

File No. 140777

Committee Item No. 1

Board Item No. _____

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Land Use and Economic Development Date September 15, 2014

Board of Supervisors Meeting

Date _____

Cmte Board

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Motion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Resolution |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Ordinance |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Legislative Digest |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Budget and Legislative Analyst Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Youth Commission Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Introduction Form |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | MOU |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Grant Information Form |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Grant Budget |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Subcontract Budget |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Contract/Agreement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Form 126 – Ethics Commission |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Award Letter |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Application |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Public Correspondence |

OTHER (Use back side if additional space is needed)

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____

Completed by: Andrea Ausberry Date September 11, 2014

Completed by: _____ Date _____

1 [Landmark Tree Designation - Giant Sequoia Located at 3066 Market Street]

2
3 **Ordinance designating the Giant Sequoia (*Sequoiadendron giganteum*) tree at 3066**
4 **Market Street (Assessor's Block No. 2656, Lot. No. 020) as a landmark tree pursuant to**
5 **Public Works Code, Section 810, making findings supporting the designation, and**
6 **requesting official acts in furtherance of the landmark tree designation.**

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

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

15 Section 1. Findings.

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

18 (b) The Board of Supervisors adopted landmark tree designation criteria in Resolution
19 No. 440-06. The Board of Supervisors subsequently amended the criteria in Resolution No.
20 63-09. Copies of these Resolutions are on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in
21 File No. 100880, which is incorporated herein by reference.

22 (c) On February 11, 2014, Supervisor Scott Wiener introduced a resolution of intent to
23 nominate the Giant Sequoia (*Sequoiadendron giganteum*) located at 3066 Market Street
24 (Assessor's Block No. 2656, Lot. No. 020) for landmark tree status. On April 1, 2014, the
25 Board of Supervisors adopted this nomination in Resolution No. 107-14. A copy of this
Resolution is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 140127 and is
incorporated herein by reference.

1 (d) The Giant Sequoia at 3066 Market Street qualifies as a landmark tree based on the
2 criteria set forth below and as further delineated in the City's landmark tree designation
3 criteria:

4 (1) Rarity: The species of tree is uncommon in San Francisco and particularly
5 uncommon as a residential tree.

6 (2) Physical: The tree is relatively large for San Francisco and is among the
7 largest trees in the immediate neighborhood. The tree is generally healthy, solidly-rooted, and
8 does not pose any apparent hazard.

9 (3) Environmental: The tree is clearly visible from several public vantage points
10 in its vicinity, including from upper Market Street. Because of its size and high visibility, it is a
11 prominent landscape feature. In an area of moderate tree density, the tree contributes to the
12 overall effect of a forested back yard, hillside, and neighborhood. The tree also provides a
13 habitat for wildlife, including several species of birds.

14 (4) Cultural: The tree has strong appreciation from members of the community
15 where it is located and neighborhood associations, which have collected signatures from over
16 90 neighborhood residents who support landmarking the tree.

17
18 Section 2. Landmark Tree Designation.

19 (a) Based on the above mentioned findings, the Board of Supervisors designates the
20 Giant Sequoia (*Sequoiadendron giganteum*) tree located at 3066 Market Street (Assessor's
21 Block No. 2656, Lot No. 020) as a landmark tree.

22 (b) The Board of Supervisors directs the Department of Public Works to record the
23 landmark designation of this tree on the property record of 3066 Market Street (Assessor's
24 Block No. 2656, Lot No. 020) and list the tree in the Department's Official Book of Landmark
25 Trees.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Section 3. 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:
DENNIS J. HERRERA, City Attorney

By: 
ZACHARY PORIANDA
Deputy City Attorney

n:\legana\as2014\1400606\00939011.doc

LEGISLATIVE DIGEST

[Landmark Tree Designation - Giant Sequoia Located at 3066 Market Street]

Ordinance designating the Giant Sequoia (*Sequoiadendron giganteum*) tree at 3066 Market Street (Assessor's Block No. 2656, Lot. No. 020) as a landmark tree pursuant to Public Works Code, Section 810, making findings supporting the designation, and requesting official acts in furtherance of the landmark tree designation.

Existing Law

Public Works Code, Section 810 establishes a procedure for the nomination, designation, and removal of landmark trees. The Board of Supervisors adopted landmark tree designation criteria in Resolution No. 440-06. The Board of Supervisors amended the landmark tree designation criteria in Resolution No. 63-09.

Amendments to Current Law

This Ordinance designates the Giant Sequoia (*Sequoiadendron giganteum*) tree located at 3066 Market Street (Assessor's Block No. 2656, Lot 020) as a landmark tree in accordance with the procedures set forth in Public Works Code, Section 810. This Ordinance also directs the Department of Public Works to record the landmark designation of this tree on the subject property and list the tree in the Department's Official Book of Landmark Trees.

Background Information

On April 1, 2014, the Board of Supervisors adopted Resolution No. 107-14, which nominated the subject tree for landmark status. This Ordinance designates the subject tree as a landmark tree pursuant to Public Works Code, Section 810, and thus brings the tree within the regulatory framework of the Public Works Code Urban Forestry Ordinance.

n:\legana\as2014\1400606\00940323.doc

1 [Landmark Designation Nomination - Tree Located at 3066 Market Street]

2
3 **Resolution of intent initiating the nomination of the Sequoiadendron giganteum tree at**
4 **3066 Market Street for landmark tree status pursuant to Public Works Code, Section**
5 **810(b); acknowledging the temporary designation of such tree pursuant to Public**
6 **Works Code, Section 810(d); and authorizing other official acts in furtherance of this**
7 **Resolution.**

8
9 WHEREAS, The Board of Supervisors adopted Ordinance No. 17-06, which amended
10 the Urban Forestry Ordinance, Public Works Code Sections 801 et seq. concerning landmark
11 and significant trees. A copy of said Ordinance is on file with the Clerk of the Board of
12 Supervisors in File No. 051458 and is incorporated herein by reference; and

13 WHEREAS, As part of this implementation of Ordinance No. 17-06, the Urban Forestry
14 Council, after duly noticed public hearings, developed criteria and procedures for the
15 designation and removal of landmark trees and recommended that this Board of Supervisors
16 adopt such criteria and procedures. Said criteria and procedures were subsequently adopted
17 by Resolution No. 0440-06 which is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File
18 No. 060487 and is incorporated herein by reference; and

19 WHEREAS, Trees provide numerous environmental, social, and economic benefits
20 such as reducing storm water runoff, reducing energy use, improving air quality, increasing
21 property values, shading for tenants, and promoting wildlife habitat; and provide residents with
22 a source of serenity in the inner city; and

23 WHEREAS, The purpose of this resolution shall be to initiate landmarking proceedings
24 for one Sequoiadendron giganteum tree, located on Assessor's Block 2656, Lot No. 020 and
25

1 listed individually below with corresponding photographs on file with the Clerk and referenced
2 herein; and

3 WHEREAS, The tree that is the subject of this resolution satisfies many of the
4 designation criteria in Public Works Code, Section 810(f)(4)(A)-(E), including having
5 prominent and beautiful visual impacts, as well as environmental and economic significance to
6 its surrounding community; now, therefore, be it

7 RESOLVED, This Board, pursuant to the Public Works Code, Section 810(b), hereby
8 adopts this Resolution of intent to initiate a landmark tree nomination for the Sequoiadendron
9 giganteum tree located at 3066 Market Street, Assessor's Block 2656, Lot No. 020; and, be it

10 FURTHER RESOLVED, That this Board requests an independent evaluation of the
11 tree, by a Department of Public Works arborist or independent third party arborist, to report on
12 the condition of the tree, including health and structural stability; and, be it

13 FURTHER RESOLVED, This Board acknowledges the temporary designation of such
14 tree for landmark tree status pursuant to Public Works Code, Section 810(d); and, be it

15 FURTHER RESOLVED, The Board directs the Clerk to forward this Resolution and
16 accompanying documents contained in the file to the Urban Forestry Council, and due to the
17 urgent nature of the situation, to urge the Urban Forestry Council to expeditiously complete
18 the landmark tree designation review for the subject tree; and, be it

19 FURTHER RESOLVED, The Board urges the Director of Public Works to immediately
20 notify the affected property owner of the pending nomination and inform said owner of the
21 special permit and approval requirements for removal of landmark trees under Public Works
22 Code, Section 810(f) if such notification has not yet occurred.



City and County of San Francisco

Tails
Resolution

City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

File Number: 140127

Date Passed: April 01, 2014

Resolution of intent initiating the nomination of the Sequoiadendron giganteum tree at 3066 Market Street for landmark tree status pursuant to Public Works Code, Section 810(b); acknowledging the temporary designation of such tree pursuant to Public Works Code, Section 810(d); and authorizing other official acts in furtherance of this Resolution.

March 24, 2014 Land Use and Economic Development Committee - RECOMMENDED..

April 01, 2014 Board of Supervisors - ADOPTED

Ayes: 10 - Avalos, Breed, Campos, Chiu, Cohen, Farrell, Kim, Tang, Wiener and Yee
Excused: 1 - Mar

File No. 140127


I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was ADOPTED on 4/1/2014 by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board

Mayor

Date Approved

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



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

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mohammed Nuru, Director, Department of Public Works
John Rahaim, Director, Planning Department
Deborah Raphael, Director, Department of the Environment

FROM: Andrea Ausberry, Assistant Clerk, Land Use and Economic Development
Committee, Board of Supervisors

DATE: July 22, 2014

SUBJECT: LEGISLATION INTRODUCED


The Board of Supervisors' Land Use and Economic Development Committee has received the following proposed legislation, introduced by Supervisor Wiener on July 8, 2014:

File No. 140777

Ordinance designating the Giant Sequoia (*Sequoiadendron giganteum*) tree at 3066 Market Street (Assessor's Block No. 2656, Lot. No. 020) as a landmark tree pursuant to Public Works Code, Section 810, making findings supporting the designation, and requesting official acts in furtherance of the landmark tree designation.

If you have any additional comments or reports to be included with the file, please forward them to me at the Board of Supervisors, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102.

c: Frank Lee, Department of Public Works
Scott Sanchez, Planning Department
AnMarie Rodgers, Planning Department
Aaron Starr, Planning Department
Mei Ling Hui, Urban Forestry Council Coordinator



CASTRO/EUREKA VALLEY NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

The neighborhood association for the Castro, Upper Market and all of Eureka Valley since 1878

EVNA
PO Box 14137
San Francisco, CA 94114
www.evna.org
Board@EVNA.org

EVNA, a 501 (C)(4) Non-profit,
Tax ID: 51-0141022

Eureka Valley Foundation,
a 501(C)(3) Non-profit,
Tax ID: 26-0831195

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Alan Beach-Nelson
President
Castro Street
Rob Cox
Secretary
Hartford Street
Gary Weiss
Treasurer
IXIA

COMMITTEE CHAIRS

James Kelm
Newsletter & Social Media
Castro Village Wine Co.
Jack Keating (Ex-Officio)
Planning & Land Use
17th Street
Aaron Seivertson
Quality of Life
Hartford Street
Mark McHale
Social
Vanguard Properties
Orie Zaklad
Technology & Marketing
Collingwood Street

DIRECTORS:

Patrick Crogan
Market Street
Tim Eicher
Q Bar
Mary Edna Harrell
Castro Street
Loïc Olichon
18th Street

EX OFFICIO DIRECTORS:

Steve Clark Hall
Webmaster
19th Street
Judith Hoyem
Emeritus
17th Street

April 17, 2014

San Francisco Urban Forestry Council
Landmark Tree Committee
1455 Market Street, Suite 1200
San Francisco, CA 94103
c/o Mei Ling Hui, Urban Forest and Urban Agriculture Coordinator

Via email: monica.fish@sfgov.org; meilling.hui@sfgov.org

Re: Sequoiadendron giganteum at 3066 Market Street, San Francisco

Dear San Francisco Urban Forestry Council and Landmark Tree Committee:

Castro/Eureka Valley Neighborhood Association joins Corbett Heights Neighbors in support Supervisor Scott Wiener's nomination and the April 1, 2014 Board of Supervisor's resolution of intent initiating the nomination of the Sequoiadendron giganteum tree at 3066 Market Street for landmark tree status pursuant to Public Works Code, Section 810(b).

According to *San Francisco Resource Analysis of Inventoried Pubic Trees* (April 2013), the benefits of trees include energy savings, air quality improvements, storm water intervention, atmospheric CO₂ reduction, and aesthetic contributions to the social and economic health of the community. This tree not only has these numerous benefits; over ninety Corbett Heights Neighbors have signed a petition in support of the Landmark tree designation.

In addition to the qualities the tree exhibits, retention of this tree is part of an agreement made in 2011 between CHN and the then-contractor who had purchased 3066 Market for remodel and resale. In a negotiation with CHN and the immediate neighbors, he agreed to retain the tree and neighbors agreed to support and assist in the building permit application. CHN carried out its commitments at that time. It is these permits under which the present contractor owner is proceeding to complete the work left unfinished by the prior contractor.

Members of the C/EVNA Planning and Land Use Committee support the nomination.

Very truly yours,

Alan Beach-Nelson
President

About EVNA:

Castro/ Eureka Valley Neighborhood Association (EVNA) is the oldest continuously operating Neighborhood Association in San Francisco established as Eureka Valley Promotion Association in 1878. For 135 years, our members have been working to make this neighborhood a great place to live, work and play. Today, we strive to preserve the unique character of our diverse neighborhood while maintaining a balance between prospering businesses and residential livability.

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 Supervisor member
- Head of a city department or agency
- Planning Commission member
- Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board member

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

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

Supervisor Scott Wiener

Name

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place Room 244

Address

San Francisco, CA 94102

Address

415-554-6968

Phone (day)

Fax #

Scott.Wiener@sfgov.org

Email

Name

Address

Address

Phone (day)

Fax #

Email

I am an authorized nominator and I support this nomination.

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

Signature

Signature

Date

Date

SAN FRANCISCO URBAN FORESTRY COUNCIL

2

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): Sequoiadendron giganteum Giant Sequoia

Number of trees: 1

Street address: 3066 Market Street, San Francisco 94114

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): Block 2656, Lot 020

Height approx. 75 feet

Average canopy width approx. 25 feet

Distance from one edge to opposite edge of tree canopy

Circumference at chest level approx. 185 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 approx. 250 inches

Distance around trunk on the ground where the trunk meets the soil.

Rarity

Rarity: Rare Uncommon Common Other
Unusual species in San Francisco or other geographic regions.

Comment: _____

Physical

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

Comment: Compare with *Sequoiadendron giganteum* at Garfield Square, Treat, 25th and 26th Streets, Several Examples in Mission District.

Age: Significantly advanced age for the species.

Comment: _____

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

Describe: Majestic and unique for the area

Tree condition: Good Poor Hazard
Consider overall tree health and structure, and whether or not tree poses a hazard

Describe: _____

Historical

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

Describe nature of appreciation: _____

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

Describe coverage: _____

Environmental

SAN FRANCISCO URBAN FORESTRY COUNCIL

4

Prominent landscape feature: Yes No

A striking and outstanding natural feature.

Describe, attach photo if possible: Photo attached. Unique species in neighborhood.

Low tree density: Low Moderate High

Tree exists in a neighborhood with very few trees.

Describe: No other trees of this size and variety.

Interdependent group of trees: Yes No

This tree is 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: Yes No

High visibility and/or accessibility from public property.

Describe: _____

High traffic area: Yes 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: _____

Important wildlife habitat: 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.

Describe: Home to various species such as ravens, hawks, squirrels, songbirds.

Erosion control: Yes No

Tree prevents soil erosion.

Describe: Down-slope building is below grade.

Wind or sound barrier: Yes No

Tree reduces wind speed or mitigates undesirable noise.

Describe: Reduces traffic noise from Market Street; Mitigates prevailing SW winds

Cultural

Neighborhood appreciation: Yes None apparent

Multiple indicators such as letters of support, petition, outdoor gatherings, celebrations adjacent or related to tree, etc. Attach documentation:

Describe:

Cultural appreciation: Yes None apparent

Particular value to certain cultural or ethnic groups in the city.

Describe nature of appreciation:

Planting contributes to neighborhood character: Yes No

Tree contributes significantly to, or represents, neighborhood aesthetic.

Describe contribution: It is an important part of the open space for block 2656 and reflects the aesthetic of the homes of the area.

Profiled in a publication or other media: Yes Unknown

Tree has received coverage in print, internet, video media, etc. **Attach documentation** if appropriate.

Describe coverage:

Prominent landscape feature: Yes No

A striking and outstanding natural feature.

Describe, attach photo if possible:

Additional comments

This tree could be trimmed to provide the open aesthetic desired by the contractor by a certified arborist instead of being removed permanently

SAN FRANCISCO URBAN FORESTRY COUNCIL

6

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, c/o Mei Ling Hui, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, CA 94102
OR meiling.hui@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 _____



SF Environment

Our home. Our city. Our planet.

A Department of the City and County of San Francisco



EDWIN M. LEE
Mayor

DAVID ASSMANN
Acting Director

**URBAN FORESTRY COUNCIL
LANDMARK TREE AD HOC COMMITTEE SPECIAL MEETING
DRAFT MEETING MINUTES**

**Thursday, May 1, 2014, 4:15 p.m.
City Hall, Room 421
One Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Jr. Place
San Francisco, CA 94102**

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Rose Hillson (Chair), Malcolm Hillan, Dan Kida, Carla Short, Jon Swae

STAFF: Mei Ling Hui

CITY ATTORNEY: Zachary Porianda

Order of Business

- 1. Call to Order and Roll Call.** The Landmark Tree Committee meeting convened at 4:15 p.m. Present: Members Hillson, Hillan, Kida, Short and Swae. Ms. Hui ascertained quorum and called the agenda items.
- 2. Approval of Minutes of the April 4, 2013 Urban forestry Council Landmark Tree Committee Special Meeting.** Explanatory Document: April 4, 2013 Draft Minutes) (Discussion and Action).

