Capítulo 91 del Código Administrativo de San Francisco "Chapter 91 of the San Francisco Administrative Code") intérpretes de chino, español y/o filipino (tagalo) estarán disponibles de ser requeridos. Las minutas podrán ser traducidas, de ser requeridas, luego de ser aprobadas por la Comisión. La asistencia en idiomas adicionales se tomará en cuenta siempre que sea posible. Para solicitar asistencia con estos servicios favor comunicarse con el Secretario de la Comisión al 415-355-3733, o peter.brastow@sfgov.org por lo menos 48 horas antes de la reunión. Las solicitudes tardías serán consideradas de ser posible.

Access Sa Wika

Ayon sa Language Access Ordinance (Chapter 91 ng San Francisco Administrative Code), maaaring mag-request ng mga tagapagsalin sa wikang Tsino, Espanyol, at/o Filipino (Tagalog). Kapag hiniling, ang mga kaganapan ng miting ay maaring isalin sa ibang wika matapos ito ay aprobahan ng komisyon. Maari din magkaroon ng tulong sa ibang wika. Sa mga ganitong uri ng kahilingan, mangyaring tumawag sa Clerk ng Commission sa 415-355-3733, o peter.brastow@sfgov.org sa hindi bababa sa 48 oras bago mag miting. Kung maari, ang mga late na hiling ay posibleng pagbibigyan.

Know Your Rights Under the Sunshine Ordinance
(Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code)

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils, and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, City Hall, Room 244, One Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102-4683 at Phone No.: (415) 554-7724; Fax No.: (415) 554-5163; E-mail: sotf@sfgov.org. Copies of the Sunshine Ordinance can be obtained from the Clerk of the Sunshine Task Force, the San Francisco Public Library and on the City's website at www.sfgov.org.

Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Requirements

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance [SF Campaign & Governmental Conduct Code §2.100, et. seq] to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the Ethics Commission at: 25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 220, San Francisco, CA 94102; telephone (415) 252-3100, fax (415) 252-3112; web site at www.sfgov.org/ethics.

Peter Brastow, Healthy Ecosystems, Biodiversity and Urban Forestry Coordinator
TEL: (415) 355-3733; FAX: 415-554-6393

Posted: December 6, 2021

SAN FRANCISCO URBAN FORESTRY COUNCIL

Landmark Tree Nomination Form

Disclaimer: Any information you include on this form will be part of the public record. Anyone may request to see the information you submit for a landmark tree nomination. For more legal information, see the last page of this form.

Who can nominate a landmark tree?

- The Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission, and Historic Preservation Commission may nominate a tree through the adoption of a resolution.
- The head of a City department or agency may nominate a tree on property under their jurisdiction. City departments and agencies should conduct an internal approval process before nominating a tree.
- A property owner may nominate a tree on his or her property.
- A member of the public may ask an authorized nominator to nominate a tree.

Please note that a permit will be required for removal of a landmark tree.

Pursuant to Ordinance 0017-06 and Public Works Code Article 16, Section 810, the Urban Forestry Council requests the following information.

I am one of the following authorized nominators (please check one):

- ☐ Property owner
- ☐ Board of Supervisors (through adopted resolution)
- ☒ Head of a city department or agency
- ☐ Planning Commission (through adopted resolution)
- ☐ Historic Preservation Commission (through adopted resolution)

Authorized nominator (Sponsoring Supervisor, Planning Commission designee, Historic Preservation Commission designee, Head of City Department, property owner):

Name	Carla Short
Department	San Francisco Public Works
Email	carla.short@sfdpw.org
Phone	628-271-3078

Member of the public who initiated nomination (if applicable):

Name	
Address	
Email	
Phone	

I am an authorized nominator or designee and I support this nomination.

Carla Short

Signature

10/4/21

Date

I am the property owner and I grant permission for city staff to evaluate the nominated tree on the property with advance notice.

Signature

Date

The Urban Forestry Council will use the following criteria to evaluate each potential landmark tree. If you need more space to describe the tree, please attach additional sheets.

TREE DESCRIPTION

Botanical name	*Quercus suber*
Common name	Cork Oak
Number of trees	1
Street address	*20th St at Noe in upper portion of garden*

Location of Tree: ☐ Front yard ☐ Rear yard ☐ Side yard ☐ Corner-side yard
☒ Public right-of-way ☐ Public lands ☐ Not sure
☐ Other: _____

If the tree which extends beyond multiple properties:

Which part of the tree does so?
☐ Trunk ☐ Canopy

Where in the neighboring area?
☐ Front yard ☐ Rear yard ☐ Side yard ☐ Corner-side yard

GPS units (OPTIONAL):

Height (in feet)	~50'
Average canopy width (in feet) Distance from one edge to opposite edge of tree canopy	~38'
Circumference at chest level (in inches) Distance around trunk at 4.5' from ground http://www.isa-arbor.com/publications/tree-ord/heritage.aspx	112"
Circumference at ground level (in inches) Distance around trunk where the trunk meets the soil.	102"

Rarity

Unusual species in San Francisco or other geographic regions.
☐ Rare
☐ Uncommon
☒ Common
☐ Other

Comments	While they are not uncommon as a species in San Francisco, cork oaks of this size are rare

Physical Attributes

Size: Notable size compared to other trees of the same species in San Francisco.
☒ Large
☐ Medium
☐ Small

Comments	This is one of the largest cork oaks I am aware of in San Francisco, certainly in the public right-of-way

Age: Significantly advanced age for the species.
☐ Yes
☒ No

Comments	

Distinguished form: Tree is an example of good form for its species, has majestic quality or otherwise unique structure.
☒ Yes
☐ No

Comments	Tree has good structure and as noted is quite large for the species in San Francisco

Tree condition: Consider overall tree health and structure, including hazard potential.
☒ Good
☐ Poor
☐ Potential hazard

Comments	

Historical Attributes

Historical association: Any relation to a historic or cultural building, site, street, person, event, etc.
☐ Yes
☐ None apparent

Comments	

Profiled in a publication or other media for its *historic* value: Tree has received coverage in print, internet, media, etc. Attach documentation or provide links if appropriate.
☐ Yes
☒ Unknown

Comments	

Environmental Attributes

Prominent landscape feature: A striking and outstanding natural feature.

