File No. 220710 **Committee Item No.** 6
Board Item No. 5

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Land Use and Transportation Committee **Date** October 3, 2022

Board of Supervisors Meeting **Date** October 25, 2022

Cmte	Board	
☐	☐	**Motion**
☐	☐	**Resolution**
☒	X	**Ordinance**
☐	☐	**Legislative Digest**
☐	☐	**Budget and Legislative Analyst Report**
☐	☐	**Youth Commission Report**
☒	X	**Introduction Form**
☐	☐	**Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report**
☐	☐	**MOU**
☐	☐	**Grant Information Form**
☐	☐	**Grant Budget**
☐	☐	**Subcontract Budget**
☐	☐	**Contract/Agreement**
☐	☐	**Form 126 – Ethics Commission**
☐	☐	**Award Letter**
☐	☐	**Application**
☐	☐	**Public Correspondence**

OTHER **(Use back side if additional space is needed)**

☒	X	ENV Ltr 022422
☒	X	ENV Transmittal 022422
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	

Completed by: Erica Major **Date** September 29, 2022
Completed by: Erica Major **Date** October 14, 2022

[Landmark Tree Designation - Coast Redwood - 313 Scott Street]

Ordinance designating the coast redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens*) tree located at 313 Scott Street as a landmark tree pursuant to the Public Works Code; making findings supporting the designation; and directing official acts in furtherance of the landmark tree designation.

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

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

Section 1. Background and Findings.

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

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

(c) On December 15, 2021, the property owner of 313 Scott Street nominated the coast redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens*) tree on the property for landmark status.

(d) The Urban Forestry Council examined the subject tree based on the adopted landmark tree designation criteria, including the tree's (1) rarity, (2) physical attributes, (3) environmental benefits, and (4) cultural value. Based on these designation criteria, the Urban

Forestry Council determined that the subject tree qualified as a landmark tree, and on February 22, 2022 adopted a resolution, Resolution File No. 2022-02-UFC, reflecting this determination. This resolution is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 220710, and is incorporated herein by reference. The Board adopts these findings as its own.

Section 2. Landmark Tree Designation. Based on the above-mentioned findings, the Board of Supervisors designates the coast redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens*) tree at 313 Scott Street between Oak and Page streets (Assessor's Parcel Block No. 1217, Lot No. 006), as a landmark tree.

Section 3. Recording the Landmark Tree Designation. The Board of Supervisors directs the Department of Public Works to record the landmark designation of this tree on the property record of 313 Scott Street (Assessor's Parcel Block No. 1217, Lot No. 006) and list the tree in the Department's Official Book of Landmark Trees.

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

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
DAVID CHIU, City Attorney

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

n:\legana\as2022\2200459\01601666.docx

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

London N. Breed
Mayor

Deborah O. Raphael
Director

February 24, 2022

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

RE: San Francisco Urban Forestry Council vote to inform the Board of Supervisors that the Coast Redwood *(Sequoia sempervirens)* at 313 Scott Street meets the criteria for landmark tree status.

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

On December 15, 2021, the Urban Forestry Council received a Landmark Tree nomination from Douglas Durkin, for a coast redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens)*, located at 313 Scott Street between Oak and Page.

At their meeting on February 22, 2022, the Urban Forestry Council found that the tree meets the criteria for landmark tree status. The Council found that the coast redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens)*, located at 313 Scott Street between Oak and Page, meets the criteria for landmark status and approved Resolution File No. 2022-02-UFC. (Ayes: Chair Sullivan, Vice Chair Crawford, Members Keller, Lacan, Xochitl Flores, Salvadori, Spigelman, Mike Sullivan, Nagle, Stringer, and Trang; Noes: Vaisset-Fauvel; Absent: Polony, Potter)

This letter and the enclosed materials from the February 22, 2022, Urban Forestry Council Meeting serve as written findings and a designation recommendation from the Urban Forestry Council.

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

Sincerely,

Peter Brastow
Urban Forestry Council Coordinator

Enclosure:
Urban Forestry Council Hearing Explanatory Documents

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

London N. Breed
Mayor

Deborah O. Raphael
Director

Urban Forestry Council Landmark Tree Committee Report

Submitted by Landmark Tree Committee Chair, Mike Sullivan on February 22, 2022

Committee members present at the February 03, 2022, Landmark Tree Ad Hoc Committee meeting: Damon Spigelman, Pam Nagle, Morgan Vaisset-Fauvel, Jillian Keller and Michael Sullivan

Address of nominated tree: 313 Scott Street.
Common name: Coast Redwood
Scientific name: *Sequoia sempervirens*

Summary

The Landmark Tree Committee recommends that the Urban Forestry Council approve this nomination and make the determination that this tree qualifies for landmark tree status. The nomination was supported by a vote of 4-1. The Committee supported this nomination based on the tree's physical attributes, environmental benefits, and neighborhood value. The one dissenter noted that the tree had been topped in the past, and thus now has two trunks, and is not as tall as it would otherwise be.