Upon Motion by Member Hillson, second by Member Hillan, the April 4, 2013 Draft Minutes were approved without objection (AYES: Members Hillson, Hillan, Kida, Short and Swae).
- 3. Hearing on Nominations for Landmark Tree Status.** The Landmark Tree Committee will hold a hearing to determine whether the tree nominated at the following location meets the criteria for designation as a landmark tree. (Discussion and Action)

Giant Sequoia (*Sequoiadendron giganteum*), located at 3066 Market Street, Assessor's Block 2656, Lot 020, San Francisco, CA. (Explanatory Documents: Nomination Form, Committee and Staff Evaluation Forms, Tree Images, Arborist Report, Board of Supervisors Resolution)

As Sponsor for the initiation for the landmarking, Andres Power from Supervisor Wiener's Office spoke on how the nomination came about from many phone calls and emails from neighbors from the neighborhood including the neighborhood associations. Mr. Power stated that the Supervisor is supportive of the process and looks forward to the recommendation from the Committee to inform their Office as this moves forward to the Board of Supervisors and then he ceded his time to the neighbors' arborist, Mr. Torrey Young.

Mr. Young, Consulting Arborist, provided a packet which contained his tree assessment report, his curriculum vitae, his outline and notes for his presentation and a chart summarizing the Sponsor's and the four evaluators' responses to the landmarking criteria. He stated that he was present not to advocate for the landmarking of the tree but to present an objective opinion of the condition of the tree. Mr. Young found that there were not any issues with insect or disease with the tree, that the tree had no structural or architectural issues that would make this tree a significant risk, and that the lean appeared to be phototropic due to a eucalyptus tree that was adjacent and removed from a photo he saw and not related to a structural issue. He stated he made the observations from an adjacent property.

Mr. Young is in agreement with Mr. Leggitt, the property owner's arborist's report. Mr. Young states the exception is Mr. Leggitt's statement that although the tree is uncommon and has no detrimental features that it was inappropriate to be designated as a landmark tree.

Mr. Young went into the rich heritage of the tree -- into the history of the development of this country and the world. He quoted some statistics of the number of landmark trees and the fact that there are no giant sequoias with only 3 being conifers. He summarized that he found no detrimental attributes and on the few giant sequoias in San Francisco; and he does not see any reason why it would not be appropriate to be a landmark tree. He asked if there were any questions and there were none.

Ms. Hui gave her Staff Analysis Report. She found the tree to be rare or uncommon and that the Urban Forest Map shows 11 of this species of tree. She stated the map was a user-generated map so not all are confirmed. In addition, she stated the tree is large for a tree in San Francisco; not of significantly advanced age; that it was planted and if we consider that trees were planted only in last 100 to 150 years, this one is of advanced age; it is a nice-looking tree; that no historical information was found after checking with the San Francisco Public Library and she looked for people who had lived in the building before and nothing was found in census data; there was environmental benefit as being large and evergreen; it was visible from the public in an area of moderate tree density; it was not part of an interdependent group of trees; as a backyard tree, there did not appear to be any traffic-calming effect but difficult to quantify; did observe a bird land and rest in the tree but no nests were seen, though possible that pieces of the tree were used for nests; likely provides some wind and sound barrier to the nearby houses; that the tree has some cultural appreciation with neighborhood support for the landmarking of this tree and is a good-looking tree that contributes to the neighborhood character; there was nothing found in print or media about this tree; overall, it is a large tree, in good health and there is neighborhood support. She asked if there were any questions and there was none.

The Property Owner, Mr. Lipton, was not present to give a presentation, nor was there present a representative for Mr. Lipton.

Gary Weiss, President of Corbett Heights Neighbors and member of the Eureka Valley Neighborhood Association, handed out copies of the 96 people who signed a petition in favor of landmarking the tree. Mr. Weiss stated that Mr. Leggitt's report was very accurate but disputes the finding that the species is not well suited for the San Francisco climate and elevation. He made mention of other locations such as the park on 25th & Harrison St. where there are huge ones there. He looked up facts on Wikipedia on where they are grown worldwide which are not at the elevations noted. He felt the tree does not just belong to the person with the tree as much as to the residents around it for the entire block to enjoy as well as the people who drive by, that it helps with the Market St. noise and pollution and that it is gorgeous.

Susan Detweiler of Eureka Valley Neighborhood Association read into the record the association letter signed by Allen Beach-Nelson, President. The letter supports Supervisor Wiener's nomination, lists the many benefits of the tree, refers to the over 90 petitions signed in support of the tree, and mentions the agreement with the previous property owner about retention of the tree and to then support and assist the contractor in his building permit application and the present contractor owner is completing that work. A copy of the letter was in the Committee's packet.

Member Short asked Ms. Detweiler whether the mentioned agreement was formalized in any way or if there was any documentation. Ms. Detweiler deferred to Mark who would be speaking later on that.

Leslie Koelsch of 197 Corbett Avenue, a resident for 37 years, gave a history of the tree as provided in the Committee packet. Ms. Koelsch spoke of the Steinbergs who purchased the house in 1969 and lived there until 1999. Ms. Koelsch found the son in Santa Cruz and he told her the tree was there when he moved in and it was about 15-20 ft. tall at that time. She referred to a letter he wrote about the tree. She said the tree is like a landmark and affords privacy for the adjacent properties. She also looked at city directories and Ancestry.com about the people who lived there from 1948-1958, Hazel Adams Causley and S. Daryl Adams. She mentioned Mr. Adams who worked for the US Forestry Service and gave the relative a sequoia in a gallon bucket. She provided his obituary.

John Koelsch provided 5 glossy photographs of the tree and surroundings and one page of bird images which show the 9 species of birds for which the tree provides an environment. Mr. Koelsch says it is environmentally significant, it softens the neighborhood. He showed views from Market St. and the view taken from Tank Hill as a significant sentinel, how it softens the noise and air pollution.

Nancy Wuerfel stated she was appointed by 3 supervisors and served over 9 years on PROSAC. She spoke about the importance of open space and about large trees that anchor a place in the minds of those who know the area. She stated it is notable and establishes the character of the place and first noticed the tree on her drive down Market St. to get to her City Hall monthly PROSAC meetings. She said the tree can be seen from a very busy upper Market St. She said that the reports which state that the tree is not visible from the public right-of-way are wrong. She stated the tree is already a symbol of the area. She thinks the tree is worthy of landmarking as it provides habitat for wildlife, is loved by the neighbors, provides privacy and beauty in a very dense city and is forever green. She believes that this tree was what the Landmark Ordinance was about when it was crafted.

Ian Berke, residential real estate broker who worked in San Francisco for the past 40 years, stated that he looked at the house when it came up for sale and saw the tree and says "majestic" is not too strong a word. He stated the tree was on the north side of the property and does not shade any part of the house or deck or block views; he was baffled by why anybody and why the contractor would want to cut the tree down. Mr. Berke said the tree adds substantial value to the property, it adds 5% or more to the value of the property. He says if the house is expected to sell for \$2.5 million, the tree could not be worth less than \$125,000. He urged the Committee to protect the tree.

Mark Reiser, member of Corbett Heights Neighbors, 19 year resident, stated that a request was made to the Property Owner to allow their arborist to examine the tree on two occasions from the subject property but were denied. Mr. Reiser said the petition signers were all from the immediate area. Mr. Reiser stated that Mr. Young's measurements with his instruments of DBH (diameter at breast height) and height are both larger than what Mr. Leggitt states in his report. Mr. Reiser spoke on the agreement with the prior developer / contractor and stated that the retention of the tree was marked on the

approved building plans which he distributed to the Committee. He said Mr. Lipton purchased the property and those entitlements.

Chair Hillson spoke about the formation of the cones on the monocious evergreen taking 2 years to form and that it is partially rare but uncommon. She asked the people to look at her pictures and the references to the sources of information on which she based her report in the packet. She stated it was a large tree and directed everyone to the error in her report which calculated the diameter from the circumference of 219 inches and to correct it to 5.8 ft. vs. 2.9 ft. She stated that the tree had distinguished form with a slight lean, was in good condition with no oozing around the roots with no insects, no apparent issues. She referred back to neighbor's previous remarks on historical as she did not find them herself, that the cultural / historical association was with the local Indians and their belief about the Northern Spotted Owl guardian and the sequoias, and the environmental aspects with the size of the tree and water and carbon sequestration. She stated that the tree is in a moderate tree density area with very few large trees anchoring the hillside; it could possibly an interdependent group of trees; visible from many vantage points including from a Muni bus on Corbett; some erosion control function on the slope. She mentions the high traffic area near the fork at Merritt and Market and refers to her photos. She states it was not noisy; measured wind speed with an anemometer and determined it was low with maximum at 6.0 mph that day; contributes to neighborhood character; unknown media publication; species found good for San Francisco Bay Area conditions per Jepson and Sunset in contrast to opinion it is good only in certain elevations in the Sierras; mentioned it is a California native tree; use for house building; logging history of old growth redwood; and that it is a good tree.

Member Hillan stated he was pleased to see a candidate for a landmark tree but was not presently in favor of supporting this tree as a landmark tree. He said he will give his report to show how he went that way. He apologized for not having the report in front of everyone as he stated he sent it in to the wrong address and Mei Ling apologized that there was the wrong address listed on the evaluation forms. Member Hillan informed everyone he turned in his report some time ago but will give what he wrote on it. He stated that with regard to rarity, he saw the tree as between uncommon and common, but not rare as there are plenty of these around town but uncommon in the city, and this tree would not be landmarked based on rarity. He stated that physically, it is small for the species if one has ever visited the General Sherman tree, it is medium for one in San Francisco of that species, as specimens in Garfield Park are specimens that are larger, though medium for the species and large for San Francisco; not significantly advanced in age; has a leader in pyramidal form and has retained this form typical of this species but it is not distinguished in that way in a landmarkable fashion; tree is in good condition, is thrifty, even though lower branches have been removed, it is sound and arborists have established that very clearly and he concurs. Member Hillan states it is not a hazard and is a sound, well-located tree and the lean is inconsequential in terms of its soundness and it is a very stable specimen; historical association not known at the time he prepared his report, he was not aware of any significant association and he appreciates the historical background from Ms. Koelsch and the personal value it has for many but the broad-based historical association, he believes is somewhat narrow; and limited in terms of the public record of the tree. Member Hillan felt that it was not a prominent landscape feature because of its location behind the homes. He said it was visible coming down Market St. and across the way but not prominent. He referred to the photograph which showed the tree with the black arrow pointing to it and he said the necessity of the black arrow to point it out speaks to the fact that it is not prominent. He said it is not to say it is not a fine and handsome specimen. The tree is in the moderate to low tree density in the general area and feels he would like to see more trees like this and it would be a shame to see this tree removed. It is not part of an interdependent group of trees and that it is visible and accessible from the public right-of-way, 'Yes' but not in a landmarkable way; have a lot of traffic on

Market St., not an important wildlife habitat in that there are birds going in and out of the tree but there is not an important nesting pair and is not landmarkable on that basis; it does not serve for erosion control nor a wind and sound barrier. Member Hillan states that certainly after today he sees the neighborhood support for the tree as significant but he does not see that alone would mean the tree is landmarkable. Member Hillan does not see any cultural appreciation with the tree, does not particularly see the tree as contributing to neighborhood character like the palms on Dolores, not in any publication, not a prominent landscape feature in regard to the entire community but for the neighbors in that one locale, not like the Norfolk Island Pine there on Market St. (Member Hillan's time was up but Chair Hillson afforded Member Hillan an additional minute to finish). Member Hillan stated that this nomination was a classic misuse of the Landmark Tree Ordinance, the interest in this tree did not come up until the tree was threatened with removal, and it does not come close to qualifying on its own merits as a landmark tree but that it would be a serious mistake to remove it, and the contractual obligations should be pursued in a legal fashion but this nomination should not come before the Landmark Tree Committee.

Member Kida stated that tree is uncommon, that there are a few in Golden Gate Park and not many in San Francisco, that it is large relative to San Francisco though larger ones exist in the Sierra Nevada, it is of a young age relative to its lifespan, found it had a distinguished form, the trimming had a slight effect since two or three larger branches were removed, stated that the members (Landmark Tree Committee) did not have a lot of time to evaluate the tree and as a certified arborist thought the overall condition of the tree was good, and he looked to see if there was uprooting on the back side of the tree with a lean and he did not see any, and agrees with arborists' reports that it is in good condition, had good taper, not top-heavy nor a candidate for failure eminently; not historical although it has a personal history -- looking for something more historic, an event, to the city -- and nothing was found in the media. Member Kida did see it as a prominent landscape feature and agrees that it would stand out although maybe not a tree everybody in the city will drive to see it; it is in a low tree density area, not part of an interdependent group of trees, noticed some Japanese maples that like shade and might have some effect if the tree is removed but not overall effect; definitely a high traffic area and may help in cutting down the noise but put 'No' on the form because it was not on the traffic side of the right-of-way as the tree but overall traffic in front of that house, he felt it is absolutely is; for important wildlife habitat, likely that squirrels and birds used the tree but did not see a nest maybe due to their possibly being scared by the traffic, and very likely the birds in the photos provided used the tree, did not see any permanent nests in the tree; did not think there was erosion control; felt that there was a wind and sound barrier for the people who lived back there; cultural, it means a lot to the folks in the area so 'Yes'; in general this tree means a lot to folks in San Francisco and California in general aside from what Chair Hillson provided, and it does contribute to character of the neighborhood and believes it is a prominent feature.

Member Swae, comments mainly on the rarity and cultural comments sections of the evaluation form. Member Swae inquired with the Recreation and Parks Department to see what the presence of these trees was like in San Francisco and there are 2 trees in Golden Gate Park, the Liberty Tree, planted by the Daughters of the American Revolution in 1894 in Conservatory Valley and 1 in the Botanical Garden and the 2 giant trees in Garfield Square. While not rare in a scientific sense, it is highly unusual in San Francisco and it is a native California tree that has a distinct range of 260 miles on the western Sierra Nevada and in 3,000 – 9,000 ft. elevation. Member Swae thinks that it is somewhat rare and surprising to see it growing in San Francisco; it provides numerous benefits to many people in the community – not only current property owner, future property owner, surrounding neighbors; have letters of support from neighborhood associations and previous owner letter, the tree has economic and environmental benefits, and a realtor's report that the tree adds substantial value to the property; the Property Owner expressed

concern on the space for backyard use such as a patio but the diagram of the yard and the canopy looks like it takes up only 140 sq. ft. of the backyard so there is significant amount of backyard for future homeowners and it does not really impact light in the backyard or on the roof deck. Member Swae finds it to be an interesting specimen and strongly urged the Committee to consider it for landmark status.

Member Short apologized for not having copies of her report available for the Committee but brought her copy and will make it available for anybody who is interested. The tree is uncommon in San Francisco and not rare, it is medium sized, there are much larger trees like at Garfield Park, not advanced in age for the species, not of a distinguished form but the form is fine and a nice tree with a rather somewhat substantial phototropic lean with an overall condition of very good. Ms. Short expressed concerns that it may show more wind burn as it gets above the rooflines where now it is being somewhat protected by the roofs around it and she has seen this species when they get above the roofline or their protected zone they can be susceptible to wind burn but in its current condition it is in good condition and no structural concerns. Ms. Short also stated that she looked at the root structure, particularly opposite the lean, and did not see any signs of problems so she was in agreement with the arborists' reports on that; as for historical association, she was pleased to hear the personal story of the one-gallon bucket with the sapling from the Sierras which got planted to become this tree but she believes the principle of the historical association is for the city of San Francisco; and Member Short was unaware of it being profiled in any publication or media. She stated that the tree is a prominent landscape feature that is very visible from the surrounding streets, that the area has a relatively high tree density for San Francisco and no question it is a prominent tree in that area; that the tree is not an integral member of a group of trees – interdependent; that it is visible from the right-of-way but not high visibility for most people but for the neighbors it is; it is in a high-traffic area though it does not provide a traffic calming benefit. She stated that it is likely to provide wildlife habitat and is a California native species, is a substantial tree in the landscape and has no question that it is used by many bird species and critters in the area; that it is not providing a huge amount of wind or sound barrier nor erosion control though maybe for localized effect. She said In order for it to provide sound barrier, would need substantial massing. Many neighbors are invested in this tree in re neighborhood appreciation. Member Short stated that cultural appreciation was not apparent but found the historical interesting from Chair Hillson but she thinks more of the Mary Ellen Pleasant trees on Octavia and that cultural role to the city of San Francisco and the many people who came through the Underground Railroad but stated she would like to read more about the Indian history. She said 'No' but stated it does contribute to neighborhood character for the neighbors. The tree is in the backyard and is visible from the surrounding streets but in a localized sense. Member Short mentioned again she is curious about the wind burn as it gets larger. Member Short, like Member Malcolm, feels the tree should remain and that if there is an agreement with the neighbors it should be pursued with the drawings that the Property Owner got as part of the permits. She would like to see a giant sequoia nominated but the purpose of the purpose of the Landmark Tree Ordinance is to attribute landmark status to the most exceptional individual trees of a species or those with really substantial historic or cultural significance so Member Short is not likely to support this landmark nomination.

Member Hillan chimed in to say that it was hard for him to say that with all of the support but from the historical perspective of this Committee there have been many people in the past who have come to the Committee wanting to protect their trees and this one certainly is worthy of protecting but the use of the Landmark Tree Ordinance...(City Attorney Zachary Porianda interjected to caution Committee members to limit discussion to the tree evaluation staff reports until the item for discussion is reached on the agenda.)

Ms. Hui gave her staff rebuttal. She stated that potential removal is not one of the criteria to be considered because it is not the criteria that exists that has been adopted. Ms. Hui urged the Members to consider the tree against the criteria that have been adopted and is part of the code.

Ms. Hui also sensed there was confusion on some of the criteria so she made clarifying statements. For the historical association, Ms. Hui stated that when the Council developed this criteria, it was looking for a specific important person to San Francisco history or general history so the Mary Ellen Pleasant trees are great examples of that -- important historical person or place or something like that. The cultural appreciation is about the tree as it stands in the place who it is important to like with support from the neighborhoods, cultural association of a community groups, non-profits, e.g. Quesada Gardens had a community-building effort that sprang up around those trees so they loom large in the minds of the people who live near there.