☒ Yes
☐ No

Comments	

Low tree density: Tree exists in a neighborhood with very few trees.

☐ Low
☐ Moderate
☒ High

Comments	

Interdependent group of trees: This tree is an integral member of a group of trees and removing it may have an adverse impact on the adjacent trees.

☐ Yes
☒ No

Comments	

Visible or accessible from public right-of-way: High visibility and/or accessibility.

☒ Yes
☐ No

Comments	

High traffic area: Tree is in an area that has a large volume of vehicle, pedestrian, or bike traffic and has a potential traffic-calming effect.

☐ Yes
☒ No

Comments	

Important wildlife habitat: Species has a known relationship with wildlife to which it provides food, shelter, nesting potential, etc.

☒ Yes
☐ No

Comments	Community has identified numerous birds including ruby throated hummingbird, white crown sparrow, chestnut-backed chickadee, dark-eyed Junco, barn owl, American robin, as well as blue bellied lizard

Erosion control: Tree prevents soil erosion.

☒ Yes

☐ No

Comments	Tree may provide some erosion control for hillside through extensive root system.

Wind or sound barrier: Tree reduces wind speed or mitigates undesirable noise.

☐ Yes

☒ No

Comments	

Cultural Attributes

Neighborhood appreciation: Multiple indicators such as letters of support, petition(s), outdoor gatherings, celebrations adjacent or related to the tree, etc. Attach documentation.

☒ Yes

☐ None apparent

Comments	Neighbors submitted a petition with more than 50 signatures supporting Landmark status, also described children from neighborhood playing in the tree dating back to the 1950s

Cultural appreciation: Tree is of value to a certain cultural or ethnic group(s) in the City.

☐ Yes

☒ None apparent

Comments	

Profiled in a publication or other media for its *cultural* value: Tree has received coverage in print, internet, media, etc. Attach documentation or provide links if appropriate.

☐ Yes

☒ Unknown

Comments	

Additional comments:

→ Also attaching communities nomination, which provides details on the community support for this tree.

If you have any questions about this form, tree terms or tree concepts, please contact the Urban Forestry Council staff (below). It is acceptable if you cannot provide some of the information requested on this form.

A photograph of the tree must be submitted with this form.

Please attach **optional** supporting documents such as letters, arborist report, etc.

Send to: sfurbanforestcouncil@sfgov.org OR
Urban Forestry Council, 1155 Market Street, 3rd Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103

Any information you submit will be part of the public record.
The Public Records Act defines a "public record" broadly to include "any writing containing information relating to the conduct of the public's business prepared, owned, used or retained by any state or local agency, regardless of the physical form or characteristics." Govt. Code § 6252(e). The Sunshine Ordinance defines "public information" as the content of "public records" as defined in the Public Records Act. Admin Code § 67.20(b). Pursuant to the Public Records Act and Sunshine Ordinance, this document is a public record and will be available to the public upon request, at the hearing site, at the San Francisco Main Library, and on the Urban Forestry Council's website. Admin Code §§ 8.16, 67.7 (b), and 67.21(a).

Application received date	_____	Received by	_____
Tree evaluation form	_____	UFC recommendation date	_____
Board of Supervisors Decision	_____		
Landmark Tree #	_____	Title recorded date	_____

SAN FRANCISCO URBAN FORESTRY COUNCIL

Landmark Tree Nomination Form

Disclaimer: Any information you include on this form will be part of the public record. Anyone may request to see the information you submit for a landmark tree nomination. For more legal information, see the last page of this form.

Who can nominate a landmark tree?

- The Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission, and Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board may nominate a tree.
- The head of a City department or agency may nominate a tree on property under their jurisdiction. City departments and agencies should conduct an internal approval process before nominating a tree.
- A property owner may nominate a tree on his or her property.
- A member of the public may ask an authorized nominator to nominate a tree.

Please note that a permit will be required for any future removal of a landmark tree.

Pursuant to Ordinance 0017-06 and Public Works Code 810, the Urban Forestry Council requests the following information.

I am one of the following authorized nominators

- ☐ Property owner
- ☐ Board of Supervisors (through resolution)
- ☐ Head of a city department or agency
- ☐ Planning Commission (through resolution)
- ☐ Historic Preservation Commission (through resolution)

Authorized nominator (Supervisor, Planning Commission, Landmarks Advisory Board, Head of City Department, Property Owner):

Name

Address

Address

Phone (day)

Fax #

Email

I am an authorized nominator and I support this nomination.

Signature

Date

Member of the public who initiated nomination (if applicable):

Name David Dea

Address 4105 20th St.

Address San Francisco CA 94114

Phone (day) 415-509-2685

Fax #

Email ddea888@gmail.com

I am the property owner and I grant permission for city staff to evaluate the nominated tree on the property with advance notice.

Signature

Date

The Urban Forestry Council will use the following criteria to evaluate each potential landmark tree. If you need more space to describe the tree, please attach additional sheets.

TREE DESCRIPTION

Tree name (species and common name): Cork Oak Tree (Quercus sue

Number of trees: 1

Street address: 20th Street & Noe St. open space garden, at the upper part of the garden

Location of Tree: ☐ Front yard ☐ Rear yard ☐ Side yard ☐ Corner-side yard
☐ Public right-of-way ☒ Public lands ☐ Not sure
☐ Other: _____

If the tree which extends beyond multiple properties: NO

Which part of the tree does so?
☐ Trunk ☐ Canopy

Where in the neighboring area?
☐ Front yard ☐ Rear yard ☐ Side yard ☐ Corner-side yard

GPS units (OPTIONAL): _____

Height 50' feet

Average canopy width 38' feet
Distance from one edge to opposite edge of tree canopy

Circumference at chest level 112" inches
Distance around trunk at 4.5 ft off the ground. http://www.isa-arbor.com/publications/tree-ord/heritage.aspx

Circumference at ground level 102" inches
Distance around trunk on the ground where the trunk meets the soil.

Rarity

Rarity: ___Rare X Uncommon ___Common ___Other
Unusual species in San Francisco or other geographic regions.

Comment: One other Quercus suber close by in Cole Valley
no other known like species in San Francisco

Physical

Size: X Large ___Medium ___Small
Notable size compared to other trees of the same species in San Francisco.