Physical Attributes

Committee members noted the health, vigor, and stature of the tree. While it's not large for a redwood, that it is large for a backyard tree.

Historical

The owner of the tree reported that the tree may have been planted from seedlings distributed during the Panama Pacific International Exposition in 1915.

Environmental

The owner noted that birds and squirrels reside in the tree.

Cultural

The owner noted in his nomination that "all my neighbors love the tree."

[Resolution endorsing the coast redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens)* tree at 313 Scott Street for landmark tree status]

Resolution endorsing the coast redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens*) tree at 313 Scott Street for Landmark Status, pursuant to Public Works Code Section 810(b).

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

WHEREAS, the coast redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens*) tree at 313 Scott Street fulfills the Landmark Tree criteria developed by the Urban Forestry Council, including its physical attributes, environmental benefits, and cultural value; and,

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

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

I hereby certify that this resolution was adopted at the Urban Forestry Council's regular meeting on February 22, 2021.

Peter Brastow, Urban Forestry Coordinator Andrew Sullivan, Council Chair

Vote: Approved 11-1

Ayes: Chair Sullivan, Vice Chair Crawford, Lacan, Keller, Nagle, Xochitl, M. Sullivan, Spigelman, Salvadori, Trang, Stringer

Noes: Vaisset-Fauvel

Absent: Polony, Potter

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

MEETING MINUTES - DRAFT

Tuesday, February 22, 2022, 6:00 p.m.
Remote meeting via web conference

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

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

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

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

   The meeting started at 6:03 PM.

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

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

   Chair Sullivan read the Ramaytush Ohlone Land Acknowledgement.

   New Member Ilaria Salvadori introduced herself. She works for the Citywide Planning group at the Planning Department and is an urban designer.

   There was no public comment.

3. **Review and vote on whether to approve Resolution File 2022-01-UFC, Resolution Making Findings to Allow Teleconferenced Meetings Under California Government Code Section 54953(e)**. Speaker: Peter Brastow, Urban Forestry Council Coordinator (Explanatory Document: Resolution File 2022-01-UFC) (Discussion and Action)

   The Council will consider adoption of a resolution making findings that newly enacted Government Code Section 54953(e) requires in order to allow the Council to hold meetings

remotely, as currently required under local law, without complying with certain Brown Act requirements.

Upon a motion by Member Lacan, seconded by Chair Sullivan, the Council approved the resolution unanimously 12-0.

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

There was no public comment.

4. **Adoption of Minutes of the December 10, 2021, Urban Forestry Council Regular Meeting.** (Explanatory Document: December 10, 2021, Draft Minutes) (Discussion and Action)

   Upon a motion by Member Mike Sullivan, seconded by Chair Sullivan, the Council approved the minutes unanimously 12-0.

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

   There was no public comment.

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

   There was no public comment.

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

   Peter Brastow introduced the item and explained that the Public Works data came in late Friday February 18th. Since it was a three-day weekend, he was only able to update some of the figures in the report and discussed those results.

   Upon a motion by Chair Sullivan, seconded by Xochitl, the Council voted 12-0 to continue the agenda item to the March 25th meeting.

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

   Public Comment:
   Josh Klipp read from the Environment code the section about the annual report timeline. He discussed the timeline as it relates to the city budget and his frustration with respect to the tardiness of the report.

Lance Carnes also discussed the timeline of the report issuance. He asked for the Council to be passionate about getting trees planted. As it relates to the pace of tree planting, he requested the development of a new urban forest plan.

7. **Hearing on nomination for Landmark Tree Status of the Coast Redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens*), located at 313 Scott Street, San Francisco, CA 94117.** The Council will hold a hearing to determine whether the tree nominated at the above location meets the criteria for designation as a landmark tree and to forward findings to the Board of Supervisors. (Explanatory Documents: Resolution File No. 2022-02-UFC, Nomination Form, Sullivan Evaluation, Nagle Evaluation, Keller Evaluation, Spigelman Evaluation, Vaisset-Fauvel Evaluation, Landmark Tree Committee Report, Draft February 3 Landmark Tree Committee Minutes.) (Discussion and Action)

   Landmark Tree Ad-Hoc Committee Chair Mike Sullivan summarized the discussion at the February 3rd Committee meeting. He explained that the redwood tree is a backyard tree on a property with a Victorian house. He explained that the vote was 4-1 to recommend the tree for Landmark status to the full Council, with Member Vaisset-Fauvel dissenting.

   Chair Sullivan asked about the Panama Pacific International Exposition (PPIE) connection, and Committee Chair Sullivan explained that the property owner was told by a consultant that the tree was likely planted from a sapling from the PPIE.

   Member Vaisset-Fauvel asked about the date of the PPIE (1915). He expressed concern about the topping cut of the redwood several decades ago, and that it could be an issue for the redwood in the not too distant future. He discussed that it could be a hazard in the future.

   Member Lacan inquired as to opposition to the tree being Landmarked.