Member Hillan continued discussion of his earlier statements. He explained how there have been in the past that trees came to the Committee with the intent to protect them and it is simply not the purpose of the ordinance as it was drafted. He stated the Committee is looking to landmark truly outstanding trees that have landmarkable qualities in perhaps even more than one category and he would like to see all avenues outside this Committee and this ordinance to protect the tree and retain it. Member Hillan stated in concurrence with Mr. Berke that the tree has enormous value to the neighbors and to the Property Owner so he was a little bewildered that it was threatened to begin with. Member Hillan, however, does not see it as this Committee's or this Ordinance's mission to save these and how there would be a long line of people with their neighbor's tree in mind and would misuse the purpose of the Committee. Member Hillan then deferred to Ms. Short on the city's protections in place in the regulations as opposed to landmarking.

Member Short stated that there are no protections for trees on private property if not within 10 feet of the public right-of-way. If the tree is within 10 feet of the public right-of-way, and meet one of any 3 size criteria, they are protected under the Public Works Code and a permit is required before they can be removed. Any tree in the public right-of-way is also protected by the Public Works Code and a permit is required before it can be removed. San Francisco does not have any protections for trees on private property that do not meet those criteria.

Member Hillan asked Member Short then that the neighbors would be reliant on the agreement reached with the Property Owner at the time of purchase to protect that tree. Member Short believed that was the case with the approved plans that show that the tree is to remain. That is something that could be pursued. Member Short is unsure what the Planning Code would say about the tree since that was part of the approved plans and whether there was any enforcement on that side.

Member Swae mentioned that if there was the community input when the drawings were considered and approved, it probably would be considered.

A question arose from an unidentified male about the number of landmarked trees on private property. The guess was about a total of 20 landmark trees, there are 5 to 6 on private property. Member Short mentioned that the Landmark Tree Ordinance initially existed it was for only public trees but it got revised around 2006 or 2007 to allow for private property landmark situations. Ms. Hui stated that since it was codified she believes there are more trees for private property being nominated with probably about 3 for public property nominations.

Member Kida stated he agreed with Malcolm although he does not have the history but he was a little uncomfortable with the way this was brought to the Committee but he tried his best to restrict his evaluation to the tree and he finds it compelling that he finds so many people in this area who deem this tree worthy; and when evaluating trees, it is hard to come up with a scientific criteria to tell the value of the tree and not that it does not matter but that if this tree were put up next to the other trees mentioned it may not stack up but even the historical aspect may not be there and reflect the stature of the tree. Member Kida explained how he visited Plymouth Rock and he was surprised with the small rock but obviously it was something where something important happened.

Member Hillan stated that he appreciates the love from the neighborhood for this tree but his biggest problem was the arborist's report that we have so few conifers, we do not have a *sequoiadendron* and maybe we should have one and it is a nice tree; however, Member Hillan felt that if this was going to be the city of San Francisco's *sequoia giganteum*, it would be a travesty when compared to one planted by the Daughters of the American Revolution, or that in Conservation Valley, or Garfield Park. He said that *that* (emphasis) is landmark; and he would love to see the Supervisor bring one of those trees to the table. Member Hillan says it breaks his heart to sit there and see all these people and say it is not landmarkable. The Committee is not here to protect every tree that comes here.

Ms. Hui stated that the Committee is not to consider the removal of the tree as a result of this action. Ms. Hui reminded Member Hillan about this being outside his scope regardless of the concern in the room.

Chair Hillson mentioned previous landmark trees and that not all have met the criteria as some are common, some do not have historical and yet they are landmarked. She stated that one hardly sees the *sequoia giganteum* on private property due to its size and also trees do come with a bunch of petitions; are not always landmarked due to rarity, on historic reason or size. She also directed the Committee to refer to a chart as yet not mentioned by anybody which was made by the arborist, Mr. Young. The chart showed 4 evaluators' responses to the criteria from the evaluation forms which had been received prior to the Committee meeting. The chart is interesting and helpful in a black-and-white manner to see a lot of 'Yes's and where there is much consensus but it is not all decided that way. Chair Hillson thought it was a landmarkable tree.

Member Swae asked for clarification of the landmark tree process – historical significance, exemplary form, whether species is part of that and the criteria. Ms. Hui explained that there could be confusion regarding the criteria of the code and proceeded to state that there are 5 areas to be considered: rarity, physical attributes, historic, environmental and cultural. She stated each of the sub-questions are to determine if the tree meets each of those five criteria, that the tree does not have to exhibit all the criteria and she was not aware of a tree that has met all the criteria. The purpose was to identify exemplary examples of specimen trees that exhibit these criteria, a criteria, some group of these criteria, in a way that the tree is a credit to trees in San Francisco. Ms. Hui stated that the terms "exceptional," "exemplary" are the terms to be thinking about when talking about landmarking trees. Ms. Hui reminded Member Hillan to that they were at the meeting when they discussed and re-did the criteria most recently and those were the words used, and that it was the Committee that is to decide whether the specimen is an exemplary specimen based on the criteria that are established only. Ms. Hui also stated that these trees are the most protected trees in the city, that Ms. Short (DPW) looks over them to make sure they are safe, and a law is written to protect each tree under threat of even jail time for harming these trees so it is a serious thing to landmark a tree.

Member Hillan asked and stated that the owner was not present at the meeting. Ms. Hui stated that she spoke with him and is aware of the meeting, mailed the notice and emailed him and was surprised given the notification and thought he was attending. Member Hillan stated he was just clarifying this.

Ms. Hui explained what the outcomes of the vote would mean. She stated that 3 votes are needed for a quorum and that a split vote of 2-2 would not happen. Whatever decision comes from this Committee will go to the full Council for consideration and it will take the final vote to send to the Supervisor's Office. Chair Hillson moved to landmark the tree, second by Member Kida.

Roll call vote to landmark the tree was taken -- AYES: Hillson, Kida, Swae; NAYES: Hillan, Short. Motion passed to send the recommendation to the full Council to landmark the tree. This matter will be heard before the full Council meeting on Friday, May 23, 2014, 8:30 a.m. in Room 400, City Hall.

Committee Members and public were asked to retain copies of the materials for the next meeting.

- 4. New Business / Future Agenda Items.** (Information and Discussion). The Committee thought about previous topic identifying landmark tree with markers – could be held at the call of the Chair or the next meeting. Members in the past thought about marking landmark trees and this could be added as an agenda item for the next meeting, to keep this topic alive. There is interest to identify the trees also not necessarily with markers. Questions on sabotage of trees that are marked arose and Member Short stated she never heard of heritage or landmark trees to be targeted.

Chair Hillson also asked about DPW Code in Chapter 16 Section 811 for penalties for landmark trees as being around maybe \$100. Member Short stated that DPW uses administrative penalties and can fine for the value of the tree if it is known; and in order to do an appraisal of the tree, there must be sufficient information prior to the illegal destruction or illegal pruning or removal and there is in many cases not enough information for the height, DBH, quality of the wood, quality of the canopy, etc. but in some cases there is that information due to the tree having been examined prior to removal so in those cases they fine for the value of the tree. Landmark trees would have sufficient information to fine for the value of the trees because they have been examined and have sufficient information to fine for the value unlike regular street trees without that information. Ms. Short stated that for landmark trees, the fine would be very high and jail time exists.

- 5. Public Comment:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda. There were no members of the public present at this time.

- 6. Adjournment.** The Landmark Tree Committee meeting adjourned at 5:43 p.m.

Minutes written and submitted by Chair Hillson.

Copies of explanatory documents are available to the public at (1) the Department of Environment, 1455 Market Street, Suite 1200, San Francisco, California 94103 between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., (2) or may be available at the Landmark Tree Committee Meeting website <http://www.sfenvironment.org/about/taskforce/urban-forestry-council/agendas> posted with each agenda or meeting minutes, or 3) upon request to the Council Secretary at the above address, telephone number 415-355-3709, or via e-mail at Monica.Fish@sfgov.org. Audio recordings of all meetings can be accessed at the following website <https://sites.google.com/a/sfenvironment.org/commission/urban-forestry-council/urban-forestry-council-and-committee-meeting-audios>.

**Findings Summary Report of May 1, 2014 LTC Meeting
Giant Sequoia (*Sequoiadendron giganteum*) at 3066 Market St. (Block 2656, Lot 020)
for May 23, 2014 full UFC Meeting**

Respectfully submitted by
Rose Hillson, Chair, Landmark Tree Committee of the Urban Forestry Council

Mr. Andres Power of Supervisor Wiener's Office stated that many calls and emails prompted the nomination of the sequoia and that the Supervisor was supportive of the process to inform their Office.

The LTC moved with a vote of 3 – 2 in favor of forwarding a recommendation to landmark the Giant Sequoia tree to the full Council.

To evaluate landmark designation for the tree, the LTC members were instructed to focus on 5 main criteria categories:

- 1) RARITY;
- 2) PHYSICAL ATTRIBUTES (size, age, distinguished form, tree condition);
- 3) HISTORICAL (historical association, profiled in a publication or other media);
- 4) ENVIRONMENTAL (prominent landscape feature, low tree density, interdependent group of trees, visible or accessible from public right-of-way, high traffic area, important wildlife habitat, erosion control, wind or sound barrier);
- 5) CULTURAL (neighborhood appreciation, cultural appreciation, planting contributes to neighborhood character, profiled in a publication or other media, prominent landscape feature).

These criteria are what are within the purview of the LTC and the full UFC to make the decision when deciding on the recommendation to landmark the tree.

Among other findings, the LTC found the specimen satisfies the following landmark tree criteria:

- It is an uncommon tree
- It is a large tree for San Francisco with 42-inch DBH
- It is a prominent landscape feature
- It provides habitat for numerous wildlife
- It is visible from various public right-of-ways
- It is in good condition as found by both property owner's and neighbors' arborists
- It has neighborhood appreciation as evidenced by over 90 signatures on petitions
- It contributes to neighborhood character

NOTE: Issues were brought up which were outside of the criteria scope above. LTC members were reminded to consider only the 5 criteria to landmark a tree.

Informational background ("detailed narrative" & "table summary") which formed basis of findings are in the Addendum to this Summary Section. As well, refer to LTC meeting explanatory documents.

ADDENDUM TO SUMMARY

BACKGROUND – “DETAILED” NARRATIVE SUMMARY:

ARBORISTS' evaluation reports (Mr. Torrey Young for neighbors + Mr. Roy Leggitt for property owner):

- ordinary nice tree, uncommon around town, not rare (Leggitt)
- not more than 50 yrs. old (Leggitt)
- no issues with insect or disease (Young), flagging but not likely to be fatal (Leggitt), no uprooting (Leggitt), root crown undisturbed (Young)
- 42” diameter at 54” dbh, 53 ft. tall, 21 ft. canopy at widest (Young); 30” diameter, 40 ft. tall, 30 ft. spread (Leggitt)
- no structural or architectural issues to pose a significant risk (Young)
- lean of 20 degrees (Leggitt); lean of 16 degrees upper, 0 degrees lower + lean appeared to be phototrophic (Young)
- tree species has history in native range, the U.S. and the world (Young)

-
- RARITY: rare or uncommon, uncommon to common, uncommon threatened status, uncommon and somewhat rare in San Francisco, uncommon → UNCOMMON
 - PHYSICAL (Size): large for San Francisco, small tree for species, medium for San Francisco, large for San Francisco, medium, Mr. Young's measurements of the tree with instruments was larger than Mr. Leggitt's → LARGE
 - PHYSICAL (Age): not significantly of advanced age, although relatively old for treeless landscape history for SF; not significantly advanced in age; not advanced in age for species
 - PHYSICAL (Distinguished form): typical pyramidal form but not distinguished, good taper, not distinguished form, distinguished form with lean, form fine but not distinguished
 - PHYSICAL (Tree condition): In good health, good tree condition, sound tree, good condition overall, good root structure, no uprooting → GOOD
 - ENVIRONMENTAL: environmental benefit being evergreen and large, environmental benefit with water and carbon sequestration
 - ENVIRONMENTAL (Prominent landscape feature): not prominent since backyard tree, prominent to immediate neighborhood, prominent landscape feature → PROMINENT
 - ENVIRONMENTAL (Low tree density): in area of moderate tree density, low tree density, moderate to low tree density area
 - ENVIRONMENTAL (Interdependent group of trees): Possible interdependent group of trees, not part of an interdependent group of trees, may effect some Japanese maples near it if removed
 - ENVIRONMENTAL (Visible or accessible from public right-of-way): visible from the public, visible from various public right-of-ways, visible from public right of way but not high visibility and visible from surrounding streets in a localized sense → VISIBLE
 - ENVIRONMENTAL (High traffic area, potential traffic calming effect): high traffic area, not immediately in front of house but overall traffic in front is high traffic area, high traffic area but does not provide a traffic calming effect

Summary of May 1, 2014 LTC Meeting

Members' evaluations of *Sequoiadendron giganteum* at 3066 Market St. (Block 2656, Lot 020)

Presented at May 23, 2014 full UFC Meeting – Rose Hillson

- ENVIRONMENTAL (Important wildlife habitat): Many species of birds seen in the tree, provides habitat for wildlife, not important wildlife habitat, likely provides wildlife habitat and does not question use by many birds and critters as a substantial tree → HABITAT FOR WILDLIFE
- ENVIRONMENTAL (Erosion control): erosion control, no erosion control
- ENVIRONMENTAL (Wind or sound barrier): wind and sound barrier, wind or sound barrier for nearby homes, not wind or sound barrier, not a huge amount of sound or wind barrier
- CULTURAL (Neighborhood appreciation): cultural appreciation with neighborhood support; 96 petitions filed in favor of landmarking the tree and shows the love for the tree; clear neighborhood support; letters of support from neighborhood associations, petitions → NEIGHBORHOOD APPRECIATION
- CULTURAL (Cultural appreciation): cultural / historical local native American connection w/ Northern Spotted Owl guardian; wood used in buildings of early days of SF; no cultural appreciation
- CULTURAL (Planting contributes to neighborhood character): Good-looking tree that contributes to neighborhood character, tree belongs to the entire block and not just to the person with the tree, tree affords a sense of place due to its prominence and as already a symbol of the area, not contribute to neighborhood character → NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER
- HISTORICAL (Historical association): history of tree as sapling from the Sierras from prior owners of 3066 Market, no historical association except for what neighbors report, no historical association to the City (see CULTURAL also for local native American and early SF building use)
- HISTORICAL (Profiled in a publication or other media): Nothing in media or print on it

See Page 4 for “DETAILED” TABLE SUMMARY.

Summary of May 1, 2014 LTC Meeting
 Members' evaluations of *Sequoiadendron giganteum* at 3066 Market St. (Block 2656, Lot 020)
 Presented at May 23, 2014 full UFC Meeting – Rose Hillson

BACKGROUND – “DETAILED” TABLE SUMMARY:

SUMMARY OF NOMINATOR / EVALUATOR RESPONSES for Giant Redwood at 3066 Market St.

Nominator / Evaluator *** RARITY *** *** PHYSICAL ***	WIENER rare ***	HILLSON partially rare—uncommon ***	HILLAN uncommon—common ***	HUI rare or uncommon ***	KIDA uncommon ***	SHORT uncommon ***	SWAE partially rare—uncommon ***
Size	large	large	small for species; medium for SF	large	Large for SF	medium	No comment
Advanced age for species	No comment	No	No	Yes and No	No	No	No comment
Distinguished form	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No comment
Condition	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	No comment
*** HISTORICAL ***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Historical association	No	native Americans, early SF bldgs, logging	No	No	No	No not to SF	No comment
Media or print	unknown	unknown	unknown	unknown	unknown	unknown	No comment
Prominent landscape feature	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No comment
Low tree density	moderate	low-moderate	low	moderate	low	relatively high	No comment
Interdepn't group of trees	No	Yes and No	No	No	No	No	No comment
Visible/access. fr/ Public ROW	No	Yes	Yes (oral), No (written)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No comment
High traffic area	No	Yes and No	Yes	No	No ("Yes on other side")	Yes but not traffic calming	No comment
Important wildlife habitat	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes (oral) No (written)	Yes	has environmental benefits
Erosion control	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No comment
Wind or sound barrier	Yes	No	No (oral), Yes (written)	Yes	Yes	No	No comment
*** CULTURAL ***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Neighborhood appreciation	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes-letters of support
Cultural appreciation	None apparent	None apparent	None apparent	some(oral) None apparent (pt)	None apparent	None apparent	Yes
Contribution to neighborhood character	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No comment



SF Environment

Our home. Our city. Our planet.



EDWIN M. LEE
Mayor

DEBORAH O. RAPHAEL
Director

**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT
URBAN FORESTRY COUNCIL**

**DRAFT MINUTES
Friday, May 23, 2014, 8:30 a.m.**

***City Hall, Room 400
One Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Jr. Place
San Francisco, CA 94102**

Order of Business

- 1. Call to Order and Roll Call.** The Urban Forestry Council meeting was called to order at 8:40 a.m. Present: Council Members Flanagan, Short, Hillan, Hillson, Kida, Leffingwell, Sullivan, Barrow, Ginsburg (8:50 a.m.); Excused: Members Most, and Sherwin.
- 2. Adoption of Minutes of the March 28, 2014 Urban Forestry Council Meeting.** (Explanatory Document: March 28, 2014 Draft Minutes) (Discussion and Action) Upon Motion by Member Hillson, second by Member Flanagan, the March 28, 2014 Meeting Minutes were approved without objection (AYES: Members Flanagan, Short, Hillan, Hillson, Kida, Leffingwell, and Sullivan; Absent: Members Most and Sherwin).
- 3. 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.

Mr. Igor Lacan, introduced himself as the new Urban Forest Advisor for UC Cooperative Extension and offered to provide technical services and answer any questions that the Council may have.

- 4. Hearing on Nomination for Landmark Tree Status.** The Council will hold a hearing to determine whether the tree nominated at the following location meets the criteria for designation as a landmark tree and may adopt a Resolution making a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. (Discussion and Action)

Giant Sequoia (*Sequoiadendron giganteum*), located at 3066 Market Street, Assessor's Block 2656, Lot 020, San Francisco, CA. (Explanatory Documents: Nomination Form, Landmark Tree Committee Chair Written Summary, Committee and Staff Evaluation Forms, Tree Images, Arborist Report, Board of Supervisors Resolution, Urban Forestry Council Draft Resolution, Public Comment including Petition, Arborist Report, Tree History, Correspondence)

Landmark Tree Committee Chair Hillson read into the record the Landmark Tree Committee's Findings Summary Report from the May 1, 2014 Committee meeting summarizing the Committee's decision-making process for making a recommendation for landmark tree status of the Giant Sequoia at 3066 Market Street. She reported that the Committee had voted 3-2 in favor of forwarding a recommendation approving landmark status to the Board of Supervisors. Committee Members voting in favor and those opposed to landmark designation discussed evaluation criteria considered in making their decision. Council members held a discussion.