Comment: Outstanding, no larger trees close by. New plantings below canopy

Age: Significantly advanced age for the species.

Comment: Not sure, looks like it's in its prime

Distinguished form: X Yes ___No
Tree is an example of good form for its species, has a majestic quality or otherwise unique structure.

Describe: Very symmetrical, outstanding presence

Tree condition: X Good ___Poor ___Hazard
Consider overall tree health and structure, and whether or not tree poses a hazard

Describe: Solid structure, very symmetrical, healthy trunk, limbs, bark in excellent condition

Historical

Historical Association: X Yes ~~X~~ None apparent
Related to a historic or cultural building, site, street, person, event, etc.

Describe nature of appreciation: See "Historical Association" attachment

Profiled in a publication or other media: ___Yes X Unknown
Tree has received coverage in print, internet, video media, etc. **Attach documentation** if appropriate.
Describe coverage: ___

Environmental

Prominent landscape feature: X Yes ___ No
A striking and outstanding natural feature.
Describe, attach photo if possible: see attach photos

Low tree density: ___ Low X Moderate ___ High
Tree exists in a neighborhood with very few trees.
Describe: other smaller trees in the garden and side st.

Interdependent group of trees: ___ Yes X No
This tree in an integral member of a group of trees and removing it may have an adverse impact on adjacent trees.
Describe:

Visible or Accessible from public right-of-way: X Yes ___ No
High visibility and/or accessibility from public property.
Describe: Visable from the 4000 block of 20th Street

High traffic area: ___ Yes X No
Tree is located in an area that has a high volume of vehicle, pedestrian or bike traffic and has a potential traffic calming effect.
Describe: low vehical traffic, local and tourist foot traffic are predominat.

Important wildlife habitat: X Yes ___ No
Species has a known relationship with a particular local wildlife species or it provides food, shelter, or nesting to specific known wildlife individuals.

see attachment - list of spotted wild life

Erosion control: X Yes ___ No
Tree prevents soil erosion.
Describe: It's leaf dropping creates mulch which, in turn promotes plant growth thus holding hillside soil

Wind or sound barrier: X Yes ___ No
Tree reduces wind speed or mitigates undesirable noise.
Describe: Very windy at times, the tree breaks up wind vectors

Erosion control: Tree prevents soil erosion.
☒ Yes
☐ No

Comments	

Wind or sound barrier: Tree reduces wind speed or mitigates undesirable noise.
☒ Yes
☐ No

Comments	

Cultural Attributes

Neighborhood appreciation: Multiple indicators such as letters of support, petition(s), outdoor gatherings, celebrations adjacent or related to the tree, etc. Attach documentation.
☒ Yes
☐ None apparent

Comments	see "petition" & Historical Association" attachments

Cultural appreciation: Tree is of value to a certain cultural or ethnic group(s) in the City.
☐ Yes
☒ None apparent

Comments	

Profiled in a publication or other media for its *cultural* value: Tree has received coverage in print, internet, media, etc. Attach documentation or provide links if appropriate.
☐ Yes
☒ Unknown

Comments	

Additional comments: see "Historical Association" attachment

→

If you have any questions about this form, tree terms or tree concepts, please contact the Urban Forestry Council staff (below). It is acceptable if you cannot provide some of the information requested on this form.

A photograph of the tree must be submitted with this form.

Please attach **optional** supporting documents such as letters, arborist report, etc.

Send to: Urban Forestry Council, 1455 Market Street, Suite 1200, San Francisco, CA 94103
OR sfurbanforestcouncil@sfgov.org

Any information you submit will be part of the public record.
The Public Records Act defines a "public record" broadly to include "any writing containing information relating to the conduct of the public's business prepared, owned, used or retained by any state or local agency, regardless of the physical form or characteristics." Govt. Code § 6252(e). The Sunshine Ordinance defines "public information" as the content of "public records" as defined in the Public Records Act. Admin Code § 67.20(b). Pursuant to the Public Records Act and Sunshine Ordinance, this document is a public record and will be available to the public upon request, at the hearing site, at the San Francisco Main Library, and on the Urban Forestry Council's website. Admin Code §§ 8.16, 67.7 (b), and 67.21(a).

Application received date _____	Received by _____
Tree evaluation form _____	UFC recommendation date _____
Board of Supervisors Decision _____	
Landmark Tree # _____	Title recorded date _____

Eco-system & Wild life sheet

* **CO_2 retention**; carbon sequestering
* **Local acoustic insulation**
* **Hillside erosion control**
* **Valuable mulch creation for the surrounding garden plants**
* **Shade for light sensitive plants**
* **Anchor for local ecosystem**
* **Shelter for local bird population**

* **Birds identified: Ruby throat hummingbird, white crown sparrow, chestnut-backed chickadee, dark-eyed Junco, crows, ravens, barn owl, American robin**
* **Blue bellied lizard**