   Committee Chair Sullivan responded that there was no neighborhood opposition and underscored that Landmark Tree Committee members who voted in favor were comforted by the owner's commitment to stewarding the tree.

   Vice Chair Crawford discussed that the tree seemed straight-forward for landmarking. Member Spigelman seconded that sentiment. Committee Chair Sullivan emphasized that this tree had no controversy.

   Upon a motion by Chair Sullivan, seconded by Member Spigelman, the Council voted 11-1 in support of the redwood tree on Scott Street meeting the criteria for designation as a Landmark Tree.

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

   There was no public comment.

   Member Salvadori left the meeting at 7:03 pm.

8. **Hearing on nomination for Landmark Tree Status of the Giant Sequoia (*Sequoiadendron giganteum*), located at 3344 Folsom Street, San Francisco, CA 94110.** The Council will hold a hearing to determine whether the tree nominated at the above location meets the criteria for designation as a landmark tree and to forward findings to the Board of Supervisors. (Explanatory

Documents: Nomination Form, Sullivan Evaluation, Keller Evaluation, Spigelman Evaluation, Vaisset-Fauvel Evaluation, Landmark Tree Committee Report, Draft February 3 Landmark Tree Committee Minutes.) (Discussion and Action)

Landmark Tree Ad-Hoc Committee Chair Mike Sullivan summarized the discussion at the February 3rd Committee meeting. The tree is on a property with a very old house from the mid-1800s. Sullivan discussed the public comment related to the neighboring property, which is being impacted by the tree. The consensus of the committee was that the tree is not a healthy, vigorous specimen.

Member Vaisset-Fauvel discussed that the health of the tree was the subject of the analysis that led to the lack of recommendation from the committee. He, as well as Member Spigelman, discussed that the litigation did not play a part in the decision of the committee.

Upon a motion by Committee Chair Sullivan, seconded by Member Stringer, the Council voted 11-0 to reject the giant sequoia for meeting the criteria for designation as a landmark tree.

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

Public Comment:
Mark Garrison, who is a structural foundation expert, and who was speaking on behalf of the adjacent property owner, testified that the tree is having a significant impact on the neighboring house, and that all of the roots should be removed.

Aaron Wang "sat in" for Roy Leggitt and discussed his inspection of the tree and that the tree should be removed, since removing the roots only would cause the tree to be an imminent hazard. He discussed that the tree is not in good health as well.

9. **Hearing on nomination for Landmark Tree Status of the Deodara pine (*Cedrus deodara*), located at 3340 Folsom Street, San Francisco, CA 94110.** The Council will hold a hearing to determine whether the tree nominated at the above location meets the criteria for designation as a landmark tree and to forward findings to the Board of Supervisors. (Explanatory Documents: Nomination Form, Sullivan Evaluation, Keller Evaluation, Spigelman Evaluation, Vaisset-Fauvel Evaluation, Landmark Tree Committee Report, Draft February 3 Landmark Tree Committee Minutes.) (Discussion and Action)

Landmark Tree Ad-Hoc Committee Chair Mike Sullivan summarized the discussion at the February 3rd Committee meeting. The tree is on the same property as the giant sequoia with a very old house from the mid-1800s. The committee found the tree to be much healthier than the giant sequoia. The committee wanted the tree to be better taken care of.

Member Lacan asked for clarification about which species the tree is.

Committee members noted that they would welcome a revisit of a nomination for Landmark status for the tree in several years after their recommendations for tree care were followed.

Upon a motion by Chair Sullivan, seconded by Member Vaisset-Fauvel, the Council voted 11-0 to reject the deodara cedar for meeting the criteria for designation as a landmark tree.

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

There was no public comment.

10. Committee Reports: (Discussion)

Planning & Funding Committee. Igor Lacan, Committee Chair.
Landmark Tree Ad Hoc Committee. Mike Sullivan, Committee Chair.

Planning and Funding Committee Chair Lacan explained that tree mortality was the main item on the agenda of the most recent meeting.

Landmark Tree Ad Hoc Committee Chair Mike Sullivan discussed the agenda from the previous committee meeting, including the three trees that were the subject of the current meeting as well as an item about improving website language and communication about why (and why not) one would nominate a tree for Landmark status. Committee Chair Sullivan also discussed the committee's discussion about the buckeye on McAllister and North Willard and that it is still not a Landmark Tree, but that it is getting closer with the district supervisor.

There was no public comment.

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

Peter Brastow discussed work on the Landmark tree nominations, improving the language on the website and generally performing lots of administrative clean up and stream-lining in preparation for the new Commission Affairs Officer, who starts soon.

There was no public comment.

12. Urban Forestry Council Member Announcements. (Discussion)

Vice Chair Crawford discussed the excitement and energy around the new street tree nursery at 5th and Harrison/Bryant, including Governor Newsom's press conference on the site.

Member Vaisset-Fauvel reported meeting with the California Native Plant Society-Yerba Buena Chapter and providing them with some native trees, e.g., CA buckeye.

There was no public comment.