Public Comment:

Mr. Gary Weiss, President, Corbett Heights Neighbors, speaking in support of landmark tree designation, provided a petition with 96 neighbors in support and an arborist report on the attributes of the tree. He cited the tree's dense canopy, good health, structure, aesthetics, historical significance, rarity, location, and wildlife habitat as reasons for approving landmark designation.

Mr. Alan Beach-Nelson, Castro Eureka Valley Neighborhood Association, representing 500 neighbors and business owners, spoke in support of landmark designation citing the tree's rarity, cultural significance, neighborhood significance, environmental impact, health, and visibility.

Ms. Leslie Koelsch, Corbett Heights Neighbors, spoke in support of landmark designation, discussing the tree's historical significance.

Mr. John Koelsch, Corbett Street resident, adjacent property owner, spoke in support of landmark designation, discussing the tree's historical significance, physical and aesthetic attributes, wildlife habitat, rarity, environmental and cultural characteristics, and asset to the property. He stated that landmark designation of this tree would be based on the attributes of the tree and not an abuse of the Landmark Tree Ordinance as a way to save a tree, citing a reference made by a Council Member opposing landmark designation.

Ms. Nancy Wuerfel spoke in support of landmark designation. She stated that she is a member of PROSAC and is familiar with qualities people value in their open spaces. She cited the tree's large size, natural beauty, community support and appreciation as evidenced by the petition and personal testimony of two neighborhood associations, visual significance, and prominence as the criteria for meeting the requirements set forth in the Landmark Tree Ordinance.

Ms. Susan Cox spoke in support of saving the Sequoia tree. She stated that the tree reduces carbon dioxide, intercepts stormwater, and is a thriving healthy magnificent 75 year old tree. Ms. Cox spoke of her concern that green space is being lost with city urbanization.

Mr. Ian Burke spoke in support of landmark designation. He questioned the comparison made by a Council Member with park trees that he believes will always overshadow privately owned trees and would result in rarely qualifying any tree on public property for landmark status. He cited the strong neighborhood support in favor of landmark tree status and spoke of his concern that the tree would be removed by the property owner.

Mr. Mark Ryser spoke in support of landmark designation citing arborist reports indicating that the tree is uncommon, its physical attributes, historical significance, visibility, prominence, cultural significance, neighborhood appreciation, and asset to the neighborhood. He cited the petition

of 96 neighborhood supporters and stated that this tree meets the criteria necessary for landmark tree designation.

Chair Flanagan motioned to approve the Resolution recommending approval of landmark tree designation to the Board of Supervisors, second by Member Hillson (AYES: Members Flanagan, Hillson, Kida and Swae; Noes: Members Short, Hillan, Leffingwell, and Sullivan; Absent: Members Most and Sherwin). The Motion was not approved for recommendation with a 4-4 vote. The Council will be forwarding a "Without Recommendation" for landmark designation decision to the Board of Supervisors.

Item 6 was heard before Item 5.

- 5. Urban Forestry Council Endorsement of Urban Forest Master Plan.** (Explanatory Documents: Summary of Key Changes Memo to Urban Forestry Council and Final Urban Forest Plan Phase 1 Street Trees <http://urbanforest/sfplanning.org> and Draft and Final Resolutions) Sponsor and Speaker: Member Swae (Discussion and Action)

Member Swae reported that a final Urban Forest Master Plan is now available and reported on key changes to the Final Plan. He discussed work that had been accomplished working with the Urban Forestry Council, Department of Public Works, City agencies, the public, and organizations on finalizing the Plan. Member Swae reported that there had been a public open house and public comment period, and that edits had been made to the Draft Plan based on feedback received. He recommended endorsement of the Plan so it can move forward to the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission for approval.

Public Comment: Ms. Denise Louie, California Native Plant Society member, shared her experience and knowledge about trees and shrubs in San Francisco. She stated that the only two trees that are native to San Francisco are the Coast Live Oak and California Buckeye that along with other native plants evolved here to withstand the heat of the dry seasons. Ms. Louie suggested that the pampas grass in front of the Conservatory of Flowers be replaced with Toyon. She suggested that the Urban Forest Plan should include and promote the use of more native plants.

Upon Motion by Member Hillan, second by Member Hillson, the Resolution endorsing the Urban Forest Plan was approved. (AYES: Members Flanagan, Short, Hillan, Hillson, Kida, Leffingwell, Sullivan, and Swae; Absent: Members Most and Sherwin).

- 6. Presidio Graduate School's City of San Francisco Urban Wood Re-Use Study Findings.** The Council will hear a presentation on a study performed by Presidio Graduate School students on urban wood reuse. Sponsor: Member Swae (Explanatory Documents: Presentation and San Francisco Urban Forest Wood Re-Use Study) (Informational Presentation and Discussion)

Member Swae reported that Presidio Graduate School students have been working with the Planning, Public Works, and Recreation and Park Departments on a recommendation made in the Urban Forest Plan to develop findings on how to manage trees throughout their life cycle. Presidio Graduate students Jonathan Dirrenberger, Cheryl Dorsey, Ryan Miller and Sonia O'Claire presented a "San Francisco Urban Forest Wood Re-Use Study" prepared for the San Francisco Planning Department. A presentation was given introducing the Presidio team, reporting on project scope, methodology, case studies, current state of re-use, stakeholders, urban tree end of life wood products and value, process for urban tree wood re-use, gross and net system

greenhouse gas emissions, best options, demand and financial value, recommendations, and barriers to implementation. Council Members Ginsburg and Short provided input and held a discussion.

7. Election of Urban Forestry Council Chair and Vice Chair. (Discussion and Action)

Upon Motion by Member Leffingwell, second by Member Hillson Member Flanagan was elected as Chair and Member Short was elected as Vice Chair (AYES: Members Flanagan, Short, Hillan, Hillson, Kida, Leffingwell, Sullivan and Swae; Absent: Members Most and Sherwin).

8. Review and Approval of Urban Forestry Council Letterhead. (Explanatory Document: Draft Letterhead) (Discussion and Action)

Council Members held a discussion about including Council seats and professional expertise on the letterhead.

Public Comment: Ms. Nancy Wuerfel stated that the title of the Recreation and Park Department should be singular for "Park" instead of "Parks" as outlined in the City Charter and Commission Bylaws. Member Ginsburg reported that the use of either the singular or plural version is correct. Ms. Wuerfel stated that the body of the letterhead should be blank and not in memo format so as not to preclude other types of correspondence. She suggested that black and white ink be used instead of color in order to conserve printer ink.

Upon Motion by Member Short, second by Member Leffingwell, the Urban Forestry Council letterhead was approved with amendments to add seat positions and member's professional expertise as room allows on the letterhead. (AYES: Members Flanagan, Short, Hillan, Hillson, Kida, Leffingwell, Sullivan, and Swae; Absent: Members Most and Sherwin).

9. Review and Approval of the 2014 Recommended Street Tree List and Draft Resolution 2014-04-UFC Approving the List. (Explanatory Documents: Draft Resolution and 2014 Recommended Street Tree Lists) (Continued from the March 28, 2014 Meeting) (Discussion and Action)

Council Coordinator Hui presented two versions of the Recommended Street Tree List, a simple version and a version with descriptions. Upon Motion by Chair Flanagan, second by Member Kida, the Resolution adopting the 2014 Recommended Street Tree Lists was approved with amendments to the Resolution and Street Tree Lists (AYES: Members Flanagan, Short, Hillan, Hillson, Kida, Leffingwell, Sullivan, and Swae; Absent: Members Most and Sherwin).

Member Swae left the meeting at 10:20 A.M.

10. Committee Reports: (Informational Reports and Discussion)

Planning & Policy Committee. Chair's Report. Planning Committee Chair Sullivan reported that the Committee has been working on presentations to the Council on Best Management Practices to educate the Council on urban forestry issues facing the City and ongoing significant City projects that have an impact on the urban forest. Council Members were asked to provide information on projects they would be interested in discussing at future meetings.

Funding Committee. Chair's Report. Council Coordinator Mei Ling Hui reported that the Funding Committee is interested in sending a Council representative to upcoming Board of

Supervisors budget meetings to advocate for forestry funding and to City departments that provide funding for the Urban Forestry Council.

Landmark Tree Ad Hoc Committee. Chair's Report. Committee Chair Hillson reported that the Committee has been discussing landmark tree markers and penalties for violations. Coordinator Hui reported that two new landmark tree nominations had been received.

11. **Staff Report.** (Informational Report and Discussion) There was no staff report issued at this time.
12. **Chair's Announcements:** Chair, Urban Forestry Council (Information and Discussion) Council Members were asked to report back on their ability to attend a special Friday July 25, 2014 Council meeting in place of the August meeting.
13. **Urban Forestry Council Member Announcements.** (Information and Discussion) Member Barrow announced his retirement from the City and County of San Francisco and membership from the Council, and that this would be his last Council meeting.
14. **New Business/Future Agenda Items.** (Information and Discussion) There was no new business or future agenda items discussed at this time.
15. **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.

Mr. Frank Mason reported that there had been two large trees planted at 1748 and 1740 Church Street, and that the tree at 1748 Church Street had been removed because it was too close to the intersection and should not have been planted there. He spoke of his frustration with the cost involved in removing the curb ramp and replacing the concrete. Mr. Mason spoke of his concern that the remaining tree at 1740 Church is leaning over the overhead wires for the J Church Muni line and may fall into the overhead wires, similar to what happened at Cesar Chavez and Church Streets that had disrupted service. Mr. Mason suggested that the Urban Forest Plan should include projected costs that the Plan would incur over the next twenty years.

16. **Adjournment.** The Urban Forestry Council meeting adjourned at 10:33 a.m.

The next meeting of the Urban Forestry Council is scheduled for Tuesday, June 24, 2014 at 6:00 p.m., Room 416, San Francisco City Hall.

Copies of explanatory documents are available to the public at (1) the Department of Environment, 1455 Market Street, Suite 1200, San Francisco, California 94103 between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. Photo identification is required for access to the building; (2) upon request to the Council Secretary at the above address or telephone number 415-355-3709 or via e-mail at Monica.Fish@sfgov.org within three business days of a meeting. Explanatory documents may also be available at the Council's meeting or agenda website <http://www.sfenvironment.org/about/taskforce/urban-forestry-council/agendas> as attachments with each agenda or meeting minutes. Meeting audios can be accessed at the following weblink <https://sites.google.com/a/sfenvironment.org/commission/urban-forestry-council/urban-forestry-council-and-committee-meeting-audios>.

Landmark Tree Criteria:

2. Ecological

4. Aesthetic

Wildlife/Ecology

Aesthetics

The sequoia at 3066 Market Street, a rare tree, for a San Francisco neighborhood, is notable in its size and impressive in its setting. It is a prominent landscape feature. It is visible from some distance. This tree was a very early planting for the area and has been appreciated for years.

There is much wildlife in the tree. Over time, one can see and hear a variety of birds, squirrels, etc. It is obvious that wildlife is depending on the tree for a microenvironment.

This tree should be judged on its merits: rarity, physical attributes, historical association, environmental, and cultural characteristics. It possesses all of these landmarkable qualities.

Why are there only twenty trees in the city landmarked since the passage of the ordinance and none of the twenty are sequoias? A living tree is certainly worth a dozen in the filing cabinet. This sequoia is sound, attractive, non-threatening and an asset to the property and is deserving of landmark status.


Wild Life seen in the sequoia.



American Robin




Blue Jay



Anna's Hummingbird




Snowy Egret



Northern Mockingbird



Red-shouldered Hawk



European Starling



Mourning Dove



Raven (pair)

Landmark Tree Criteria: 2. Ecology

**ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS
SEQUIADENDRON GIGANTEUM
3066 MARKET STREET
SAN FRANCISCO**

Using itreetool.org technology, a state-of-the-art, peer-reviewed software suite from the USDA Forest Service providing urban and community forestry analysis and benefits assessment tools, the sequoia at 3066 Market Street provides many benefits to the environment, one of the five criteria for consideration for landmarking status.

Air pollution is a serious health threat. The urban forest can mitigate the health effects of pollution by absorbing pollutants. Please view the total air quality benefits on page 2.


Over the next 99 years, the sequoia at 3066 Market will reduce atmospheric dioxide by a total amount of 28,169 pounds. See page 3.

Over the next 99 years, the sequoia at 3066 Market will intercept a total of 613,891 gallons of storm water. See page 4.

If the sequoia is cared for, the sequoia at 3066 Market will provide a total of \$5,236 worth of overall benefits over the next 99 years. These benefits are well documented, other difficult to quantify (human and social health). See page 5.

For a given year, the energy savings produced by the sequoia of 49" in diameter at this address are 54 kWh and 8.7 therms. See page 6.

Help Save the Mid-block Giant Sequoia
Please support this tree's protection



On February 11, 2014, Supervisor Scott Wiener introduced a Notice of Intent to Landmark the sequoia tree in the rear yard of 3066 Market Street, at the middle of block 2656 (Corbett/Market/Hattie/Danvers) at the request of neighbors and members of *Corbett Heights Neighbors* (CHN). A developer who began the remodeling in 2011 agreed to retain the tree as an agreement with neighbors and members of CHN, and it is shown as being retained in the approved plans/permit. The building went into foreclosure in January 2014. The developer who purchased the house for resale wants to cut down this tree. The house has been vacant and partially completed for 2 ½ years.

Temporary protections are in place with the passage of the Notice of Intent to Landmark. It cannot be harmed or cut down until a series of hearings have been held. The Landmark Tree Committee, Forestry Council Commission, and eventually the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor will make the final determination. A hearing before the Landmark Tree Committee is tentatively scheduled for April 3, 2014. Landmark status is not assured. Neighborhood support is needed to help ensure its passage.

Landmarked trees are very special. Trees are evaluated individually using a set of criteria that includes the tree's **rarity** as well as its **ecological, historical, social, or aesthetic** contributions to San Francisco's landscape. Due to their exceptional contributions, those deemed the best trees receive the highest level of protection afforded to San Francisco trees. In order to prevent the senseless loss of this beautiful and substantial tree, which has taken many decades to reach its current stature, we ask for your support. **Please sign below indicating, by your signature, that you support this tree's protection.**

Name	Address	Contact: Email/Phone
See attached three (3) pages with 96 signatures.	Redacted. On file.	Redacted. On file.

Name	David Hour
Name	Nicole Bengivero
Name	Joan Murray
Name	ROBERT Emmons
Name	Terry Hanes
Name	Raelynn
Name	Richard Johnson
Name	Roscoe Mapps
Name	Bill Purcell
Name	PAULA MARCHELLO Paula Marchello

Name	Camille Davis
Name	Gabriel Loguiano
Name	Mitchell L. Perilla Mr. Bill
Name	Jason Totzke Jason Totzke
Name	Stacy Moore
Name	Lucinda Walstad
Name	Jakob Roth
Name	Lucy Nellison
Name	Jannemarie Roth
Name	RALPH J. STEINBERG

Name	NICOLAS SAU TH
Name	BARDWIN ROD
Name	WHELAN, AMY
Name	Eleanor Morton
Name	GREGORY BROUSE
Name	Dirk Aguilar
Name	Michael Suchovick
Name	MARY LAY HENRY
Name	STEPHEN ELMORE
Name	Deb Nelson
	①

Name
NINA A. MITINA
Nina A. Mitina

Name
ZOFIA MITINA
Zofia Mitina

Name
EKATERINA
SUKHAROV
Ekaterina Sukharov

Name
KONSTANTIN
SUKHAROV
Konstantin Sukharov

Name
Andrew

Name
Charlie So

Name
DAN JAMES WILSON
Dan James Wilson

JASON CUCUMADI

Name
Beau

Name
John Diesel

Name
PANOS
KOUTSOMAKIS

Name
Kearsten Krehbiel

Name
Leslie Koelch
Cand Koelch
TAMM KOELSCH
John Koelch

Name
Cande Neilson
David NELSON
Josh Elmore

Name
LYLE V. FREDRICKSON
Lyle V. Fredrickson

Name
Marlene
Goldman

Name
Lisa and Caroline
Sternman

Name
Psalm
Crane

Name
Christian Jurinka

Name
JANICE T. LOW

Name
Samuel
Milla

Name
Shana
Ong

Name
Lui (Linda)

Name
Marilyn Chism

Name
Patrick Keldner

Name
Ton-Yun Fang

Name
BRUCE K. LODIGER

Name
Joy Berry

Name
Richard I. Klein
RICHARD I. KLEIN

Name
Janice T. Low
JANICE T. LOW

Name
Susan Greenwood
M. J. Cox

Name
Jacob Shogren
Jacole Shogren

Name
GARY ROBERTSON
[Signature]

Name
Ted [Signature]
TED TERPIL

Name
[Signature]

Name
Brady Lawrence ^A

Name
DENISE BELLOZZI
KRISTINA OLSON

Name
Susan Detwiler
Susan Detwiler

Name
Todd Huss
[Signature]

Name
Anya Mastina
[Signature]

Name
Marilyn Whalen

Name
Jeri T. Cautin

Name
John A. Hamel

Name
Jack Whalen

Name
Erika Whalen

Name
Mick Whalen

Name
Jack Keating
[Signature]

Name
grace gellerman
GRACE GELLERMAN

Name
MARK RYSER
[Signature]

Name
Loyce Roschinger

Name
Jerry James Hill
GERRY JAMES HILL

Name
Sharon White
Sharon White

Name
James C. White
James C. White

Name
BEN FROM BEN
JESSICA FROM BEN

Name
DONTEL
Freenom

Name
ELISA
EIFFER

Name
Bradley
Charbonneau

Name
Gary Weiss

Name
BIRGIT CHASE

Name
CHUCK
STILL

Name
Lary Peiper



EVNA
PO Box 14137
San Francisco, CA 94114
www.evna.org
Board@EVNA.org
EVNA, a 501 (C)(4) Non-profit,
Tax ID: 51-0141022
Eureka Valley Foundation,
a 501(C)(3) Non-profit,
Tax ID: 26-0631195

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Alan Beach-Nelson
President
Castro Street
Rob Cox
Secretary
Hartford Street
Gary Weiss
Treasurer
IXIA

COMMITTEE CHAIRS

James Kelm
Newsletter & Social Media
Castro Village Wine Co.
Jack Keating (Ex-Officio)
Planning & Land Use
17th Street
Aaron Seivertson
Quality of Life
Hartford Street
Mark McHale
Social
Vanguard Properties
Orie Zaklad
Technology & Marketing
Collingwood Street

DIRECTORS:

Patrick Crogan
Market Street
Tim Eicher
Q Bar
Mary Edna Harrell
Castro Street
Loïc Olichon
18th Street

EX OFFICIO DIRECTORS:

Steve Clark Hall
Webmaster
19th Street
Judith Hoyem
Emeritus
17th Street

CASTRO/EUREKA VALLEY NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

The neighborhood association for the Castro, Upper Market and all of Eureka Valley since 1878

April 17, 2014

San Francisco Urban Forestry Council
Landmark Tree Committee
1455 Market Street, Suite 1200
San Francisco, CA 94103
c/o Mei Ling Hui, Urban Forest and Urban Agriculture Coordinator

Via email: monica.fish@sfgov.org; meiling.hui@sfgov.org

Re: Sequoiadendron giganteum at 3066 Market Street, San Francisco

Dear San Francisco Urban Forestry Council and Landmark Tree Committee:

Castro/Eureka Valley Neighborhood Association joins Corbett Heights Neighbors in support Supervisor Scott Wiener's nomination and the April 1, 2014 Board of Supervisor's resolution of intent initiating the nomination of the Sequoiadendron giganteum tree at 3066 Market Street for landmark tree status pursuant to Public Works Code, Section 810(b).