Plant Eco-system at 20th St @ Noe St garden

* *Aechmea fasciata*-varigated bromeliad, silver vase/urn plant tropical Americas
* *Phyllostachys aura*-golden bamboo China
* Camellia-*tea flower China/Korea/Japan*
* *Rosa setigera*-climbing rose *North America*
* *Acanthus* mollis-bear's breeches, bear's foot plant/sea holly/oyster plant Mediterranea *region*
* *Genista monspessulana*-French broom/Montpellier broom/Cape broom US/Australia
* *Crocosmia*-montbretia southern & eastern Africa
* *Dichrostachys cinerea*-sicklebush/Bell minosa/Chinese lantern tree/Kalahari Christmas tree Africa/Indian subcontinent/North Australia
* *Cotoneaster frigidus*-Cotoneaster Himalayas
* *Chlorophytum comosum*-spider plant
* Rhododendron-Asia & US
* Crassula ovata-Jade plant Africa
* *Geranium retrorsum*-New Zealand geranium Australia
* *Festuca glauca*-blue fescue Asia
* *Aeonium* -succulent Canary Island/Madeira/Morocco/East Africa
* *Ophiopogon planiscapus*-black mondo grass Japan
* Echeveria-hen and chicks central America/Mexico/South America
* Sago palm-southeast Asia
* Juniperus-juniper worldwide
* Pittosporum-Australia
* Plectranthus
* *Oscularia deltoides*-deltoid-leave dew plant South Africa
* Ceanothus-North America
* *Lavandula dentata*-French lavender Madeira/Canary Islands
* *Asparagus densiflorus*-Asparagus fern Africa
* *Japonicum-Fargugium Argenteum*/variegated Leopard plant Japan
* *Dicksoniaceae*-tree fern New Zealand
* *Leptospermum laevigatum*-coast tea tree Australia
* *Pelargonium*- geranium tropical regions of the world/South Africa
* *Impatiens*-jewelweed/touch-me-not/snapweed/patience Northern Hemisphere, tropics
* *Centranthus*-ruber-red valerian/spur valerian/fox's brush/devil's beard/Jupiter's beard Mediterranean region
* *Cotyledon orbiculata*-pig's ear/round-leafed navel-wort South African succulent
* *Phytolacca americana*-American pokeweed/poke sallet/dragonberries North America very poisonous
* *Citrus limon*-lemon tree Assam a region in northeast India
* *Polypodium*-fern tropics
* *Dietes grandiflora*-fairy iris/African iris Australia
* *Plectranthus oertendahlii* -Swedish ivy/silverleaf spurflower
* *Thaumatophyllum bipinnatifidum*-split leaf philodendron tropical forests of Mexico to Panama
* *Monstera deliciosa*-swiss cheese philodendron tropical forests of Mexico to Panama
* *Abutilon*-Indian mallow/velvetleaf/room maple/parlor maple/flowering maple tropic & subtropics

Plant Eco-system at 20th St @ Noe St garden

* *Kalanchoe crenato*-Mother of Thousands plant Madagascar/tropical Africa
* *Hatiora salicornioides-Dancing Bones/bottle/spice cactus* a native of Brazil really an epiphytic
* *Thaumatophyllum Xanadu-Philodendron Xanadu* Brazil
* *Neoregelia Aztec-Bromelioideae (bromeliad)* South America
* *Neoregelia bahiana-Bromelioideae (bromeliad)* Brazil
* Ophiopogon japonicus-mondograss, monkey grass China/India/Japan/Vietnam
* Farfugium-Variegated Leopard plant China/Japan/Korea
* *Eriobotrya japonica*-Loquat tree China
* *Senecio serpens*-Blue chalk sticks South Africa
* *Crassula Muscosa*-Watch chain South Africa
* *Echinopsis pachanoi*-San Pedro cactus Central/South Americas, a traditional medicine
* *Dracaena fragrans*-varigrated Dracaena tree tropical Africa
* Agave americana-century plant/maguey/American aloe Mexico/US
* Agave *americana marginata*-variegate cultivar yellow stripe Mexico/US
* Agave parry-Parry's agave/mescal agave Mexico/Southwest US
* *Quercus suber*-cork oak tree Portugal

Historical Association

Additional comments

In the 50's on 20th Street where kids grew up the hillside at that time was known as "Nanny Goat Hill". Local kids nearby would go the Cliff's and buy kites and go up to the hillside to fly them. There were picnics, kids made forts in the middle of wild fennel and English Ivy growing around the Cork Oak tree. The gang of kids numbered 10-15 all living in the area and visited this open space often. Back then there were no apartment buildings. There was two rough pathways up to the hillside, concrete stairs were not built.

The Cork Oak tree has been an intergral to 20th Street/ Hartford neighborhood and was witness to nearby community events for over 75 years.

Table 1

LANDMARK TREE NOMINATION FOR CORK OAK TREE PETITION LIST

Name	address	date	
Lorraine Selman	4106 20th St SF CA 94114	Aug 4th 2021	
Lindsey Cedillos	9118 20th St. SF, CA 94114	8/3/21	
JOE WAGENHOFER	4115 20th St SF, CA 94114	8/3/21	
Tom Goddard	4119 20th St, SF CA 94114	8/4/21	
He Liu	4119 20th St, SF CA 94114	8/4/21	
John Ozdemir	4122 20th St, SF CA 94114	8/4/21	
IKUKO HOTTA	4130 20TH STREET, SF, 94114		
NICOLE MIKO	4147 20th St, SF, 94114		
MARTYN SELMAN	4106 20th St		
Odette Williams	4127 20th St	94114	
NICK LAW	4127 20th St	94114	
DEV DAS	42 LOWER TER	94114	
HWEE TEO	42 LOWER TER	94114	
DORIS CHEW	4105-20TH ST	94114	
Elizabeth Schumann	4100 20th St	94114	
Chris Steger	4100 20th St.	94114	
MARIANNE GOODKIN	4130 20th St.	94114	
Merrill Deskins	4137 20th ST	94114	
Jess Sullivan	4126 - 20th St	94114	
JULIA CHEW	125 EWING TER	94118	
Zann Goff	4167A 20th St	94114 8/4/21	
Anthony Varoni	4167A 20TH ST	8/5/21	
STEPHEN MOREWITZ	695 NOE ST	8.6.21	
Jedd Morris	4111 20th St	8/7/21	
KARL LEICHUM	3325 Octavia St. SF.	8.7.21	
Liz Clark	721 Sanchez	8-7-21	
Liz Kantor	348 Cumberland	"	
Joseph Titi	633 Noe St.	8/09/21	
JOHN O'DONNELL	384 LIBERTY ST, SF	7 AUG 2021	
Jennifer Bury	384 Liberty St, SF	8/7/21	
JUSTIN ERMIA	1499 CALIFORNIA ST SF	8/7/21	
Carolyn Kenady	3632 21st St. 94114	8/7/21	
Patty Sigman	532 Day St. 94131	8/10/21	
Eileen Mann	71 29th St 94110	8/10/21	
Elizabeth Eades	375 30TH St 94131	8/10/2021	
ALEXANDER YEE	417 HAZELWOOD DRIVE 94080	8/14/21	
KHRISTA H. QUEMA-YEE	417 Hazelwood Drive, SSF, CA 94080	8/14/21	
Lori Yee	200 Lake Dr, San Bruno, CA 94066	8/14/21	
Norma Knox	215 Scofield Dr. Moraga, CA 94556		
DONNA CHEW	1246 Lombard St, SF 94109		
Alycia Chen	1246 Lombard St. SF 94109		
Tim Chen	1246 Lombard St SF 94109		
Gabriella Schuck	4130-20 St SF 94114		