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

Chair Sullivan mentioned the street tree nursery as a future item, and asked Peter Brastow to relay which items had been discussed recently. He mentioned the City of Los Angeles urban forester. Member Vaisset-Fauvel asked to focus on funding for planting trees for the next meeting. Chair Sullivan underscored the importance of funding tree planting as a future agenda item. Member Lacan agreed that the Planning and Funding Committee could initiate that conversation. Chair Sullivan discussed the Strategic Plan as a likely item for the next meeting.

Public Comment:
Lance Carnes agreed that Rachel Malarich from LA would be great to host at the UFC. He suggested that SF put some "webinars" about urban forestry on the City's websites, like what LA has. Mr. Carnes thanked the Council for the discussions on this item.

14. Adjournment.

The Meeting adjourned at 7:59 pm.

The next meeting of the Urban Forestry Council is scheduled for Tuesday, March 25, 2022, at 8:30 a.m. Find out about upcoming deadlines, public hearings, and meetings. Search the SFEnvironronment.org website archived minutes and agenda.

Remote Access to Information and Participation

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

Attending the Meeting: Watch or Listen

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

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

https://ccsf.webex.com/ccsf/onstage/g.php?MTID=e7460d4a3b853f9ec1a9eb767254577c0

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

Option 2: Join the meeting by phone if you do not have access to a computer or smart device.
Dial: **415-655-0001** and then enter the Access Code: **2484 743 2383**

Participating During Public Comment

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

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

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

Copies of explanatory documents are available, 1) on the Urban Forestry Council webpage https://sfenvironment.org/about/taskforce/urban-forestry-council; or (2) upon request to the Urban Forestry Coordinator, at telephone number 415-355-3733, or via e-mail at peter.brastow@sfgov.org.

Important Information

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

Public Comment

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

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

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

Disability Access

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

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

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

Language Access

Per the Language Access Ordinance (Chapter 91 of the San Francisco Administrative Code), Chinese, Spanish and or Filipino (Tagalog) interpreters will be available upon requests. Meeting Minutes may be translated, if requested, after they have been adopted by the Commission. Assistance in additional languages may be honored whenever possible. To request assistance with these services please contact the Commission Affairs

Manager at 415-355-3700 or peter.brastow@sfgov.org, at least 48 hours in advance of the hearing. Late requests will be honored if possible.

語言服務

根據語言服務條例(三藩市行政法典第91章)，中文、西班牙語和/或菲律賓語（泰加洛語）傳譯人員在收到要求後將會提供傳譯服務。翻譯版本的會議記錄可在委員會通過後透過要求而提供。其他語言協助在可能的情況下也將可提供。上述的要求，請於會議前最少48小時致電 415-355-3709或電郵至 peter.brastow@sfgov.org 向委員會秘書提出。逾期提出的請求，若可能的話，亦會被考慮接納。

Acceso A Idioma

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

Access Sa Wika

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

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

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

Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Requirements

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

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

Posted: February 18, 2022

Urban Forestry Council
Landmark Tree Evaluation Form and Criteria

Pursuant to Public Works Code, Article 16, Section 810, the Urban Forestry Council developed these criteria for evaluating potential landmark trees in San Francisco. When evaluating trees, please consider a tree within the context of its site using the criteria below. Use the comment sections, as appropriate, to explain or support your evaluation.

Evaluator's name	Jillian Keller
Date of evaluation	1/26/2022
Start time of evaluation	9:45AM
End time of evaluation	10:15AM
Botanical (Latin) name	Sequoia sempervirens
Common name	Coast redwood
Street address	313 Scott Street
Cross streets	Oak Street and Page Street

Rarity
Unusual species in San Francisco or other geographic regions.

☐ Rare
☑ Uncommon
☐ Common
☐ Other

Comments	

Physical Attributes

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

☑ Large ☐ Medium ☐ Small

Comments	Large for other trees of the same species in SF, but average for its age/species

Age: Significantly advanced age for the species.

☐ Yes ☑ No

Comments	Mature in development, but not over-mature

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

☑ Yes ☐ No

Comments	Significant feature of the landscape

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

☑ Good to Excellent
☐ Fair to Poor
☐ Potential hazard

Comments	Well maintained, average vigor, typical form for the species, rounded top

OVERALL CATEGORY RATING

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

☑ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No

Historical Attributes

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

☑ Yes ☐ None apparent

Comments	Potenitally an exposition redwood seedling	

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

☐ Yes ☑ Unknown

Comments	

OVERALL CATEGORY RATING

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

☐ Yes ☑ Partially ☐ No

Environmental Attributes

Prominent landscape feature: A striking and outstanding natural feature.

☑ Yes ☐ No

Comments	

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

☐ Low ☑ Moderate ☐ High

Comments	

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

☐ Yes ☑ No

Comments	

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

☐ Yes ☑ No

Comments	

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

☐ Yes ☑ No

Comments	

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

☑ Yes ☐ No

Comments	

Erosion control: Tree prevents soil erosion.