According to *San Francisco Resource Analysis of Inventoried Public Trees* (April 2013), the benefits of trees include energy savings, air quality improvements, storm water intervention, atmospheric CO₂ reduction, and aesthetic contributions to the social and economic health of the community. This tree not only has these numerous benefits; over ninety Corbett Heights Neighbors have signed a petition in support of the Landmark tree designation.

In addition to the qualities the tree exhibits, retention of this tree is part of an agreement made in 2011 between CHN and the then-contractor who had purchased 3066 Market for remodel and resale. In a negotiation with CHN and the immediate neighbors, he agreed to retain the tree and neighbors agreed to support and assist in the building permit application. CHN carried out its commitments at that time. It is these permits under which the present contractor owner is proceeding to complete the work left unfinished by the prior contractor.

Members of the C/EVNA Planning and Land Use Committee support the nomination.

Very truly yours,

Alan Beach-Nelson
President

About EVNA:

Castro/ Eureka Valley Neighborhood Association (EVNA) is the oldest continuously operating Neighborhood Association in San Francisco established as Eureka Valley Promotion Association in 1878. For 135 years, our members have been working to make this neighborhood a great place to live, work and play. Today, we strive to preserve the unique character of our diverse neighborhood while maintaining a balance between prospering businesses and residential livability.

Landmark Tree Criteria:

1. Rarity

California designated the redwood as the official state tree in 1937 (the coast redwood: *Sequoia sempervirens*, and the giant sequoia: *Sequoia gigantea*).

In the mid - 1700's, original coast redwoods covered nearly 2 million acres. Since then 96 percent of that magnificent old growth forest has been harvested - just 4 percent remains today for us to protect. Over 95% of the remaining old forest is under the protection of parks and reserves: 257,000 acres in California parks and another 125,000 acres on public land (in both, harvesting of redwood trees is prohibited).

There are currently no giant sequoia trees designated as San Francisco landmark trees. Of the approximately 200 San Francisco landmark trees, 165 are palms, and only 35 are broad-leaf or conifer species. Only 8 trees are native to California.

Landmark Tree Criteria:

- 3. Historical Contributions**
- 4. Social Contributions.**

**HISTORY OF THE SEQUIADENDRON GIGANTEUM
at 3066 Market Street, San Francisco**

Information provided by Leslie A. Koelsch, San Francisco, CA.

- **1969-1999**
3066 Market Street was owned by Abraham and Myrrha Steinberg from 1969 to 1998, both retired artists from New York. Their only son, Ralph J. Steinberg of Santa Cruz, provides the following information about the tree (email on February 27, 2014).

Dear Leslie and John,

My deceased parents purchased 3066 Market Street, San Francisco in approximately 1969 after they both retired. They sold their house in New York State and moved to San Francisco to be closer to their only child, their five grandchildren and me. At the time, my wife and I were living in Campbell and I was a lawyer in a general practice in San Jose.

Both my parents were artists. They were attracted to the old house at 3066 Market because of its Edwardian charm. The house featured both a front yard and a back yard, which was unusual because most of the houses between it and Castro Street had no front yards. The front yard had a brick path to the downstairs entryway, a brick retainer wall with a low black wrought iron gate and fence, including a small fountain. There were trees, ivy, shrubbery, and vines in the front yard, all of which presented a pastoral appearance, also unusual in the middle of a city and on a busy street.

In the backyard, there was also a sequoia tree, which I estimate to be about 15 to 20 feet in height at that time.

Over the years since, the tree grew to a great height, and is now a majestic tree that uniquely affords privacy to the backyard and house at 3066 but also to the backyard of the house behind it at 197 Corbett Ave.

My parents lived at 3066 Market Street for about 27 years. My father died in 1996 and we were forced to sell the house in about 1998 so I could move my mother to Santa Cruz to live closer to me as she was in her late eighties.

Over the years that my parents lived at 3066 Market, my wife and I and our 5 children frequently visited them.

When I informed my daughter Rebecca on February 26, that there was a danger that the sequoia tree in the backyard would be demolished, she emailed me immediately with the following response:

"That tree is such a part of the S.F. Neighborhood. It always amazed me with its greatness--size and shade it provided. Myrrh (my grandmother) & Pop's (my grandfather) backyard always felt like a forest to me because of the tree. It would be very sad if it were removed."

I share that view. Over the years the tree has become a landmark, which gives the surrounding neighborhood a distinctive character as well as affording privacy for the adjacent landowners. It provides a "forest" feeling in the middle of this urban setting. If it is cut down it will leave a bare void filled in by buildings, but no longer by nature. The character of an old S.F. neighborhood will be eroded to make way for modernity. And in the process S.F. will come a step closer to losing its unique identity that makes the City so special for all its citizens.

Very truly yours,


*Ralph J. Steinberg
Santa Cruz, Ca. 95062*

- **1948-1958**
Prior to the Steinbergs, Hazel "Honey" Adams Causley (1895-1980) lived at 3066 Market from 1948 to 1958. Veronica Tofflemire, a descendant of Hazel states the following;

Veronica Tofflemire (email on April 12, 2014)

I just talked with my 93 year-old aunt with the following information. My Aunt Honey met and married Charles Causley after moving to San Francisco. The house may follow his family (which I'm not familiar with) Honey's youngest brother, Sylvan Daryl Adams (1909-2005?)...worked in some field of forestry. He gave my grandmother, Alice, (Honey's sister) three Sequoias in gallon buckets that he brought her from the Yosemite area. She remembers Uncle Daryl taking some to Honey as well. This would be in the late 40's to early 50's. My aunt thinks one remains where my grandmother lived in Stonyford, CA and is 60-70 ft tall.

ADAMS, S. Daryl. Passed away at the age of 95 in Santa Rosa on July 25, 2005. Survived by Carolyn, his beloved wife of 66 years. He was proud of being a native Californian, raised in Stonyford, Colusa County, and was a graduate of the University of California at Berkeley, Class of 1933. He worked for the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Entomology from 1930-1967, with time out to enlist in the U.S. Navy and teach navigation during World War II. He retired from the Naval Reserve as a commander. In 1968 he settled in Santa Rosa, where he loved looking at the hills and trees every day. At his request, there will be no services. DANIELS CHAPEL OF THE ROSES FUNERAL & CREMATION SERVICES. 707-525-



3730. Published Online in the Press Democrat on July 27, 2005

*Sources: Ancestry.com; San Francisco City Directories, 1947-on, Press Democrat, 2005
lak 4-12-2014*



Hazel "Honey" Adams Causley and her grandson, Howard W. Pinkard, 1956



Hazel "Honey" Adams Causley



Myrrha Steinberg in her eighties painted by her son, Ralph Joachim Steinberg

Landmark Tree Criteria:

3. Historical Contributions

4. Social Contributions.

**HISTORY OF THE SEQUIADENDRON GIGANTEUM
at 3066 Market Street, San Francisco**

Information provided by Leslie A. Koelsch, San Francisco, CA.

- **1969-1999**

3066 Market Street was owned by Abraham and Myrrha Steinberg from 1969 to 1998, both retired artists from New York. Their only son, Ralph J. Steinberg of Santa Cruz, provides the following information about the tree (email on February 27, 2014).

Dear Leslie and John,

My deceased parents purchased 3066 Market Street, San Francisco in approximately 1969 after they both retired. They sold their house in New York State and moved to San Francisco to be closer to their only child, their five grandchildren and me. At the time, my wife and I were living in Campbell and I was a lawyer in a general practice in San Jose.

Both my parents were artists. They were attracted to the old house at 3066 Market because of its Edwardian charm. The house featured both a front yard and a back yard, which was unusual because most of the houses between it and Castro Street had no front yards. The front yard had a brick path to the downstairs entryway, a brick retainer wall with a low black wrought iron gate and fence, including a small fountain. There were trees, ivy, shrubbery, and vines in the front yard, all of which presented a pastoral appearance, also unusual in the middle of a city and on a busy street.

In the backyard, there was also a sequoia tree, which I estimate to be about 15 to 20 feet in height at that time.

Over the years since, the tree grew to a great height, and is now a majestic tree that uniquely affords privacy to the backyard and house at 3066 but also to the backyard of the house behind it at 197 Corbett Ave.

My parents lived at 3066 Market Street for about 27 years. My father died in 1996 and we were forced to sell the house in about 1998 so I could move my mother to Santa Cruz to live closer to me as she was in her late eighties.

Over the years that my parents lived at 3066 Market, my wife and I and our 5 children frequently visited them.

When I informed my daughter Rebecca on February 26, that there was a danger that the sequoia tree in the backyard would be demolished, she emailed me immediately with the following response:

"That tree is such a part of the S.F. Neighborhood. It always amazed me with its greatness--size and shade it provided. Myrrh (my grandmother) & Pop's (my grandfather) backyard always felt like a forest to me because of the tree. It would be very sad if it were removed."

I share that view. Over the years the tree has become a landmark, which gives the surrounding neighborhood a distinctive character as well as affording privacy for the adjacent landowners. It provides a "forest" feeling in the middle of this urban setting. If it is cut down it will leave a bare void filled in by buildings, but no longer by nature. The character of an old S.F. neighborhood will be eroded to make way for modernity. And in the process S.F. will come a step closer to losing its unique identity that makes the City so special for all its citizens.

Very truly yours,


*Ralph J. Steinberg
Santa Cruz, Ca. 95062*

- **1948-1958**
Prior to the Steinbergs, Hazel "Honey" Adams Causley (1895-1980) lived at 3066 Market from 1948 to 1958. Veronica Tofflemire, a descendant of Hazel states the following;

Veronica Tofflemire (email on April 12, 2014)

I just talked with my 93 year-old aunt with the following information. My Aunt Honey met and married Charles Causley after moving to San Francisco. The house may follow his family (which I'm not familiar with) Honey's youngest brother, Sylvan Daryl Adams (1909-2005?)...worked in some field of forestry. He gave my grandmother, Alice, (Honey's sister) three Sequoias in gallon buckets that he brought her from the Yosemite area. She remembers Uncle Daryl taking some to Honey as well. This would be in the late 40's to early 50's. My aunt thinks one remains where my grandmother lived in Stonyford, CA and is 60-70 ft tall.

ADAMS, S. Daryl. Passed away at the age of 95 in Santa Rosa on July 25, 2005. Survived by Carolyn, his beloved wife of 66 years. He was proud of being a native Californian, raised in Stonyford, Colusa County, and was a graduate of the University of California at Berkeley, Class of 1933. He worked for the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Entomology from 1930-1967, with time out to enlist in the U.S. Navy and teach navigation during World War II. He retired from the Naval Reserve as a commander. In 1968 he settled in Santa Rosa, where he loved looking at the hills and trees every day. At his request, there will be no services. DANIELS CHAPEL OF THE ROSES FUNERAL & CREMATION SERVICES. 707-525-



3730. Published Online in the Press Democrat on July 27, 2005

*Sources: Ancestry.com; San Francisco City Directories, 1947-on, Press Democrat, 2005
lak 4-12-2014*



Hazel "Honey" Adams Causley and her grandson, Howard W. Pinkard, 1956



Hazel "Honey" Adams Causley



Myrrha Steinberg in her eighties painted by her son, Ralph Joachim Steinberg

Summary of Arborist's Report 3066 Market Street Sequoia

CHN contracted with consulting arborist Torrey Young. This nine-page report was presented by Mr. Young at the May 1st Landmark Tree Committee hearing and can be found in your packet.

Mr. Young found the tree to be vigorous, with a dense canopy of good color and free of significant insects or diseases. The tree has been pruned, and was otherwise substantially free of dead branches or foliage. The architecture of the canopy is uniform and well balanced, with no obvious structural weaknesses. The tree displays a moderate lean of the upper trunk to the east, of approximately 16 degrees from vertical, as a natural response to competition from an adjacent gum tree or Eucalyptus tree removed in 2003. There is significant response growth in the lower trunk, produced as a natural adaptive response to the stress of supporting the upper trunk and canopy and the accompanying lean. It can be anticipated that additional adaption will occur.

This tree provides screening and aesthetics to multiple properties and the surrounding neighborhood. Its location at the northeast corner of the property minimizes shading and space domination. The natural litter shed is beneficial to a garden, and a common component of garden amendments (e.g., compost, mulch, soils). Mr. Young observed a healthy tree with no inordinate risk of whole-tree failure or failure of significant limbs.

Giant sequoia trees have a long history of reverence and celebration, not only in their native range but throughout the country and the world. The history of the species dates to prehistoric times, with specimens several thousand years old still thriving in California. The following are elements that support this specimen and the species as rare, aged and of historical significance.

- There are currently no giant sequoia trees designated as San Francisco Landmark Trees.
- There are few designated Landmark Trees in the vicinity, with the four closest at distances of 1-1.5 miles away.
- Of the approximately 200 S.F. Landmarks trees, about 165 are palms, and only 35 are of broad-leaf or conifer species. Only 8 trees are native to California. Giant sequoia is a native, California tree.

CHN supports its landmarking! See full report.

Dryad, LLC

14010-10217

April 15, 2014

Corbett Heights Neighbors
C/O Gary Weiss, President
78 Mars Street
San Francisco CA 94114

RE.: Evaluation and S.F. Landmark Tree application.
Site: 3066 Market St., San Francisco, CA.

Corbett Heights Neighbors, et al.;

I am writing in response to your request for a report of my findings relative to my recent inspection of a single giant Sequoia tree (*Sequoiadendron giganteum*) and site, located at 3066 Market St. in San Francisco, and review of a variety of images and documents. I have been contracted by the Corbett Heights Neighbors. My assignment is to 1) evaluate the condition of the tree, within the limitations to my inspection¹, 2) review a related Arborist Report developed by Mr. Roy Leggitt². And 3) review and comment on the application for Landmark Tree status³ by San Francisco Supervisor Scott Wiener.

I inspected and photographed the tree on April 12, 2014. I also met with Corbett Heights Neighbors (CHN) board members Leslie Koelsch and Mark Ryser, and CHN member John Koelsch. My inspection consisted solely of a visual inspection from the ground and deck of 197 Corbett Ave. Access to 3066 Market St. was not available to me. I also reviewed the following images and documents provided by the clients (CHN), or downloaded from the S.F. Urban Forest Council web pages.

- 23 images of the subject tree and locale proved by CHN
- City of San Francisco Public Works Code, Article 16, Section 810. LANDMARK TREES.
- Landmark Tree Nomination Form, completed by Supervisor Scott Wiener (undated, unsigned)
- Arborist Report, addressed to Maven Investments, dated 4/2/14 and signed by Roy C. Leggitt of Tree Management Experts.
- Landmark Trees of San Francisco via GoogleMaps
- List of Landmarked Trees (2)
- A Petition entitled "Help Save the Mid-block Giant Sequoia" (unsigned version)
- Various information accessible via the S.F. Urban Forest Council web pages
- A history of the tree and property owners provided by Leslie Koelsch (CHN).

SUMMARY: The tree appeared vigorous, with a dense canopy of good color and free of significant insects or disease¹. The tree has been pruned, and was otherwise substantially free of dead branches or foliage. The architecture of the canopy is uniform and well-balanced, with no obvious structural weaknesses. The tree displays a moderate lean of the upper trunk to the east, of approximately 16 degrees⁴ from vertical (refer to images pg. 4), as a natural response to competition from an adjacent gum tree (*Eucalyptus* sp.) removed in 2004.

This tree provides screening and aesthetics to multiple properties and the surrounding neighborhood. Its location at the northeast corner of the property (3066 Market St.) minimizes shading and space domination. The natural litter shed is beneficial to a garden, and a common component of garden amendments (e.g., compost, mulch, soils).

I observed nothing suggesting the tree is at inordinate risk⁵ of whole-tree failure or failure of significant limbs⁶. There is no disagreement as to the condition of the tree between the Consulting Arborist reports of Torrey Young and Roy Leggitt². This tree is a revered species of exceptional longevity, and of significant value to the property on which it stands, and the community as a whole.