Table 1

LANDMARK TREE NOMINATION FOR CORK OAK TREE PETITION LIST

Name	address	date	
CHANNING HOO	111 BAY VIEW RD, PACIFICA, CA	8-16-21	
James Frank	370 Church St. Apt. E SF CA	8-20-21	
[illegible]	544 CHURCH ST. SF, CA	8-20-21	ART CHERDSKI
MARY ELLEN MACEK	2151 30TH Ave SF CA	8-2021	
[illegible]	219 Jersey St. SF, CA 94114	8/21/21	
Harry Ford	695 Noe Apt #3	8/21/22	
[illegible]	"	"	
Rachael Lacey	460 Staples Ave	8/22/2021	
Peter Wohlt	713 Noe	8/22/2021	
mark thoma	713 Noe	8/22/2021	
Mark BARTZ	4084 20th St	8/22/2021	

NOMINATION

Any of the following may nominate:

- Property owner (submits a nomination form)
- Board of Supervisors (passes nomination resolution)
- Historic Preservation Commission (passes nomination resolution)
- Planning Commission (passes nomination resolution)
- Director of Agency or Dept. Head (submits nomination form)

NOTIFICATION

Upon receipt UFC Staff notifies:

- Public Works
- Planning staff
- UFC Landmark Tree Committee (LTC) members

SITE EVALUATION

- UFC Staff coordinates site visits for LTC members and staff
- LTC members and UFC staff submit evaluation forms for committee hearing.

UFC Staff schedules and notifies hearings

- LTC hearings require 15-day notice
- Letters and/or on-site posting for adjacent property owners requires 7-day notice

UFC LANDMARK TREE COMMITTEE HEARING

- Meeting process
  1) Nomination sponsor (8 min)
  2) Staff analysis (8 min)
  3) Property owner presentation, may including outside professional staff (8 min)
  4) Public comment (up to 3 min/per person)
  5) Committee Evaluation Reports (8 min total)
  6) Staff Rebuttal (3-5 min)
  7) Property owner Rebuttal (3-5 min)
- Motion and vote to recommend to UFC either support or deny (regardless of outcome, goes on to UFC)
- Chair prepares and submits report to full UFC

URBAN FORESTRY COUNCIL HEARING

- Meeting process
  1) Landmark Committee Chair provides Committee Report
  2) Member discussion of Landmark Committee member findings; may ask questions from public present at meeting
  3) Public Comment, includes property owner
- Motion and vote
  - If motion fails, nomination ends. Tree can't be nominated again for 3 years
  - If motion passes or a quorum can't be reached, advisory packet goes to BOS with either "no recommendation" cover letter
  - If motion passes, advisory packet goes to BOS with supportive resolution

Board of Supervisors Process


NO PARKING
9PM - 11AM
FRIDAY
2
HOUR
PARKING
8AM - 9PM
MON - FRI
5

Urban Forestry Council
Landmark Tree Evaluation Form and Criteria

Pursuant to Ordinance 0017-06 and Public Works Code Article 16, Section 810, the Urban Forestry Council developed these criteria for evaluating potential landmark trees in San Francisco. When evaluating or considering potential landmark trees, please consider the context of the tree within its site location. For example, a tree on PUC land may not have the same community importance that a street or park tree would. Use the comment sections, as appropriate, to explain or support evaluation.

Evaluator's name	Jillian Keller
Date of evaluation	10-15-21
Start time of evaluation	~10:00AM
End time of evaluation	~10:30AM
Botanical name	Quercus suber
Common name	Cork Oak
Street address	20th St.
Cross streets	Noe

Rarity

Unusual species in San Francisco or other geographic regions.

☐ Rare
☑ Uncommon
☐ Common
☐ Other

Comments	

Physical Attributes

Size: Notable size compared to other trees of the same species in San Francisco.

☑ Large
☐ Medium
☐ Small

Comments	Very large for the species

Age: Significantly advanced age for the species.

☑ Yes
☐ No

Comments	Mature in development

Distinguished form: Tree is an example of good form for its species, has majestic quality or otherwise unique structure.

☑ Yes

☐ No

Comments	Impressive spreading crown

Tree condition: Consider overall tree health and structure, including hazard potential.

☑ Good

☐ Poor

☐ Potential hazard

Comments	Good health and structure

OVERALL CATEGORY RATING

Do the **physical attributes** of this tree support a recommendation for Landmark status?

☑ Yes

☐ Partially

☐ No

Historical Attributes

Historical association: Any relation to a historic or cultural building, site, street, person, event, etc.

☐ Yes

☑ None apparent

Comments	

Profiled in a publication or other media for its *historic* value: Tree has received coverage in print, internet, media, etc. Attach documentation or provide links if appropriate.

☐ Yes

☑ Unknown

Comments	

OVERALL CATEGORY RATING

Do the **historic attributes** of this tree support a recommendation for Landmark status?

☐ Yes

☐ Partially

☑ No

Environmental Attributes

Prominent landscape feature: A striking and outstanding natural feature.

☑ Yes
☐ No

Comments	

Low tree density: Tree exists in a neighborhood with very few trees.

☐ Low
☑ Moderate
☐ High

Comments	

Interdependent group of trees: This tree is an integral member of a group of trees and removing it may have an adverse impact on the adjacent trees.

☑ Yes
☐ No

Comments	

Visible or accessible from public right-of-way: High visibility and/or accessibility.

☑ Yes
☐ No

Comments	

High traffic area: Tree is in an area that has a large volume of vehicle, pedestrian, or bike traffic and has a potential traffic-calming effect.

☑ Yes
☐ No

Comments	

Important wildlife habitat: Species has a known relationship with wildlife to which it provides food, shelter, nesting potential, etc.

☑ Yes
☐ No

Comments	

Erosion control: Tree prevents soil erosion.

☑ Yes

☐ No

Comments	

Wind or sound barrier: Tree reduces wind speed or mitigates undesirable noise.

☑ Yes

☐ No

Comments	

OVERALL CATEGORY RATING

Do the **environmental attributes** of this tree support a recommendation for Landmark status?

☑ Yes

☐ Partially

☐ No

Cultural Attributes

Neighborhood appreciation: Multiple indicators such as letters of support, petition(s), outdoor gatherings, celebrations adjacent or related to the tree, etc. Attach documentation.