☐ Yes ☑ No

Comments	

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

☑ Yes ☐ No

Comments	

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

Cultural Attributes

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

Comments	Neighbors seem to appreciate tree

Cultural appreciation: Tree has value to a local cultural or ethnic group(s).
☐ Yes ☑ None apparent

Comments	

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

Comments	

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

Additional comments:

→ I think the coast redwood should be granted landmark tree status.

Urban Forestry Council
Landmark Tree Evaluation Form and Criteria

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

Evaluator's name	Pam Nagle
Date of evaluation	1/26/2022
Start time of evaluation	9:30 AM
End time of evaluation	10:00 AM
Botanical name	*Sequoia sempervirens*
Common name	Coast redwood
Street address	313 Scott Street, San Francisco
Cross streets	Oak/Page

Rarity

Unusual species in San Francisco or other geographic regions.

☐ Rare
☐ Uncommon
☒ Common
☐ Other

Comments	

Physical Attributes

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

☐ Large
☒ Medium
☐ Small

Comments	DBH: 39". In rear yard (southwest corner) growing at fence. Enlarged base, slightly sinuous upper trunk, vigorous, dense

	crown. Possible codominant stems in upper crown, difficult to see.

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

Comments	Fast-growing, long-lived species. Age is likely not significant.

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

Comments	Upright form typical of the species; crown rounded at top.

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

Comments	

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

Historical Attributes

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

Comments	

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

☐ Yes

☒ Unknown

Comments	

OVERALL CATEGORY RATING

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

☐ Yes

☐ Partially

☒ No

Environmental Attributes

Prominent landscape feature: A striking and outstanding natural feature.

☒ Yes

☐ No

Comments	The tree is vigorous, and visible to neighboring properties and surrounding buildings.

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

☐ Low

☒ Moderate

☐ High

Comments	The Haight contains a good number of mature street/frontage and back yard trees.

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

☐ Yes

☒ No

Comments	

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

☐ Yes

☒ No

Comments	Not tall enough to be visible from surrounding streets.

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

☐ Yes

☒ No

Comments	

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

☒ Yes

☐ No

Comments	The redwood adds wildlife habitat value in this urban setting.

Erosion control: Tree prevents soil erosion.

☐ Yes

☒ No

Comments	

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

☒ Yes

☐ No

Comments	Tree possibly reduces noise of area traffic for surrounding buildings.

OVERALL CATEGORY RATING

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

☒ Yes

☐ Partially

☐ No

Cultural Attributes

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

☐ Yes
☒ None apparent

Comments	Applicants may have submitted testimonials from neighbors.

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

Comments	

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

Comments	

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

Additional comments:

→

I support the nomination of this Coast Redwood for landmark status.

Urban Forestry Council
Landmark Tree Evaluation Form and Criteria

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

Evaluator's name	Damon Spigelman
Date of evaluation	01-02-2020
Start time of evaluation	9:45 am
End time of evaluation	10:15am
Botanical name	Sequoia sempervirens
Common name	Coastal Redwood
Street address	1313 Scott Street
Cross streets	Oak Street

Rarity

Unusual species in San Francisco or other geographic regions.

☐ Rare
☐ Uncommon
☒ Common
☐ Other

Comments	

Physical Attributes

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

☒ Large
☐ Medium
☐ Small

Comments	

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

Comments	Large Root Flair suggesting significant age

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

Comments	

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

Comments	

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

Historical Attributes

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

Comments	

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

Comments	

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

Environmental Attributes

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

Comments	

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

Comments	

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

Comments	

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

Comments	

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

Comments	

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

☒ Yes

☐ No

Comments	Species could sustain significant habitat

Erosion control: Tree prevents soil erosion.

☐ Yes

☒ No

Comments	

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

☒ Yes

☐ No

Comments	

OVERALL CATEGORY RATING

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

☒ Yes

☐ Partially

☐ No

Cultural Attributes

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

☐ Yes

☒ None apparent

Comments	

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

☐ Yes
☒ None apparent

Comments	

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

☐ Yes
☒ Unknown

Comments	

OVERALL CATEGORY RATING

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

☐ Yes
☒ Partially
☐ No

Additional comments:

→

Urban Forestry Council

Landmark Tree Evaluation Form and Criteria

Pursuant to Public Works Code, Article 16, Section 810, the Urban Forestry Council developed these criteria for evaluating potential landmark trees in San Francisco. When evaluating trees, please consider a tree within the context of its site using the criteria below. Use the comment sections, as appropriate, to explain or support your evaluation.

Evaluator's name	Michael Sullivan
Date of evaluation	1/23/22
Start time of evaluation	9AM
End time of evaluation	9:20AM
Botanical (Latin) name	Sequoia sempervirns
Common name	Coast redwood
Street address	313 Scott Street

Cross streets

Rarity

Unusual species in San Francisco or other geographic regions.

☐ Rare
☐ Uncommon
☐ Common
☐ Other

Comments	Common tree in San Francisco

Physical Attributes

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

☐ Large ☐ Medium ☐ Small

Comments	A bit larger than most

Age: Significantly advanced age for the species.

☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments	Not advanced age for the species in habitat, but it's a relatively old specimen for San Francisco

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

☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments	Excellent structure

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

☐ Good to Excellent

☐ Fair to Poor

☐ Potential hazard

Comments	Excellent health and structure; no hazards observed. I believe the physical attributes of this tree support a recommendation.

OVERALL CATEGORY RATING

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

☐ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No

Historical Attributes

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

☐ Yes ☐ None apparent

Comments	None apparent.	

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

☐ Yes ☐ Unknown

Comments	None. I don't believe that the historic attributes support a recommendation for landmark status

OVERALL CATEGORY RATING

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

☐ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No

Environmental Attributes

Prominent landscape feature: A striking and outstanding natural feature.

☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments	yes

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

☐ Low ☐ Moderate ☐ High

Comments	No - lots of trees in the neighborhood

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

☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments	no

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

☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments	no

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

☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments	no

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

☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments	Yes, as a Bay Area native, I suppose so - although I don't know that redwoods existed in SF in pre-European times

Erosion control: Tree prevents soil erosion.

☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments	no

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

☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments	No.

OVERALL CATEGORY RATING

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

☐ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No

Cultural Attributes

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

☐ Yes ☐ None apparent

Comments	None that I'm aware of

Cultural appreciation: Tree has value to a local cultural or ethnic group(s).

☐ Yes ☐ None apparent

Comments	no

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

☐ Yes ☐ Unknown

Comments	no

OVERALL CATEGORY RATING

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

☐ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No

Additional comments:

→

SAN FRANCISCO URBAN FORESTRY COUNCIL

Landmark Tree Nomination Form

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

Who can nominate a landmark tree?

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

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

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

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

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

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

Name	DOUGLAS DURKIN
Department	PROPERTY OWNER
Email	douglas@durkindesign.com
Phone	415·412·7520

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

Name	Douglas Durkin
Address	313 Scott Street
Email	douglas@durkindesign.com
Phone	415·412·7520

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

Signature

11/2/2021

Date

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

Signature

11/2/2021

Date

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

TREE DESCRIPTION

Botanical name	Sequoia Sempervirens
Common name	Coast Redwood
Number of trees	1
Street address	313 Scott Street, San Francisco CA 94117
Reason for Nomination	I love this tree and it is beautiful. All my neighbors love the tree too. If someone was to move I don't want any issues or be forced to cut it down.

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

If the tree extends into multiple properties:

Which part of the tree does?
☐ Trunk ☒ Canopy

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

Latitude and Longitude (OPTIONAL):

Height (in feet)	
Average canopy width (in feet) Distance from one edge to opposite edge of tree canopy	70 to 80 feet
Circumference at chest level (in inches) Distance around trunk at 4.5' from ground http://www.isa-arbor.com/publications/tree-ord/heritage.aspx	20 to 25 feet
Circumference at ground level (in inches) Distance around trunk where the trunk meets the soil.	8 feet

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.

Rarity

Unusual species in San Francisco or other geographic regions.

☐ Rare
☒ Uncommon
☐ Common
☐ Other

Comments	I have been told they exist in SF but are not very common.

Physical Attributes

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

☐ Large
☒ Medium
☐ Small

Comments	

Age: Significantly advanced age for the species.

☐ Yes
☒ No

Comments	Circa 1915 - Planted from the Pan. Pacific International Exposition in SF.

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

☒ Yes
☐ No

Comments	

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

☒ Good
☐ Poor
☐ Potential hazard

Comments	

Historical Attributes

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

☐ Yes
☒ None apparent

Comments	

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

☐ Yes
☒ Unknown

Comments	

Environmental Attributes

Prominent landscape feature: A striking and outstanding natural feature.

☒ Yes
☐ No

Comments	

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

☐ Low
☒ Moderate
☐ High

Comments	

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

☐ Yes
☒ No

Comments	

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

☒ Yes
☐ No

Comments	It can be seen from numerous neighbors gardens and the street

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

☐ Yes
☒ No

Comments	

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

☒ Yes
☐ No

Comments	Lots of birds, squirrels, etc live there

Erosion control: Tree prevents soil erosion.

☐ Yes
☒ No

Comments	

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

☒ Yes
☐ No

Comments	

Cultural Attributes

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

☐ Yes
☒ None apparent

Comments	All of my neighbors love the tree

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

☒ Yes
☐ None apparent

Comments	Area1 SanFrancisco piece of History

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

☐ Yes

☒ Unknown

Comments	

Additional comments:

I understand from various landscapes that this tree has been called an "exposition" redwood. Saplings were given out at the 1915 pan-Pacific exposition and planted in Victorian Gardens in SF. This tree is a nice bit of history.

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.

At least one 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, 1155 Market Street, 3rd Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103
OR environment@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

London N. Breed
Mayor

Deborah O. Raphael
Director

February 24, 2022

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

RE: San Francisco Urban Forestry Council vote to inform the Board of Supervisors that the Coast Redwood *(Sequoia sempervirens)* at 313 Scott Street meets the criteria for landmark tree status.