Dryad, LLC

35570 Palomares Rd.
Castro Valley CA 94552

PHONE (877) 206-4001
FAX (510) 538-6001
E-MAIL tyoung@dryad.us

OBSERVATIONS:

- Genus/species: giant Sequoia (*Sequoiadendron giganteum*).
- Diameter: 42 inches⁷ at 54" above grade (dbh⁸)
- Height: 53 feet⁹
- Canopy¹⁰: 21 feet diameter⁷ (widest point)
- Foliage: dense, vigorous twig growth, excellent, deep green color.
- Trunk deviation from perpendicular¹¹: upper trunk - 16 degrees; lower trunk – 0 degrees.
- Response growth¹²: significant response growth was apparent on the lower trunk and in buttressing at the tree base.
- Taper¹³: Significant taper to the trunk. The tree is extremely stout for its height.
- Architecture¹⁴: The canopy is very uniform and well balanced, with a live-crown ratio of approximately 60%¹⁵.
- Root crown¹⁶: the root crown region appeared undisturbed, and to be at the original slope.
- I observed no significant insect or disease issues. Minor flagging could be a result of *Botryosphaeria* spp.¹⁷
- Pruning: Recent pruning was apparent, as well as past maintenance pruning.
- Recent construction on the property, including grading, was apparent adjacent to this tree. It appeared the construction activities were at significant distance from this tree and unlikely to have had significant impact.

DISCUSSION:

Condition: The tree generally appears to be vigorous, and I observed no conditions that warranted concern¹. The most obvious anomaly of this tree is the lean of the trunk to the east. The lower trunk is perpendicular for several feet above grade. This lean appears to be a natural phototropic¹⁸ response to competition for sunlight from an adjacent gum tree (*Eucalyptus* sp.) removed in 2004 (as reported by CHN). I observed no apparent lifting, cracking of the soil, or significant grade changes in the vicinity of the base of the tree.

There is significant response growth¹² in the lower trunk, produced as a natural adaptive response to the stress of supporting the upper trunk and canopy and the accompanying lean. As the competing gum tree was removed, it can be anticipated that additional adaption will occur.



Landmark Tree application: Giant sequoia trees have a long history of reverence and celebration, not only in their native range but throughout the country and the world. The history of the species dates to prehistoric times, with specimens several thousand years old still thriving in California. The following are elements that support this specimen and the species as rare, aged and of historical significance.

1. The largest recorded tree on earth is a Giant sequoia (General Sherman).
2. The oldest recorded giant sequoia is over 3,500 years old.
3. The species is planted all over the world, but the remaining native range is limited to approximately 35,000 acres in a narrow belt of the western Sierras (5,000-7,000 ft. alt.).
4. There are currently no giant sequoia trees designated as San Francisco Landmark Trees.
5. There are few designated Landmark Trees in the vicinity, with the four closest at distances of 1-1.5 miles away¹⁹.
6. Of the approximately 200 S.F. Landmarks trees, about 165 are palms, and only 35 are of broad-leaf or conifer species²⁰. Only 8 trees are native to California. Giant sequoia is a native, California tree.

Arborist Report by R. Leggitt²: There is no disagreement as to the favorable condition of the tree between the Consulting Arborist reports of Torrey Young and Roy Leggitt. Specific areas of disagreement:

1. Conclusions (R. Leggitt, pg 2): The opinion expressed as to the suitability of this tree for Landmark Status is not a conclusion, but an opinion, and one to be rendered by the S.F. Landmark Tree Committee and Urban Forestry Council.
2. Species rareness, historical and cultural importance²¹: R. Leggitt describes the species as "...uncommon... but not rare" (pg. 2). I suggest that the species is unusual in many ways, limited in natural range, with a rich history and a California native species celebrated around the world.


April 18, 2014
Dryad, LLC
14010-10217 Corbett Heights Neighbors





Dryad, LLC

35570 Palomares Rd.
Castro Valley CA 94552

PHONE (877) 206-4001
FAX (510) 538-6001
E-MAIL tyoung@dryad.us



View from residence at 3066 Market St. Images excerpted and merged from the Arborist Report to Maven Investments, dated 4/2/14, by Roy C. Leggitt.



Images illustrating the phototropic lean to the south of approximately 16° from vertical (GeoCam for Android, v4.34, Wazar). Image date 04/12/2014.




Images illustrating the perpendicular stance of the lower trunk, and 16° lean above. Also illustrates trunk taper, buttressing, response growth and tree location. Images provided by client (CHN); image date reported as 02/2014.



Images illustrating condition of root crown region:
Brackets indicate areas of obvious response growth¹².

- Upper left: view south.
- Upper right: view southeast.
- Lower left: view east.
- Lower right: view north (Image provided by client; image date reported as 02/2014).



April 18, 2014
Dryad, LLC
14010-10217 Corbett Heights Neighbors



Images illustrating the vigorous, dense and generally excellent condition of foliage.



Dryad, LLC

35570 Palomares Rd.
Castro Valley CA 94552


PHONE (877) 206-4001
FAX (510) 538-6001
E-MAIL tyoung@dryad.us

April 18, 2014
Dryad, LLC
14010-10217 Corbett Heights Neighbors

This species, as the largest species in the world, can eventually achieve tremendous size. Therefore it is inevitable that it will outgrow its location. However, growth rate for the species is typically moderate, and I observed no evidence that suggests this tree cannot thrive in this location for generations.

Please feel free to contact me for further discussion.

Respectfully,


Torrey Young
Registered Consulting Arborist®



ASCA Registered Consulting Arborist® No. 282
ISA Board Certified Master Arborist No. WE-0131BM
CUFC Certified Urban Forester No. 121
ISA Tree Risk Assessment Qualified
CA P.C. Qualified License No.: 104772
CA Contractors License No. 363372 (C-27 & D-49; inactive)



¹ Inspection limitations: The inspection of this tree consisted solely of a visual inspection from the ground and deck of 197 Corbett Ave. Access to 3066 Market St. was not made available to me. While more thorough techniques are available for inspection and evaluation, they were neither requested nor considered necessary or appropriate at this time.

² I obtained a copy of a document online, entitled Arborist Report, addressed to Maven Investments, dated 4/2/14 and signed by Roy C. Leggitt of Tree Management Experts. Source: <http://www.sfenvironment.org/about/taskforce/urban-forestry-council/agendas/may-1-2014-landmark-tree-ad-hoc-committee-meeting-special-meeting-agenda>

³ City of San Francisco Public Works Code, Article 16, Section 810. LANDMARK TREES.

⁴ As determined and recorded with the software GeoCam for Android, v4.34, Wazar.

⁵ All large landscape trees in proximity to people, structures, utilities or roadways present some degree of risk regardless of their condition. Such risk must be retained in order to enjoy the benefits of such trees.

⁶ Arborist Disclosure Statement: Arborists are tree specialists who use their education, knowledge, training and experience to examine trees, recommend measures to enhance their health and beauty and to attempt to reduce the risk of living near trees. Clients may choose to accept or disregard the recommendations of the arborist or to seek additional advice. Trees and other plantlife are living, changing organisms affected by innumerable factors beyond our control. Trees fall in ways and because of conditions we do not fully understand. Arborists cannot detect or anticipate every condition or event that could possibly lead to the structural failure of a tree. Conditions are often hidden within the trees and below ground. Arborists cannot guarantee that a tree will be healthy or safe under all circumstances, for any specific period or when a tree or its parts may fail. Further, remedial treatments, as with any treatment or therapy, cannot be guaranteed. Treatment, pruning, bracing and removal of trees may involve considerations beyond the scope of the arborists skills and usual services such as the boundaries of properties, property ownership, site lines, neighbor disputes and agreements and other issues. Therefore, arborists cannot consider such issues unless complete and accurate information is disclosed in a timely fashion. Then, the arborist can be expected, reasonably, to rely upon the completeness and accuracy of the information provided. Trees can be managed but not controlled. To live near trees, regardless of their condition, is to accept some degree of risk. The only way to eliminate all risk associated with trees is to eliminate all trees.

⁷ Scaled from images against the 6' fence height. Measurements are approximate.

⁸ DBH: Diameter at Breast Height, or approximately 4.5 feet (54 inches) above grade. This expression is commonly used as a point of reference in determining tree size (synonymous with DSH, or Diameter at Standard Height).

⁹ Height measurements: measurements were taken with an OptiLogic LH400 laser rangefinder/hypsometer. The recorded height can only be estimated due to the dynamic nature of foliage at tree tops, and lack of a 100% opaque target. In this case, the height was averaged from five sets of measurements, with 6 feet added for the fence, i.e., no view of the bottom of the tree.

¹⁰ Canopy: One of several accepted terms describing that area of a tree which includes limbs, branches, foliage, and to a lesser degree, upper stems (synonymous with 'foliage crown').

¹¹ GeoCam for Android, v4.34, Wazar

¹² Response growth (reaction wood): Specialized, secondary xylem (sapwood) that forms in response to mechanical stresses on limbs and trunks. Rapid changes in stress points in vigorous trees can result in large distortions of limbs and trunks from the development of such wood. Such growth may also be characterized by extensive splitting of outer bark as new bark and wood expands. Includes compression wood, tension wood and woundwood.

¹³ Taper: (of stems & limbs) the increase in diameter towards the base of stems (trunks) and limbs that is typical and desirable in woody plants. Degree of taper is influenced by a variety of factors including foliage, limb and branch distribution, species, location (sunlight), wind patterns, pruning, etc. Insufficient taper results in a concentration of stress from movement towards the base of the limb or stem, resulting in a greatly increased potential for breakage or uprooting. Pruning that removes interior lateral branches from limbs and/or lower limbs from trunks dramatically reduces taper development.

¹⁴ Architecture: (as employed in this report) the arrangement of the (external) parts of a tree; primarily refers to the foliage crown including major (scaffold) limbs, lateral branches and trunks.

¹⁵ Live crown ratio: the ratio of live canopy height to overall tree height. In this case, canopy height = 20 feet, tree height = 53 feet (62% lcr).

¹⁶ Root Crown (root collar): One of several accepted terms describing the junction of trunk and buttress roots at the original soil grade. Synonymous terms: root collar, root flare.

¹⁷ *Botryosphaeria* spp. (*Dothiorella*; redwood blight): a canker-forming fungus commonly found on CA coast redwoods (and other species), often associated with drought or other forms of tree stress. The disease typically kills branch tips and entire branches. It is spread by free-form water (rain, fog). There is no strongly effective chemical treatment, but some advise pruning out infected parts well into healthy tissue and treating locally with a broad-spectrum insecticide. Entire-tree spraying is of no benefit.

¹⁸ Phototropic: A growth response in relation to sunlight. In trees, this response is often leaning away from competing trees or structures, and towards the most available sunlight.

¹⁹ Four closest Landmark Trees: Area landmark trees (4) 4124 23rd St. (1 mile), 1221 Stanyan St. (1 mile), 20 Rosemont Pl. (1.3 miles), 730 Dolores (1.4 miles).

²⁰ Lists (2) of Landmarked Trees, S.F. Urban Forestry Council web pages.

²¹ "Landmark trees are trees that have been designated by the Board of Supervisors as extra special. It may be due to the rareness of the species, their size or age, or extraordinary structure, or ecological contribution. In addition, historical or cultural importance can qualify a tree for Landmark Status." (S.F. Urban Forestry Council web pages)



**Torrey Young
Consulting Arborist**

LICENSES & CERTIFICATIONS:

- Registered Consulting Arborist® No. 282 (ASCA)
- Board Certified Master Arborist No. WE-0131BM (Municipal Specialist) (ISA)
- Certified Urban Forester No. 121 (CUFC)
- Tree Risk Assessment Qualified (ISA)
- P.C. Qualified License No. 104772 (CA-QAL)
- California Licensed Contractor No. 363372 (C61, D49, C-27)(inactive)



PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS:

- American Society of Consulting Arborists (ASCA) (1987)
- International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) (1978)
- Western Chapter, International Society of Arboriculture (WC ISA) (1978)
- Society of Commercial Arboriculture (ISA-Charter Member)
- Society of Municipal Arborists (ISA)
- Tree Care Industry Association (TCIA) (formerly the National Arborist Association, NAA) (1980)
- California Arborists Association (CAA) (1978)
- California Landscape Contractors Association (CLCA) (1993)
- California Urban Forests Council (CUFC)
- California Oak Foundation (COF)
- American Forests (AF)
- Pesticide Applicators Professional Association (PAPA)

EDUCATION:

- **1977-present:** Several thousand hours of horticulture related seminars, workshops and conferences, on a continuing basis (various held licenses, certifications & memberships require annual Continuing Education Credits).
- **1985-1997:** Merritt Community College Landscape Horticulture courses
 - Arboriculture
 - Plant Terminology
 - Plant Disease Identification & Control
 - Identification of CA Native Plants
 - Identification of Groundcovers
 - Plant Taxonomy
 - Drip Irrigation
 - Advanced Drip Irrigation
 - Landscape Construction
 - Landscape Design
- **1995:** Arboricultural Consulting Academy, ASCA (Graduate #00001).
- **1987:** Arboriculture II, TCIA (NAA)
- **1984:** Arboriculture I, TCIA (NAA)
- **1981:** Integrated Pest Management, John Muir Institute.
- **1970-77:** Peralta Community College District general education courses
 - Compositional English
 - Chemistry
 - Anthropology
 - Animal Biology
 - Human Relations
 - General Psychology
 - Advanced General Psychology
 - Environmental Psychology
 - Fire Science
 - Emergency Medical Technician
- **1970:** Graduated Skyline High School, Oakland, California

May 1, 2014
Dryad, LLC
CV, Torrey Young

BACKGROUND/EMPLOYMENT:

- **2004-Present:** Owner/Manager, Consulting Arborist, Dryad, LLC¹
- **2007-8:** Senior Consultant, The Care of Trees², Tree Preservation & Land Restoration Division, National
- **2005-7:** Regional Education & Development Coordinator, The Care of Trees, California
- **2004-5:** District Manager, TREESCAPES, a division of The Care of Trees³
- **1986-2004:** President, General Manager, Consulting Arborist for TREESCAPES, Inc.
- **1986:** Incorporated The Tree Co. as TREESCAPES, Inc., serving as President & General Manager.
- **1977:** Founded 'The Tree Co.', a sole proprietorship tree service.
- **1976-80:** Employed as Fire Fighter I with City of Emeryville Fire Dept.; served as Emergency Medical Technician/Rescue; Fire Fighter IV-I.
- **1972-76:** Employed with Entriken Tree Service, Piedmont, CA: entry level as Pest Control Technician; moved to Tree Maintenance crew ('72), trained as Trimmer and High Climber ('72-3), promoted to Foreman ('73-5), continued as occasional employee (Climber) through 1976.

AWARDS/COMMENDATIONS:

- **2010:** 'President's Award', Western Chapter, ISA
- **2008:** 'Award of Excellence', Western Chapter, ISA
- **2006:** 'President's Award', American Society of Consulting Arborists
- **2005:** 'Honorary Lifetime Membership', California Arborists Association, Inc.
- **2004:** 'Honorary Lifetime Membership', Western Chapter, ISA
- **2001:** 'Award of Excellence', California Arborists Association, Inc.
- **2000:** 'Award of Recognition', American Society of Consulting Arborists.
- **1998:** 'Award of Recognition', American Society of Consulting Arborists.
- **1996:** 'Award of Achievement', Western Chapter, ISA.
'Award of Appreciation', California Arborists Association, Inc.
- **1995:** 'Special Award of Appreciation', for work as WCISA Certification Committee Chair (92-95).
- **1994:** 'President's Award', California Arborists Association, Inc.

PUBLICATIONS:

- **2014:**
 1. Review Committee: International Society of Arboriculture's Best Management Practices, Tree Support Systems.
 2. Article: "Strategies for Preserving Heritage Trees", Tree Risk, a Collection of CEU Articles, (ISA; reprint).
- **2013:** Article: "Strategies for Preserving Heritage Trees", SCA Today (reprint).
- **2012:** Article: "An Introduction to Arboricultural Consulting", Arboricultural Consultant, ASCA.
- **2011:** Article: "Strategies for Preserving Heritage Trees", Arborist News, ISA.
- **2008:** Article: "Interpreting and Applying Pruning Standards for Commercial Arboriculture", Western Arborist magazine
- **2001:** Article: "Defining the Assignment", Consulting Arborist Newsletter (ASCA).
- **1999:** Article: "Interpreting and Applying Pruning Techniques", Western Arborist magazine.
- **1998:** Article: "Pruning to the Standard" Grounds Maintenance Magazine.
- **1997:**
 1. Article: "The Philosophy of Tree Pruning", Western Arborist magazine.
 2. Article: "The Philosophy of Tree Pruning (Part I)", Arbor Age magazine.
 3. Article: "The Philosophy of Tree Pruning (Part II)", Arbor Age magazine.
- **1996-7:** Monthly column "California Arborist", California Arborists Association News.

¹ Torrey Young left the employ of The Care of Trees/Davey Tree Expert Company in November of 2008, to pursue consulting full-time as Dryad, LLC.

² Hendricksen, The Care of Trees, Inc. (The Care of Trees, Inc.), became a wholly-owned subsidiary of The Davey Tree Expert Company, Inc., on June 27, 2008. Torrey Young left the employ of The Care of Trees effective 10/31/08.

³ Hendricksen, The Care of Trees, Inc. purchased the assets of TREESCAPES, Inc. on July 12, 2004. TREESCAPES, Inc. was dissolved effective 12/31/2004, with all staff becoming full-time employees of Hendricksen, The Care of Trees, Inc..

May 1, 2014
Dryad, LLC
CV, Torrey Young

- **1995:**
 1. Article: "Hydraulic Crane Use in Tree Care", Arbor Age magazine.
 2. Article: "Tree Survival Guide...Ground Level Plant Health Care" (Part II), California Landscaping magazine.
- **1994:**
 1. Article: "Arboriculture Certification Programs", CA ReLeaf Newsletter;
 2. Article: "Homeowner's Guide for Creating a High Maintenance Landscape", (humor) Western Chapter News; (reprinted: 1995, CA Landscaping magazine 1995, Tennessee Arborists' Assoc. Newsletter 1996).
 3. Article: "Tree Survival Guide...Ground Level Plant Health Care" (Part I), California Landscaping magazine.
 4. Article: "Unlicensed Contractors... How They Effect our Industry and What is Being Done About It!", Western Chapter News.