☑ Yes

☐ None apparent

Comments	

Cultural appreciation: Tree is of value to a certain cultural or ethnic group(s) in the City.

☐ Yes

☑ None apparent

Comments	

Profiled in a publication or other media for its *cultural* value: Tree has received coverage in print, internet, media, etc. Attach documentation or provide links if appropriate.

☐ Yes

☑ Unknown

Comments	

OVERALL CATEGORY RATING

Do the **cultural attributes** of this tree support a recommendation for Landmark status?

☐ Yes
☑ Partially
☐ No

Additional comments:

→

I recommend Landmarking the tree.

Urban Forestry Council
Landmark Tree Evaluation Form and Criteria

Pursuant to Ordinance 0017-06 and Public Works Code Article 16, Section 810, the Urban Forestry Council developed these criteria for evaluating potential landmark trees in San Francisco. When evaluating or considering potential landmark trees, please consider the context of the tree within its site location. For example, a tree on PUC land may not have the same community importance that a street or park tree would. Use the comment sections, as appropriate, to explain or support evaluation.

Evaluator's name	Morgan Vaisset Fenvel
Date of evaluation	11/01/2021
Start time of evaluation	8.25 am.
End time of evaluation	8-40 am.
Botanical name	quercus suber
Common name	Cork oak.
Street address	Noe & 20th.
Cross streets	" "

Rarity

Unusual species in San Francisco or other geographic regions.

☐ Rare
☒ Uncommon SF.
☐ Common Bay.
☒ Other

Comments	Uncommon at ~~Kees~~ SF, Common in the bay area

Physical Attributes

Size: Notable size compared to other trees of the same species in San Francisco.

☑ Large
☐ Medium
☐ Small

Comments	large specimen for San Francisco.

Age: Significantly advanced age for the species.

☒ Yes
☐ No

Comments	The tree is large but mid age -

Distinguished form: Tree is an example of good form for its species, has majestic quality or otherwise unique structure.

☒ Yes
☐ No

Comments	The tree has a typical rounded form, in good condition

Tree condition: Consider overall tree health and structure, including hazard potential.

☒ Good
☐ Poor
☐ Potential hazard

Comments	The tree is in great health condition One included bark section, but not in bad condition -

OVERALL CATEGORY RATING
Do the **physical attributes** of this tree support a recommendation for Landmark status?
☒ Yes
☐ Partially
☐ No

Historical Attributes

Historical association: Any relation to a historic or cultural building, site, street, person, event, etc.

☒ Yes
☐ None apparent

Comments	w/ the public support over the neighborood

Profiled in a publication or other media for its *historic* value: Tree has received coverage in print, internet, media, etc. Attach documentation or provide links if appropriate.

☐ Yes

☐ Unknown

Comments	

OVERALL CATEGORY RATING

Do the **historic attributes** of this tree support a recommendation for Landmark status?

☐ Yes

☑ Partially

☐ No

Environmental Attributes

Prominent landscape feature: A striking and outstanding natural feature.

☒ Yes

☐ No

Comments	domind visual attribute -

Low tree density: Tree exists in a neighborhood with very few trees.

☐ Low

☐ Moderate

☒ High

Comments	tree located on a vegetated median. but neighborhood is heavy tree vegetated.

Interdependent group of trees: This tree is an integral member of a group of trees and removing it may have an adverse impact on the adjacent trees.

☐ Yes

☒ No

Comments	in an island of non native vegetation and trees.

Visible or accessible from public right-of-way: High visibility and/or accessibility.

☒ Yes

☐ No

Comments	Only visible on the top of the stairs.

High traffic area: Tree is in an area that has a large volume of vehicle, pedestrian, or bike traffic and has a potential traffic-calming effect.

☒ Yes

☐ No

Comments	near streets (planted parkway) and cross 2 major streets

Important wildlife habitat: Species has a known relationship with wildlife to which it provides food, shelter, nesting potential, etc.

☒ Yes

☐ No

Comments	canopy similar past the live oak tree such as California oak worm -

Erosion control: Tree prevents soil erosion.

☐ Yes

☒ No

Comments	event on the hill side, multiple trees are located on that site

Wind or sound barrier: Tree reduces wind speed or mitigates undesirable noise.

☒ Yes

☐ No

Comments	nearby neighbors for cars and wind control (Evergreen tree).

OVERALL CATEGORY RATING

Do the **environmental attributes** of this tree support a recommendation for Landmark status?

☒ Yes

☐ Partially

☐ No

Cultural Attributes

Neighborhood appreciation: Multiple indicators such as letters of support, petition(s), outdoor gatherings, celebrations adjacent or related to the tree, etc. Attach documentation.

☒ Yes

☐ None apparent

Comments	

Cultural appreciation: Tree is of value to a certain cultural or ethnic group(s) in the City.

☐ Yes

☒ None apparent

Comments	

Profiled in a publication or other media for its *cultural* value: Tree has received coverage in print, internet, media, etc. Attach documentation or provide links if appropriate.

☒ Yes

☒ Unknown

Comments	into the park listed on the mini vegetated island

OVERALL CATEGORY RATING

Do the **cultural attributes** of this tree support a recommendation for Landmark status?

☒ Yes

☐ Partially

☐ No

Additional comments:

→

Urban Forestry Council
Landmark Tree Evaluation Form and Criteria

Pursuant to Ordinance 0017-06 and Public Works Code Article 16, Section 810, the Urban Forestry Council developed these criteria for evaluating potential landmark trees in San Francisco. When evaluating or considering potential landmark trees, please consider the context of the tree within its site location. For example, a tree on PUC land may not have the same community importance that a street or park tree would. Use the comment sections, as appropriate, to explain or support evaluation.

Evaluator's name	Pam Nagle
Date of evaluation	10/18/2021
Start time of evaluation	12:30 PM
End time of evaluation	12:45 PM
Botanical name	*Quercus suber*
Common name	Cork Oak
Street address	20th & Noe Streets, upper garden
Cross streets	" " "

Rarity

Unusual species in San Francisco or other geographic regions.

☐ Rare
☐ Uncommon
☒ Common
☐ Other

Comments	Fairly common.

Physical Attributes

Size: Notable size compared to other trees of the same species in San Francisco.