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

On December 15, 2021, the Urban Forestry Council received a Landmark Tree nomination from Douglas Durkin, for a coast redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens)*, located at 313 Scott Street between Oak and Page.

At their meeting on February 22, 2022, the Urban Forestry Council found that the tree meets the criteria for landmark tree status. The Council found that the coast redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens)*, located at 313 Scott Street between Oak and Page, meets the criteria for landmark status and approved Resolution File No. 2022-02-UFC. (Ayes: Chair Sullivan, Vice Chair Crawford, Members Keller, Lacan, Xochitl Flores, Salvadori, Spigelman, Mike Sullivan, Nagle, Stringer, and Trang; Noes: Vaisset-Fauvel; Absent: Polony, Potter)

This letter and the enclosed materials from the February 22, 2022, Urban Forestry Council Meeting serve as written findings and a designation recommendation from the Urban Forestry Council.

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

Sincerely,

Peter Brastow
Urban Forestry Council Coordinator

Enclosure:
Urban Forestry Council Hearing Explanatory Documents

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

London N. Breed
Mayor

Deborah O. Raphael
Director

Urban Forestry Council Landmark Tree Committee Report

Submitted by Landmark Tree Committee Chair, Mike Sullivan on February 22, 2022

Committee members present at the February 03, 2022, Landmark Tree Ad Hoc Committee meeting: Damon Spigelman, Pam Nagle, Morgan Vaisset-Fauvel, Jillian Keller and Michael Sullivan

Address of nominated tree: 313 Scott Street.
Common name: Coast Redwood
Scientific name: *Sequoia sempervirens*

Summary

The Landmark Tree Committee recommends that the Urban Forestry Council approve this nomination and make the determination that this tree qualifies for landmark tree status. The nomination was supported by a vote of 4-1. The Committee supported this nomination based on the tree's physical attributes, environmental benefits, and neighborhood value. The one dissenter noted that the tree had been topped in the past, and thus now has two trunks, and is not as tall as it would otherwise be.

Physical Attributes

Committee members noted the health, vigor, and stature of the tree. While it's not large for a redwood, that it is large for a backyard tree.

Historical

The owner of the tree reported that the tree may have been planted from seedlings distributed during the Panama Pacific International Exposition in 1915.

Environmental

The owner noted that birds and squirrels reside in the tree.

Cultural

The owner noted in his nomination that "all my neighbors love the tree."

[Resolution endorsing the coast redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens)* tree at 313 Scott Street for landmark tree status]

Resolution endorsing the coast redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens*) tree at 313 Scott Street for Landmark Status, pursuant to Public Works Code Section 810(b).

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

WHEREAS, the coast redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens*) tree at 313 Scott Street fulfills the Landmark Tree criteria developed by the Urban Forestry Council, including its physical attributes, environmental benefits, and cultural value; and,

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

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

I hereby certify that this resolution was adopted at the Urban Forestry Council's regular meeting on February 22, 2021.

Peter Brastow, Urban Forestry Coordinator Andrew Sullivan, Council Chair

Vote: Approved 11-1

Ayes: Chair Sullivan, Vice Chair Crawford, Lacan, Keller, Nagle, Xochitl, M. Sullivan, Spigelman, Salvadori, Trang, Stringer

Noes: Vaisset-Fauvel

Absent: Polony, Potter

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

MEETING MINUTES - DRAFT

Tuesday, February 22, 2022, 6:00 p.m.
Remote meeting via web conference

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

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

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

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

   The meeting started at 6:03 PM.

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

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

   Chair Sullivan read the Ramaytush Ohlone Land Acknowledgement.

   New Member Ilaria Salvadori introduced herself. She works for the Citywide Planning group at the Planning Department and is an urban designer.

   There was no public comment.

3. **Review and vote on whether to approve Resolution File 2022-01-UFC, Resolution Making Findings to Allow Teleconferenced Meetings Under California Government Code Section 54953(e)**. Speaker: Peter Brastow, Urban Forestry Council Coordinator (Explanatory Document: Resolution File 2022-01-UFC) (Discussion and Action)

   The Council will consider adoption of a resolution making findings that newly enacted Government Code Section 54953(e) requires in order to allow the Council to hold meetings

remotely, as currently required under local law, without complying with certain Brown Act requirements.

Upon a motion by Member Lacan, seconded by Chair Sullivan, the Council approved the resolution unanimously 12-0.

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

There was no public comment.

4. **Adoption of Minutes of the December 10, 2021, Urban Forestry Council Regular Meeting.** (Explanatory Document: December 10, 2021, Draft Minutes) (Discussion and Action)

   Upon a motion by Member Mike Sullivan, seconded by Chair Sullivan, the Council approved the minutes unanimously 12-0.

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

   There was no public comment.

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

   There was no public comment.

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

   Peter Brastow introduced the item and explained that the Public Works data came in late Friday February 18th. Since it was a three-day weekend, he was only able to update some of the figures in the report and discussed those results.