CURRENT PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES:

- Representative to the ANSI A300 Standards Committee, ASCA
- Consulting Academy Coach, ASCA
- Appraisal Advisory Group, ASCA
- Board Certified Master Arborist Test Committee, ISA
- Consulting Arborist Committee, WCISA
- CA State License Board Industry Expert (standards compliance investigations)
- CA Urban Forests Advisory Council, CAL-Fire
- Certification Emeritus Group, WCISA (Charter Member).

PREVIOUS PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES:

- President, ASCA (2004-5)
- President-elect, ASCA (2003-4)
- Board of Directors, ASCA (2 terms)
- Education Task Force, ASCA
- Consulting Academy Task Force, ASCA
- Consulting Academy Document Review Committee, ASCA.
- Certified Tree Risk Assessor No. 602 (PNW-ISA; 09/2009-02/01/2013)
- USDA Forest Service International Urban Forestry Standards Team, USDA (2010-2012)
- Strategic Plan Task Force, TCIA (previously NAA)
- Tree Care Standards Review Committee, TCIA
- Safety Committee, TCIA.
- Education & Employee Development Committee, TCIA
- Certified Arborist Exam Proctor, ISA.
- ISA Society of Municipal Arborists Standard Specifications Committee
- Tree Academy Instructor, ISA.
- Pruning Practices publication review committee, ISA
- Appraisal Committee, WC ISA
- International Arborist Certification Committee Liaison, WC ISA.
- Board of Directors, Western Chapter ISA.
- Secretary, Executive Committee, WC ISA (2006-7, 2008-9, 2009-10)
- Chairman, Certification Committee, WC ISA.
- Northern CA Exam Coordinator, Certification Committee, WC ISA.
- Certified Tree Worker Exam Coordinator, Certification Committee, WC ISA.
- Certified Tree Worker Task Force, ISA
- WC ISA Certified Tree Worker No.: 668 (6/1995-6/2001)
- Co-chairman, Commercial Arborist Committee, WC ISA.
- Consulting Arborist Committee member, WC ISA.
- Safety & Training Committee Chairman, WC ISA.

May 1, 2014
Dryad, LLC
CV, Torrey Young

- Chairman, Executive Director Task Force, WC ISA.
- Bylaws Committee Chairman, WC ISA.
- President, California Arborists Association (CAA).
- Vice-President, CAA.
- Secretary-Treasurer, CAA
- Workshop Instructor, CAA.
- Bylaws Committee Chairman, CAA.
- Standard Practices Committee member, TCIA.
- Education Committee member, TCIA.
- Chairman, Northern California Tree Trimmers Jamboree Judging Committee.
- Board of Directors, SF Bay/East Chapter CLCA.
- Chairman, Arborist Committee, SF Bay/East Chapter CLCA.
- Education Committee member, N. Bay Chapter CLCA.
- University of CA at Davis Extension Faculty (instructor) (2003-5)
- Instructor, Arboriculture, Peralta Community College District
- Instructor, Arboriculture, Diablo Valley Community College District
- Merritt College Landscape Horticulture Advisory Committee member.
- Tree Advisory Committee member, City of Oakland.
- Tree Ordinance Task Force member, City of Oakland.
- Sudden Oak Death Syndrome Task Force (Arborist Committee)

SPEAKING/TRAINING EVENTS:

- **2014:**
 1. Speaker: "Case Study – Valley Oak", California Tree Failure Report Program Annual Meeting, Palo Alto, CA.
 2. Speaker: "Reassessing our Pruning Goals & Techniques", WCISA Annual Conference, Pasadena, CA.
- **2013:**
 1. Speaker: "Assessing Fire Damage to Amenity Trees", Wildland Fire Litigation Conference, Monterey, CA
- **2012:**
 1. Speaker: "The New Standard for Tree Risk Assessment" and "Case Studies in Tree Risk Assessment", WCISA Regional Conference, Chico, CA.
 2. Speaker: "Using Extraordinary Measures to Preserve Heritage Trees", 2012 Professional Landscape Management School, Purdue University Extension Service, Evansville, IN
 3. Speaker: "Using Cabling, Bracing, and Crown Reduction to Preserve Structurally Deficient Heritage Trees", California Tree Failure Report Program 2012 S. CA Annual Meeting.
- **2011:**
 1. Speaker: "Strategies for Preserving Heritage Trees", California Tree Failure Report Program Annual Meeting, Palo Alto, CA.
 2. Instructor: "Pruning Mature Oaks", WCISA Regional Conference, Stanford, Palo Alto, CA
 3. Speaker: "Pruning Mature Trees for their Preservation", WCISA Regional Conference, Chico, CA
 4. Speaker: "Pruning Standards", WCISA Regional Conference, Santa Barbara, CA
 5. Speaker: "Tree Failures-Case Studies", WCISA Regional Conference, Santa Barbara, CA
- **2010:**
 1. Speaker: "Failure of *Pinus radiata* (Monterey pine)", California Tree Failure Report Program 2010 Annual Meeting, Palo Alto, CA.
 2. Coach at ASCA Academy, Rohnert Park, CA
 3. Speaker: "Using Extraordinary Measures to Preserve Structurally-Deficient Heritage Trees" ISA Annual Conference, Chicago, IL
 4. Speaker: "Introduction to Arboricultural Consulting": ISA Annual Conference, Chicago, IL
 5. Speaker: "Practical Management of *Armillaria*", WCISA Regional Conference, Milpitas, CA

May 1, 2014
Dryad, LLC
CV, Torrey Young

- **2009:**
 1. Speaker: "An Introduction to Arboricultural Consulting": WCISA Annual Conference, Reno, NV
 2. Speaker: "An Introduction to Arboricultural Consulting": ISA Annual Conference, Providence, RI
- **2008:**
 1. Speaker: "Using Cabling, Bracing and Crown Reduction to Preserve Structurally-Deficient Heritage Trees", California Tree Failure Report Program 2008 Annual Meeting.
 2. Speaker: "Managing Mature Trees: Pruning and Supplemental Support Systems", WCISA Annual Conference, San Jose, CA
 3. Speaker: "Using Cabling, Bracing and Crown Reduction to Preserve Structurally-Deficient Heritage Trees", Pacific-Northwest Tree Failure Report Program 2008 Annual Meeting, Vancouver, BC, Canada.
 4. Speaker: "Tree Assessment", Desert Green Horticulture Conference, Tucson, AZ.
 5. Speaker: "Standards and Specifications", WCISA Regional Conference, Carson City, NV.
 6. Speaker: "Tree Preservation", ("Using Cabling, Bracing and Crown Reduction to Preserve Structurally-Deficient Heritage Trees") Desert Green Foundation Conference, Las Vegas, NV
 7. Coach at ASCA Academy, San Diego, CA
- **2007:** Coach at ASCA Academy, Sacramento, CA
- **2006:**
 1. Instructor at Certified Arborist Exam preparation course, "Compartmentalization of Decay", Sealana & Associates (private).
 2. Speaker at WCISA Annual Conference, "Interpreting and Applying Pruning Standards for Commercial Arboriculture".
- **2005:** Coach at ASCA Academy, Chicago, IL
- **2004:**
 1. Instructor, University of CA Davis Extension Services. "A Pruning Workshop for Arborists"
 2. Speaker/Instructor at California Arborists Association, Inc. workshop entitled, "Cabling & Bracing Workshop".
- **2003:**
 1. Instructor, University of CA Davis Extension Services. "A Pruning Workshop for Arborists"
 2. Speaker at WCISA Annual Conference, "Consulting vs. Sales"
 3. Coach at ASCA Academy, Sacramento, CA
- **2002:** Coach at American Society of Consulting Arborists Consulting Academy, Chicago, IL
- **2001:** Speaker at American Society of Consulting Arborists Annual Conference "Consultants as Contractors".
- **2000:** Speaker/Instructor at California Arborists Association, Inc. workshop entitled, "Cabling & Bracing Workshop".
- **1999:**
 1. Speaker/Instructor at California Arborists Association, Inc. workshop entitled, "Tree Support Systems".
 2. Speaker/Instructor at CAA workshop, presentation entitled, "Prioritizing Residential Tree Work"
- **1998:**
 1. Speaker: WCISA Annual Conference, "Interpreting & Applying ANSI A300 & ISA Pruning Standards".
 2. Speaker: NCTL Turf and Landscape Exposition, "Interpreting and Applying Pruning Standards".
 3. Articles: Contributed to WCISA Web Site "Twenty of the Most Common Myths About Trees and Tree Care", "Pine Pitch Canker, a Serious Disease of Pines in California", "Selecting a Contractor"
- **1997:**
 1. Instructor, Hayward Parks District class, "Philosophy of Tree Pruning".
 2. Instructor, Arboriculture (semester class), Diablo Valley College District.
 3. Instructor for Certified Tree Worker training session, by contract, for the Arizona Community Tree Council.
 4. Coordinator and instructor for series of 3 Tree Worker training sessions, by contract, for the WC ISA.
 5. Conducted Training Seminar for East Bay Municipal Utility District maintenance personnel entitled "Winch Types, Operation and Techniques".
- **1996:**
 1. Organizer, Speaker, Trainer, Exam Judge for 3-day study session/exam for WC ISA Certified Tree Worker program.

May 1, 2014
Dryad, LLC
CV, Torrey Young

2. Speaker at WC ISA Regional Meeting, with two presentations entitled 'Philosophy of Tree Pruning' & 'Large-scale Tree Removals', Phoenix, AZ.
 3. Speaker at the Western Chapter, International Society of Arboriculture Annual Conference, with presentation entitled 'Certification: an Arborist's Most Valuable Tool', Honolulu, HI.
- **1995:**
 1. Instructor, Arboriculture (LH-013. semester class), Peralta Community College District.
 2. Speaker at WC ISA Regional meeting, presentation entitled "Broadleaf Plant Culture", Modesto, CA.
 3. Presentation on 'Aerial Rescue' at California Arborists Association, Inc. Aerial Rescue/CPR Workshop.
 4. Coordinator for California Arborists Association, Inc. "Field Supervisors' Workshop-Developing Effective Leadership"
 - **1994:**
 1. Speaker, field demonstration, program coordinator at WC ISA/CAA Regional Meeting "Applications for Cranes in Tree Work".
 2. Developed and conducted Training Seminar for the City of San Francisco Public Works Dept., tree crew entitled "Aerial Rescue Training and Workshop".
 3. Developed and delivered one-day seminar entitled "Hazard Tree Evaluation Workshop", sponsored by the Landscape Industry Council of Hawaii, Honolulu, HI.
 - **1993:**
 1. Speaker & instructor for "Hazard Evaluation Workshop" for the International Society of Arboriculture Tree Academy at the annual meeting of the International Society of Arboriculture, University of California, Berkeley, CA.
 2. Speaker on panel at WC ISA Annual Conference, 'Innovations in Arboriculture'.
 - **1992:**
 1. Speaker at WC ISA Annual Conference Field Day, 'Hazard Evaluation of Trees'.
 2. Instructor at California Arborists Association, Inc. workshop "Rigging for Removals", Pleasant Hill, CA
 - **1991:**
 1. Speaker at the Northern CA Turfgrass Council Turf and Landscape Expo, "Myths About Trees and Tree Care", Santa Clara, CA.
 2. Speaker at WC ISA Regional meeting at San Francisco State University, "Special Drought Situations for Trees", San Francisco, CA.
 - **1989:** Presented project profile at ASCA Annual Meeting "Inventory and Evaluation of *Pinus radiata*", Santa Barbara, CA.



Civic Design Review Committee - August 18, 2014 - Meeting Minutes

Civic Design Review Committee - August 18, 2014

MEETING OF THE CIVIC DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE OF THE SAN FRANCISCO ARTS COMMISSION

Monday, August 18, 2014

2:00 p.m.

25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 70

Minutes

Committee Chair Cass Calder Smith called the meeting to order at 2:04 p.m.

1. Roll Call

Commissioners Present

Cass Calder Smith, Chair

Dorka Keehn

Roberto Ordeñana

Kimberlee Stryker

Kathrin Moore, ex officio

Commissioners Absent

None

Staff Present

Jill Manton, Director of Public Art Trust and Special Initiatives

Sharon Page Ritchie, Commission Secretary

2. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

3. Guy Place Park: Phase 2

Marvin Yee, Project Manager, Recreation and Park Department

Martha Ketterer, Landscape Architect, Department of Public Works—Building Design and Construction

The team presented the project and reviewed the changes made in response to the Committee's prior

comments, and they presented the developer's streetscape plan. The team discussed the water features, addressing their very low water use and explaining that they would still be very attractive even when the water is turned off. They presented material samples and reviewed the plant selections.

The Committee appreciated the work done since the last review. They preferred the heavier gauge mesh presented, and discussed the plant selection, lighting and the view corridor.

Public Comment:

Katina Johnson explained that she was a resident of Guy Place, and had worked with the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure. She said the street was really small and quiet, and she thought the park's design was great, creating a quiet oasis. She said that it fit well with the eventual view, and the columns were a good height. She said that parks were in short supply in the neighborhood, and the neighbors really want this park, but don't believe it will happen. She urged the Committee to approve it.

Chris Jacks said that he lives on First Street, and was eagerly awaiting the completion of the park. He also commented on the view corridor. He thought it was important to pay attention to the height of the bamboo, and noted that in other locations bamboo had been cut down and removed because it grew too tall. He also said that many of the neighbors have picture windows looking out over the site and asked the design team to be mindful that any lighting in the park would not shine into the neighbors' windows.

There was no further public comment, and the motion was unanimously approved as follows.

Motion to approve Phase 2 of the Guy Place Park project, contingent upon: (1) using the square mesh in the heavier gauge presented; (2) using more lights, at least two per column, making sure not to shine them toward the south into the windows of the facing building; (3) limiting the height of bamboo around the perimeter of the park to ensure that it does not diminish the view corridor; (4) reviewing the choice of fence, gates and basin.

Ms. Manton agreed to plan an informal review in the coming weeks.

4. Balboa Park Pool: Phase 1

Toks Ajike, Project Manager, Recreation and Park Department
Bryon Kuth and Mike McGroarty, ELS/Kuth Ranieri JV, Project Architects

The design team reviewed the project, its budget and design priorities. They presented changes since the last review, and responses to comments from the community.

The Committee noted that the current drawings illustrated a blank wall and plantings where the team said that a service door would be placed. They discussed other elements of the project, including materials proposed and how the budget might constrain the project. They discussed ideas for adaptive reuse and material finishes to help with costs, and referred to the work of Tadao Ando and the "art of concrete." They requested further work on the design of the community room and its entry, study of the light from the interior through the new windows in the pool area, and resolution of the entry façade and placement of the service entrance.

The Committee thought that there was not enough detail in the design for Phase 1 approval, and requested that Ms. Manton work with the team to arrange informal interim review, with the possibility of a combined phase review later to try to keep the project on schedule.

The Committee made the following recommendations: (1) resolve the design of the front of the building, including the entry, the placement of the service door and the landscape design as it relates to the building; (2) consider separating the main entry from the service door, providing access to the service door from the side of the building, and eliminating the existing ramp altogether; (3) resolve the design of the entry to the community room, providing a landing space for a group of people to gather at the top of the stairs; (4) consider how to open up the community room; (5) at the rear of the building, resolve the design of the termination of the bleachers and their junction with the existing stair; (6) investigate creative uses of finishes and materials, and adaptive reuse, as cost-saving design solutions; (7) present views of the fenestration from the interior of the pool area as well as the exterior, considering how the increased light will affect swimmers.

There was no public comment, and there was no motion.

5. Southeast Plant Building 522 (521A) Electrical/HPU Building: Phase 1

Kent Ford, Project Architect, Bureau of Design and Construction, Department of Public Works
Jignesh Desai, Project Manager, Public Utilities Commission

The team presented the project, noting that the building would not be seen by the general public and would be required to be able to survive a large seismic event.

The Committee discussed the project, and asked about the requirements for both ventilation and daylight. They discussed the treatment of the parapet, the roof and the entry. They agreed that the design could be simplified and its elements better integrated. They requested material samples and finishes for Phase 2 review.

There was no public comment, and the motion was approved unanimously as follows.

Motion to approve Phase 1 of the Southeast Plant Building 522 (521A) Electrical/HPU Building project, contingent upon (1) simplifying the design; (2) further developing the entry, possibly using a canopy; (3) using a flat roof with skylights; (4) making the roll-up door side of the building a single unit rather than three separate elements; (5) further developing the landscape; (6) showing siding material and finishes at Phase 2 review; (7) either lowering or raising the parapet to be equal in height to the other building.

6. Alameda Creek Diversion Dam/Fish Passage Facilities—Electrical Control Building: Phase 3

Kent Ford, Project Architect, Department of Public Works—Building Design and Construction
Ravi Krishnaiah, Project Manager, Public Utilities Commission

The design team reviewed the project, explaining that the fish ladder itself is considered equipment and is not subject to Civic Design Review. They discussed changes made in regard to the location of the solar

panels since the last review, explaining where requirements of the Public Utilities Commission conflicted with the Committee's recommendations. They showed material and color samples.

The Committee discussed the project briefly, including the treatment of the fence and the concrete wall.

There was no public comment, and the motion was unanimously approved as follows.

Motion to approve Phase 3 of the Alameda Creek Diversion Dam/Fish Passage Facilities—Electrical Control Building project, contingent upon resolving the junction between the fence and the concrete wall.

7. San Francisco Airport ("SFO") Terminal 3 East: Phase 3

Claudia Luquin, Project Manager, SFO Design and Construction

Gary Brandau, Project Architect, Gensler

The team reviewed the project and the changes since the Committee's last review, and recalled that the project would have to be designed and built so that it did not require taking the terminal out of service. They emphasized that a design goal was to create something that would not limit the anticipated redesign of Terminal 3 West.

The Committee much preferred the design direction of the sketch shown in the prior (Phase 2) review, suggesting that the team make the structure more like the interior of Terminal 3. They made the following recommendations: (1) manipulate the upper bezel to increase the overhang of the roof at the east end; (2) emphasize the horizontal aspect of the design, eliminating the vertical joints in the waterfall roof and using a small corrugation oriented horizontally for the façade; (3) increase the texture of the façade.

Ms. Manton agreed to set up informal review over the next several weeks.

There was no public comment, and there was no motion.