☒ Large
☐ Medium
☐ Small

Comments	Largest cork oak I have seen in the City.

Age: Significantly advanced age for the species.

☐ Yes
☒ No

Comments	

Distinguished form: Tree is an example of good form for its species, has majestic quality or otherwise unique structure.

☒ Yes

☐ No

Comments	

Tree condition: Consider overall tree health and structure, including hazard potential.

☒ Good

☐ Poor

☐ Potential hazard

Comments	Tree has codominant stems at 4’ with multiple attachments above. DBH of 23 and 23”. Approximate height of ~50’, width of ~40’. Wide vigorous crown.

OVERALL CATEGORY RATING

Do the **physical attributes** of this tree support a recommendation for Landmark status?

☒ Yes

☐ Partially

☐ No

Historical Attributes

Historical association: Any relation to a historic or cultural building, site, street, person, event, etc.

☐ Yes

☒ None apparent

Comments	

Profiled in a publication or other media for its *historic* value: Tree has received coverage in print, internet, media, etc. Attach documentation or provide links if appropriate.

☐ Yes

☒ Unknown

Comments	

OVERALL CATEGORY RATING

Do the **historic attributes** of this tree support a recommendation for Landmark status?

☐ Yes

☐ Partially
☒ No

Environmental Attributes

Prominent landscape feature: A striking and outstanding natural feature.
☒ Yes
☐ No

Comments	Large, vigorous tree.

Low tree density: Tree exists in a neighborhood with very few trees.
☐ Low
☒ Moderate
☐ High

Comments	

Interdependent group of trees: This tree is an integral member of a group of trees and removing it may have an adverse impact on the adjacent trees.
☐ Yes
☒ No

Comments	

Visible or accessible from public right-of-way: High visibility and/or accessibility.
☒ Yes
☐ No

Comments	

High traffic area: Tree is in an area that has a large volume of vehicle, pedestrian, or bike traffic and has a potential traffic-calming effect.
☐ Yes
☒ No

Comments	

Important wildlife habitat: Species has a known relationship with wildlife to which it provides food, shelter, nesting potential, etc.
☒ Yes
☐ No

Comments	

Erosion control: Tree prevents soil erosion.

☒ Yes

☐ No

Comments	Tree is at top of planted slope near concrete retaining wall and likely its root system provides erosion control on hillside.

Wind or sound barrier: Tree reduces wind speed or mitigates undesirable noise.

☐ Yes

☒ No

Comments	Crown of tree is below crest of hill; traffic is light on nearby steep streets.

OVERALL CATEGORY RATING

Do the **environmental attributes** of this tree support a recommendation for Landmark status?

☒ Yes

☐ Partially

☐ No

Cultural Attributes

Neighborhood appreciation: Multiple indicators such as letters of support, petition(s), outdoor gatherings, celebrations adjacent or related to the tree, etc. Attach documentation.

☒ Yes

☐ None apparent

Comments	Neighbors have submitted a community nomination.

Cultural appreciation: Tree is of value to a certain cultural or ethnic group(s) in the City.

☐ Yes

☒ None apparent

Comments	

Profiled in a publication or other media for its *cultural* value: Tree has received coverage in print, internet, media, etc. Attach documentation or provide links if appropriate.

☐ Yes

☒ Unknown

Comments	

OVERALL CATEGORY RATING

Do the **cultural attributes** of this tree support a recommendation for Landmark status?

☒ Yes

☐ Partially

☐ No

Additional comments:

→

Urban Forestry Council
Landmark Tree Evaluation Form and Criteria

Pursuant to Ordinance 0017-06 and Public Works Code Article 16, Section 810, the Urban Forestry Council developed these criteria for evaluating potential landmark trees in San Francisco. When evaluating or considering potential landmark trees, please consider the context of the tree within its site location. For example, a tree on PUC land may not have the same community importance that a street or park tree would. Use the comment sections, as appropriate, to explain or support evaluation.

Evaluator's name	Damon Spigelman
Date of evaluation	10-19-2021
Start time of evaluation	9:30
End time of evaluation	10:30
Botanical name	Quercus suber
Common name	Cork oak
Street address	20th St at Noe in upper portion of garden
Cross streets	Noe

Rarity

Unusual species in San Francisco or other geographic regions.
☒ Rare
☐ Uncommon
☐ Common
☐ Other

Comments	

Physical Attributes

Size: Notable size compared to other trees of the same species in San Francisco.
☒ Large
☐ Medium
☐ Small

Comments	

Age: Significantly advanced age for the species.
☒ Yes
☐ No

Comments	

Distinguished form: Tree is an example of good form for its species, has majestic quality or otherwise unique structure.
☒ Yes
☐ No

Comments	

Tree condition: Consider overall tree health and structure, including hazard potential.
☒ Good
☐ Poor
☐ Potential hazard

Comments	

OVERALL CATEGORY RATING
Do the **physical attributes** of this tree support a recommendation for Landmark status?☒ Yes
☐ Partially
☐ No

Historical Attributes

Historical association: Any relation to a historic or cultural building, site, street, person, event, etc.
☐ Yes
☐ None apparent

Comments	

Profiled in a publication or other media for its *historic* value: Tree has received coverage in print, internet, media, etc. Attach documentation or provide links if appropriate.
☐ Yes
☒ Unknown

Comments	

OVERALL CATEGORY RATING
Do the **historic attributes** of this tree support a recommendation for Landmark status?
☐ Yes
☐ Partially
☒ No

Environmental Attributes

Prominent landscape feature: A striking and outstanding natural feature.
☒ Yes
☐ No

Comments	

Low tree density: Tree exists in a neighborhood with very few trees.
☐ Low
☒ Moderate
☐ High

Comments	

Interdependent group of trees: This tree is an integral member of a group of trees and removing it may have an adverse impact on the adjacent trees.
☐ Yes
☒ No

Comments	

Visible or accessible from public right-of-way: High visibility and/or accessibility.
☒ Yes
☐ No

Comments	

High traffic area: Tree is in an area that has a large volume of vehicle, pedestrian, or bike traffic and has a potential traffic-calming effect.
☒ Yes
☐ No

Comments	

Important wildlife habitat: Species has a known relationship with wildlife to which it provides food, shelter, nesting potential, etc.

☒ Yes

☐ No

Comments	

Erosion control: Tree prevents soil erosion.

☐ Yes

☒ No

Comments	

Wind or sound barrier: Tree reduces wind speed or mitigates undesirable noise.

☒ Yes

☐ No

Comments	

OVERALL CATEGORY RATING

Do the **environmental attributes** of this tree support a recommendation for Landmark status?

☒ Yes

☐ Partially

☐ No

Cultural Attributes

Neighborhood appreciation: Multiple indicators such as letters of support, petition(s), outdoor gatherings, celebrations adjacent or related to the tree, etc. Attach documentation.

☒ Yes

☐ None apparent

Comments	Neighbors have submitted petition with over 50 signatures supporting this nomination.

Cultural appreciation: Tree is of value to a certain cultural or ethnic group(s) in the City.

☐ Yes
☒ None apparent

Comments	

Profiled in a publication or other media for its *cultural* value: Tree has received coverage in print, internet, media, etc. Attach documentation or provide links if appropriate.

☐ Yes
☒ Unknown

Comments	

OVERALL CATEGORY RATING

Do the **cultural attributes** of this tree support a recommendation for Landmark status?

☐ Yes
☒ Partially
☐ No

Additional comments:

→

Urban Forestry Council
Landmark Tree Evaluation Form and Criteria

Pursuant to Ordinance 0017-06 and Public Works Code Article 16, Section 810, the Urban Forestry Council developed these criteria for evaluating potential landmark trees in San Francisco. When evaluating or considering potential landmark trees, please consider the context of the tree within its site location. For example, a tree on PUC land may not have the same community importance that a street or park tree would. Use the comment sections, as appropriate, to explain or support evaluation.

Evaluator's name: Mike Sullivan
Date of evaluation: 10-27-21
Start time of evaluation: 12:15 PM
End time of evaluation: 12:45 PM
Botanical name: Quercus suber
Common name: cork oak
Street address:
Cross streets: Noe/21st

Rarity

Unusual species in San Francisco or other geographic regions.
- ☐ Rare
- ☐ Uncommon
- ☐ Common
- ☒ Other

Comments: becoming more common as a street tree; very rare to see one this large (may be largest in SF)

Physical Attributes

Size: Notable size compared to other trees of the same species in San Francisco.
- ☒ Large
- ☐ Medium
- ☐ Small

Comments: perhaps largest in the City

Age: Significantly advanced age for the species.
- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

Comments:

Distinguished form: Tree is an example of good form for its species, has majestic quality or otherwise unique structure.
- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

Comments: Beautiful!

Tree condition: Consider overall tree health and structure, including hazard potential.
- ☒ Good
- ☐ Poor

☐ Potential hazard
Comments

OVERALL CATEGORY RATING
Do the **physical attributes** of this tree support a recommendation for Landmark status? ☒ Yes
☐ Partially
☐ No

Definitely.

Historical Attributes

Historical association: Any relation to a historic or cultural building, site, street, person, event, etc.
☐ Yes
☒ None apparent
Comments

Profiled in a publication or other media for its *historic* value: Tree has received coverage in print, internet, media, etc. Attach documentation or provide links if appropriate.
☐ Yes
☒ Unknown
Comments none known.

OVERALL CATEGORY RATING
Do the **historic attributes** of this tree support a recommendation for Landmark status?
☐ Yes
☐ Partially
☒ No

Environmental Attributes

Prominent landscape feature: A striking and outstanding natural feature.
☒ Yes
☐ No
Comments

Low tree density: Tree exists in a neighborhood with very few trees.
☐ Low
☐ Moderate
☐ High
Comments not true. Plenty of street trees nearby.

Interdependent group of trees: This tree is an integral member of a group of trees and removing it may have an adverse impact on the adjacent trees.
☐ Yes
☒ No
Comments

Visible or accessible from public right-of-way: High visibility and/or accessibility.
☒ Yes
☐ No
Comments Yes

High traffic area: Tree is in an area that has a large volume of vehicle, pedestrian, or bike traffic and has a potential traffic-calming effect.

☐ Yes
☒ No
Comments

Important wildlife habitat: Species has a known relationship with wildlife to which it provides food, shelter, nesting potential, etc.

☐ Yes
☐ No
Comments
☒ uncertain

Erosion control: Tree prevents soil erosion.

☐ Yes
☐ No
Comments not any significant amount.

Wind or sound barrier: Tree reduces wind speed or mitigates undesirable noise.

☒ Yes
☐ No
Comments

OVERALL CATEGORY RATING
Do the **environmental attributes** of this tree support a recommendation for Landmark status?

☒ Yes
☐ Partially
☐ No

Cultural Attributes

Neighborhood appreciation: Multiple indicators such as letters of support, petition(s), outdoor gatherings, celebrations adjacent or related to the tree, etc. Attach documentation.

☐ Yes
☒ None apparent
Comments

Cultural appreciation: Tree is of value to a certain cultural or ethnic group(s) in the City.

☐ Yes
☒ None apparent
Comments

Profiled in a publication or other media for its *cultural* value: Tree has received coverage in print, internet, media, etc. Attach documentation or provide links if appropriate.

☐ Yes
☒ Unknown
Comments

OVERALL CATEGORY RATING
Do the **cultural attributes** of this tree support a recommendation for Landmark status?

☐ Yes
☐ Partially
no.

X No

Additional comments:
à

BOARD of SUPERVISORS

City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. (415) 554-5184
Fax No. (415) 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. (415) 554-5227

MEMORANDUM

Date: April 7, 2022

To: Members, Board of Supervisors

From: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

Subject: Urban Forestry Council - Landmark Tree Recommendations

The Office of the Clerk of the Board received two memos from the Urban Forestry Council recommending landmark tree designations.

1.) At the meeting of December 10, 2021, the Council determined the Cork Oak tree located at 20th Street at Noe Street meets the criteria for landmark tree status.

2.) At the meeting of February 22, 2022, the Council determined the coast redwood located at 313 Scott Street between Oak and Page, meets the criteria for landmark tree status.

If you wish to pursue an ordinance on either matter, you can submit a request to the City Attorney's Office following the usual process.

c. Alisa Somera - Legislative Deputy
Anne Pearson - Deputy City Attorney
Supervisor Melgar - Land Use and Transportation Committee Chair