8. Golden Gate Recycled Water Pump Station and Reservoir: Phase 1

Barbara Palacios, Project Manager, Public Utilities Commission

Michael Pierron, Project Architect, Department of Public Works—Building Design and Construction

The team presented the project, located at an existing site which is also a composting facility. They noted that all of the openings in the new building are on the north façade, opposite the composting area to minimize dust.

The Committee discussed the project, including potential noise issues. They discussed the shape of the wall, making reference to Rem Koolhaas's Casa da Musica in Portugal.

The Committee made the following recommendations: (1) resolve the design of the top of the wall, considering a more angular form; (2) consider creating a line of color to mark the stack height for compost; (3) use heavy gauge metal screen; (4) compose the openings in the building more carefully.

There was no public comment, and there was no motion. Ms. Manton agreed to work with the team to set up an informal review over the next several weeks.

9. Fire Station #5: Informational Presentation

Gabriella Judd Cirelli, Project Manager, Department of Public Works–Building Design and Construction
Alejandro Pimentel, Architectural Associate, Department of Public Works–Building Design and Construction

The team presented the project, the fire station at Turk and Webster streets, discussing its funding and scope. They reported on the priorities expressed by the firefighters, and their responses to initial conceptual renderings. The design team presented three design schemes.

The Committee discussed the three proposed schemes and asked about the firefighters' responses and preferences.

The Committee encouraged the team to clarify the design, approaching it conceptually with one or two big ideas, guided by function and expressing how the firefighters live and why.

There was no public comment, and there was no motion.

10. Visual Arts Committee Update

Commissioner Keehn reported that the Visual Arts Committee had recently approved three finalists for the public art project on the pedestrian bridge at the Moscone Center. She showed images of a project by Mark Brest van Kempen approved for the Alameda Creek Watershed, a curved glass-sided ramp allowing a person to walk into the pond. She also reported on the public art proposal by Adriane Colburn for the Guy Place Mini Park.

There was no public comment.

11. New Business and Announcements

There was no new business or announcements.

12. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:32 p.m.

spr 9/2/14

Language Accessibility

Translated written materials and interpretation services are available to you at no cost. For assistance, please notify Director of Special Projects and Civic Design Review Program Manager Jill Manton, 415-252-2585, jill.manton@sfgov.org.

我們將為閣下提供免費的書面翻譯資料和口譯服務。如需協助，Director of Special Projects and Civic Design Review Program Manager Jill Manton, 415-252-2585, jill.manton@sfgov.org.

Materiales traducidos y servicios de interpretación están disponibles para usted de manera gratuita. Para asistencia, notifique a Director of Special Projects and Civic Design Review Program Manager Jill Manton, 415-252-2585, jill.manton@sfgov.org.

Ang mga materyales na nakasalin sa ibang wika at ang mga serbisyong tagapagsalin sa wika ay walang bayad. Para sa tulong, maaring i-contact si Director of Special Projects and Civic Design Review Program Manager Jill Manton, 415-252-2585, jill.manton@sfgov.org.

Young, Victor

From: Page_Ritchie, Sharon (ART)
Sent: Wednesday, September 03, 2014 9:25 AM
To: pdatesh@aol.com
Cc: Lazar, Howard (ART); SOTF (BOS); Young, Victor; Patterson, Kate (ART); Krell, Rebekah (ART)
Subject: FW: Civic Design Review Committee | San Francisco Arts Commission

In response to your request, please be advised that the minutes from the August 18 Civic Design Review Committee meeting were posted yesterday afternoon. You can find them here: <http://sfgov.org/arts/civic-design-review-committee/meeting/2014-august-18-minutes>

Sharon Page Ritchie
Commission Secretary

San Francisco Arts Commission
25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 345
San Francisco, CA 94102
T: 415-252-2591 F: 415-252-2595
sfartscommission.org

[e-Newsletter](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Facebook](#) | [YouTube](#) | [Flickr](#)

Begin forwarded message:

From: pdatesh@aol.com
Date: September 2, 2014 at 2:59:27 PM PDT
To: sotf@sfgov.org, Kate Patterson <kate.patterson@sfgov.org>, victor.young@sfgov.org
Subject: Civic Design Review Committee | San Francisco Arts Commission

The minutes for this meeting have not posted. It is over 10 business days.

<http://sfgov.org/arts/civic-design-review-committee/meetings>

Sent from my iPhone

1-Tree Design 1000 Market Street, San Francisco, CA 94114, USA

[Home](#)
[About](#)
[Save Resue](#)
[Print](#)
[View Report](#)
[Return to Setup](#)


Overall Benefits

Stormwater

Energy

Air Quality

Carbon Dioxide



From: Annual for removal, which is year tree absorbing or intercepting pollutants. "Avoid" stands for avoided, which is year tree lessening the need for creation of these pollutants in the first place by reducing energy production needs.

Over the next 99 years, the total air quality benefits of your giant sequoia are shown in the graph at left.

Air pollution is a serious health threat that causes asthma, coughing, headaches, respiratory and heart disease, and cancer. Over 150 million people live in areas where ozone levels violate federal air quality standards; more than 100 million people are impacted when dust and other particulate levels are considered "unhealthy." We now know that the urban forest can mitigate the health effects of pollution by:

- Absorbing pollutants like ozone (O₃), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), and sulfur dioxide (SO₂) through leaves
- Intercepting particulate matter less than 10 microns (PM₁₀) like dust, ash, and smoke
- Releasing oxygen through photosynthesis
- Lowering air temperatures which reduces the production of ozone
- Reducing energy use and subsequent pollutant emissions from power plants (if a tree produces no energy benefits there will be no resulting avoided pollutants.)

It should be noted that trees themselves emit biogenic volatile organic compounds (BVOCs) which can contribute to ground-level ozone production. This may negate the positive impact the tree has on ozone mitigation for some high emitting species (e.g., willow oak or sweetgum).

Total to Date

Total (2014-2113)


Future Year (2113)

Current Year (2014)

Tree Design, Inc. 3086 Market Street, San Francisco, CA 94114, USA

Save Cover
 Return to Start
 View Report
 Home
 Save Result
 About

Overall Benefits Stormwater Energy Air Quality Carbon Dioxide



Over the next 99 years, your giant sequoia will reduce atmospheric carbon dioxide (CO₂) by a total amount of 26,169 pounds.

How significant is this number? Most car owners of an "average" car (mid-sized sedan) drive 12,000 miles (19,312 kilometers) generating about 11,000 pounds (4,990 kilograms) of carbon dioxide (CO₂) every year. A flight from New York to Los Angeles adds 1,400 pounds (635 kilograms) of CO₂ per passenger. Trees can have an impact by reducing atmospheric carbon in two primary ways (see figure at left):

- They sequester ("lock up") CO₂ in their roots, trunks, stems, and leaves while they grow, and in wood products after they are harvested.
- Trees near buildings can reduce heating and air conditioning demands, thereby reducing emissions associated with power production. However, if a tree produces no energy benefits there will be no resulting avoided CO₂.

Combating climate change will take a worldwide, multifaceted approach, but by planning a tree in a strategic location, driving fewer miles/kilometers, or replacing business trips with conference calls, it's easy to see how we can each reduce our individual carbon "footprints".

Overall Benefits	Stormwater	Energy	Air Quality	Carbon Dioxide
	<p>Over the next 99 years, your giant sequoia will intercept a total of 613,891 gallons of stormwater.</p> <p>Urban stormwater runoff (or "non-point source pollution") washes chemicals (oil, gasoline, salts, etc.) and litter from surfaces such as roadways and parking lots into streams, wetlands, rivers, and oceans. The more impervious the surface (e.g., concrete, asphalt, rooftops), the more quickly pollutants are washed into our community waterways. Drinking water, aquatic life, and the health of our entire ecosystem can be adversely affected by this process.</p> <p>Trees act as mini-reservoirs, controlling runoff at the source. Trees reduce runoff by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intercepting and holding rain on leaves, branches, and bark • Increasing infiltration and storage of rainwater through the tree's root system • Reducing soil erosion by slowing rainfall before it strikes the soil 			
Total to Date	Total (2014-2113)	Future Year (2113)	Current Year (2014)	

Overall Benefits

Stormwater

Energy

Air Quality


Carbon Dioxide

Current Year (2014)

Future Year (2113)

Total (2014-2113)

Total to Date




Breakdown of Tree Benefits

Click on one of the tabs above for more data!

If it is cared for, this giant sequoia will provide a total of \$5,236 worth of overall benefits over next 99 years.

While some functional benefits of trees are well documented, others are difficult to quantify (e.g., human social and communal health). Trees' specific geography, climate, and interactions with humans and infrastructure are highly variable and make precise calculations that much more difficult. Given these complexities, the results presented here should be considered initial approximations to better understand the environmental and economic value associated with trees and their placement.

Benefits of trees do not account for the costs associated with trees' long-term care and maintenance.



Giant sequoia
 Sequoiadendron giganteum



San Francisco Urban Forestry Council

April 10, 2014

To PROPERTY OWNER:

This is to inform you of the upcoming public hearings of the Urban Forestry Council to discuss and take action on the nomination for landmark status of the following tree(s):

One Giant Sequoia (*Sequoiadendron giganteum*) located at 3066 Market Street, assessor's block 2656, Lot 020.

The UFC Landmark Tree Committee will hold a public hearing on this tree on:
Thursday, May 1, 2014, 4:15 p.m.
City Hall, Room 421
One Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Jr. Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Following this hearing, the full Urban Forestry Council will hold a public hearing on:
Friday, May 23, 2014, 8:30 a.m.
City Hall, Room 400
One Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Jr. Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

After the UFC has completed their hearing process, they will forward their findings to the Board of Supervisors for final determination.

There will be an opportunity for public comment at the hearings.

Copies of meeting minutes and agendas are available on the SF Environment website at: <http://www.sfenvironment.org/ufc> or by contacting Department staff at the address and phone number listed below. This letter has been sent to satisfy noticing requirements set forth in Public Works Code section 810(b)(3)(A).

Please feel free to share the information contained in this letter with other interested parties.

Respectfully,
San Francisco's Urban Forestry Council

Contact Mei Ling Hui, Urban Forest Coordinator, for more information:
meiling.hui@sfgov.org or (415) 355-3731

11 Grove Street, San Francisco, CA 94102
Telephone: (415) 355-3700 • Fax: (415) 554-6393
Email: urbanforestcouncil@sfgov.org

Updated April 11, 2014

Notifications to property owner C Lipton and surrounding property owners mailed on April 11, 2014.

The following properties received mailed notification of the nomination and hearings for one Giant Redwood (*Sequoiadendron giganteum*) located at 3066 Market Street, 94114, Assessor's Block 2656, Lot 020.

UFC Landmark Tree Committee Hearing on:
Thursday, May 1, 2014 at 4:15 p.m.
City Hall, Room 421
One Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Jr. Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Full UFC Hearing on:
Friday, May 23, 2014 at 8:30 a.m.
City Hall, Room 400
One Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Jr. Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Notifications mailed on April 1, 2014.

Mailing address and property owner information retrieved from the San Francisco Assessor-Recorder's Office in City Hall on February 11, 2014.

Property owner mailing address and contact updated through information provided in an email from the property owner to DPW staff on February 16, 2014. A copy of this email is in the tree file.

Property Owner:
Assessor's Block 2656, Lot 020
Lot Address: 3066 MARKET ST, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94114
Craig Lipton
1138 Taylor, SF CA 94108

Assessor's block 2656, lot 018
Lot address: 3058 MARKET ST, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94114
Mailing address:
Joan C Murray
3058 Market Street
San Francisco, CA 94114

Assessor's block 2656, lot 019
Lot address: 3062 MARKET ST, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94114
Mailing address:
Nicole S Bengiveno
PO Box 2761

New York, New York 10163

Assessor's block 2656, lot 021

Lot address: 3070 MARKET ST, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94114

Mailing address:

David Howe and Andrea Semancik

3070 Market Street

San Francisco, CA 94114-1825

Assessor's block 2656, lot 022

Lot address: 3074 MARKET ST, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94114

Mailing address:

Stephen D Hutcheon Revocable Trust

3074 Market Street

San Francisco, CA 94114

Assessor's block 2656, lot 044

Lot address: 203-205 CORBETT AVE, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94114

Mailing address:

Yoshizaki Aya

203-205 Corbett Ave

San Francisco, CA 94114-1816

Assessor's block 2656, lot 045

Lot address: 197 CORBETT AVE, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94114

Mailing address:

Koelsch Family Trust 1998

197 Corbett Ave

San Francisco, CA 94114

Assessor's block 2656, lot 046

Lot address: 193 CORBETT AVE, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94114

Mailing address:

Freddrickson 2007 Trust

PO Box 1257

Occidental, CA 95465

Assessor's block 2656, lot 047

Lot addresses: 189-191 CORBETT AVE, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94114

Mailing addresses:

Sofia Mitina 2006 Revoc Tr

6440 Ridgewood Dr

Castro Valley, CA 94552

Assessor's block 2656, lot 073

Lot address: 207 CORBETT AVE, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94114

Mailing address:

Felcia L Serman

207 Corbett Ave

San Francisco, CA 94114

Assessor's block 2656, lot 074

Lot address: 209 CORBETT AVE, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94114

Mailing address:

Christian and Lisa M Jurinka

209 Corbett Ave

San Francisco, CA 94114

Assessor's block 2656, lot 075

Lot address: 211 CORBETT AVE, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94114

Mailing address:


Felcia L Serman

207 Corbett Ave

San Francisco, CA 94114

block/lot	owner name	mail address	mail city, state	mail c/o	mail zip	ref. lot(s)	associated address(es) **
2656020	MF FUND III LP	1138 TAYLOR ST	SAN FRANCISCO CA	CRAIG LIPTON	94108	N/A	3066 MARKET ST
2656044	YOSHIZAKI AYA	203 - 205 CORBETT AVE	SAN FRANCISCO CA		94114	N/A	203 CORBETT AVE
2656044	YOSHIZAKI AYA	203 - 205 CORBETT AVE	SAN FRANCISCO CA		94114	N/A	205 CORBETT AVE
2656021	HOWE DAVID C & SEMANCIK ANDREA	3070 MARKET ST	SAN FRANCISCO CA		94114	N/A	3070 MARKET ST
2656046	FREDRICKSON 2007 TRUST	P O BOX 1257	OCCIDENTAL CA	FREDRICKSON LYLE V TRUSTEE	95465	N/A	193 CORBETT AVE
2656047	SOFIA MITINA 2006 REVOC TR	6440 RIDGEWOOD DR	CASTRO VALLEY CA	MITINA SOFIA TRUSTEE	94552	N/A	191 CORBETT AVE
2656047	SOFIA MITINA 2006 REVOC TR	6440 RIDGEWOOD	CASTRO VALLEY CA	MITINA SOFIA TRUSTEE	94552	N/A	189 CORBETT AVE
2656018	JOAN C MURRAY LVG TR	3058 MARKET ST	SAN FRANCISCO CA	JOAN C MURRAY, TTEE	94114	N/A	3058 MARKET ST

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



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


NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO LAND USE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Land Use and Economic Development Committee will hold a public hearing to consider the following proposal and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard:

- Date:** Monday, September 15, 2014
- Time:** 1:30 p.m.
- Location:** Committee Room 263, located at City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA
- Subject:** File No. 140777. Ordinance designating the Giant Sequoia (*Sequoiadendron giganteum*) tree at 3066 Market Street (Assessor's Block No. 2656, Lot. No. 020) as a landmark tree pursuant to Public Works Code, Section 810, making findings supporting the designation, and requesting official acts in furtherance of the landmark tree designation.

In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments to the City prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made as part of the official public record in this matter, and shall be brought to the attention of the members of the Committee. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, Room 244, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102. Information relating to this matter is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board. Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, September 12, 2014.


Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

DATED: September 4, 2014
MAILED/POSTED: September 5, 2014

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 544-5227

PROOF OF MAILING

Legislative File Nos. 140777

Description of Items:

Notice of Public Hearing: September 15, 2014 at 1:30 p.m. at City Hall, Committee Room 263; 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102

Ordinance designating the Giant Sequoia (*Sequoiadendron giganteum*) tree at 3066 Market Street (Assessor's Block No. 2656, Lot. No. 020) as a landmark tree pursuant to Public Works Code, Section 810, making findings supporting the designation, and requesting official acts in furtherance of the landmark tree designation.

I, Andrea Ausberry, a United States citizen and over 18 years of age, mailed the above described document(s) by depositing the sealed items with the United States Postal Service (USPS), with the postage fully prepaid as follows:

Date: September 5, 2014

Time: 9:43 AM

USPS Location: Front Desk, Office of the Clerk of the Board

Mailbox/Mailslot Pick-Up Times (if applicable): N/A

Signature: 

Instructions: Upon completion, original must be returned to the following for inclusion in the official legislative file:

Print Form

Introduction Form

By a Member of the Board of Supervisors or the Mayor

Time stamp
or meeting date

I hereby submit the following item for introduction (select only one):

- 1. For reference to Committee.
An ordinance, resolution, motion, or charter amendment.
- 2. Request for next printed agenda without reference to Committee.
- 3. Request for hearing on a subject matter at Committee.
- 4. Request for letter beginning "Supervisor [] inquires"
- 5. City Attorney request.
- 6. Call File No. [] from Committee.
- 7. Budget Analyst request (attach written motion).
- 8. Substitute Legislation File No. []
- 9. Request for Closed Session (attach written motion).
- 10. Board to Sit as A Committee of the Whole.
- 11. Question(s) submitted for Mayoral Appearance before the BOS on []

Please check the appropriate boxes. The proposed legislation should be forwarded to the following:

- Small Business Commission Youth Commission Ethics Commission
- Planning Commission Building Inspection Commission

Note: For the Imperative Agenda (a resolution not on the printed agenda), use a Imperative

Sponsor(s):

Supervisor Wiener

Subject:

Landmark Tree Designation of Giant Sequoia Located at 3066 Market Street

The text is listed below or attached:

Ordinance designating the Giant Sequoia (Sequoiadendron giganteum) tree at 3066 Market Street (Assessor's Block 2656, Lot: No. 020) as a landmark tree pursuant to Public Works Code Section 810, making findings supporting the designation, and requesting official acts in furtherance of the landmark tree designation.

Signature of Sponsoring Supervisor: *Scott Wiener*

For Clerk's Use Only:

140777