   Upon a motion by Chair Sullivan, seconded by Xochitl, the Council voted 12-0 to continue the agenda item to the March 25th meeting.

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

   Public Comment:
   Josh Klipp read from the Environment code the section about the annual report timeline. He discussed the timeline as it relates to the city budget and his frustration with respect to the tardiness of the report.

Lance Carnes also discussed the timeline of the report issuance. He asked for the Council to be passionate about getting trees planted. As it relates to the pace of tree planting, he requested the development of a new urban forest plan.

7. **Hearing on nomination for Landmark Tree Status of the Coast Redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens*), located at 313 Scott Street, San Francisco, CA 94117.** The Council will hold a hearing to determine whether the tree nominated at the above location meets the criteria for designation as a landmark tree and to forward findings to the Board of Supervisors. (Explanatory Documents: Resolution File No. 2022-02-UFC, Nomination Form, Sullivan Evaluation, Nagle Evaluation, Keller Evaluation, Spigelman Evaluation, Vaisset-Fauvel Evaluation, Landmark Tree Committee Report, Draft February 3 Landmark Tree Committee Minutes.) (Discussion and Action)

   Landmark Tree Ad-Hoc Committee Chair Mike Sullivan summarized the discussion at the February 3rd Committee meeting. He explained that the redwood tree is a backyard tree on a property with a Victorian house. He explained that the vote was 4-1 to recommend the tree for Landmark status to the full Council, with Member Vaisset-Fauvel dissenting.

   Chair Sullivan asked about the Panama Pacific International Exposition (PPIE) connection, and Committee Chair Sullivan explained that the property owner was told by a consultant that the tree was likely planted from a sapling from the PPIE.

   Member Vaisset-Fauvel asked about the date of the PPIE (1915). He expressed concern about the topping cut of the redwood several decades ago, and that it could be an issue for the redwood in the not too distant future. He discussed that it could be a hazard in the future.

   Member Lacan inquired as to opposition to the tree being Landmarked.

   Committee Chair Sullivan responded that there was no neighborhood opposition and underscored that Landmark Tree Committee members who voted in favor were comforted by the owner's commitment to stewarding the tree.

   Vice Chair Crawford discussed that the tree seemed straight-forward for landmarking. Member Spigelman seconded that sentiment. Committee Chair Sullivan emphasized that this tree had no controversy.

   Upon a motion by Chair Sullivan, seconded by Member Spigelman, the Council voted 11-1 in support of the redwood tree on Scott Street meeting the criteria for designation as a Landmark Tree.

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

   There was no public comment.

   Member Salvadori left the meeting at 7:03 pm.

8. **Hearing on nomination for Landmark Tree Status of the Giant Sequoia (*Sequoiadendron giganteum*), located at 3344 Folsom Street, San Francisco, CA 94110.** The Council will hold a hearing to determine whether the tree nominated at the above location meets the criteria for designation as a landmark tree and to forward findings to the Board of Supervisors. (Explanatory

Documents: Nomination Form, Sullivan Evaluation, Keller Evaluation, Spigelman Evaluation, Vaisset-Fauvel Evaluation, Landmark Tree Committee Report, Draft February 3 Landmark Tree Committee Minutes.) (Discussion and Action)

Landmark Tree Ad-Hoc Committee Chair Mike Sullivan summarized the discussion at the February 3rd Committee meeting. The tree is on a property with a very old house from the mid-1800s. Sullivan discussed the public comment related to the neighboring property, which is being impacted by the tree. The consensus of the committee was that the tree is not a healthy, vigorous specimen.

Member Vaisset-Fauvel discussed that the health of the tree was the subject of the analysis that led to the lack of recommendation from the committee. He, as well as Member Spigelman, discussed that the litigation did not play a part in the decision of the committee.

Upon a motion by Committee Chair Sullivan, seconded by Member Stringer, the Council voted 11-0 to reject the giant sequoia for meeting the criteria for designation as a landmark tree.

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

Public Comment:
Mark Garrison, who is a structural foundation expert, and who was speaking on behalf of the adjacent property owner, testified that the tree is having a significant impact on the neighboring house, and that all of the roots should be removed.

Aaron Wang "sat in" for Roy Leggitt and discussed his inspection of the tree and that the tree should be removed, since removing the roots only would cause the tree to be an imminent hazard. He discussed that the tree is not in good health as well.

9. **Hearing on nomination for Landmark Tree Status of the Deodara pine (*Cedrus deodara*), located at 3340 Folsom Street, San Francisco, CA 94110.** The Council will hold a hearing to determine whether the tree nominated at the above location meets the criteria for designation as a landmark tree and to forward findings to the Board of Supervisors. (Explanatory Documents: Nomination Form, Sullivan Evaluation, Keller Evaluation, Spigelman Evaluation, Vaisset-Fauvel Evaluation, Landmark Tree Committee Report, Draft February 3 Landmark Tree Committee Minutes.) (Discussion and Action)

Landmark Tree Ad-Hoc Committee Chair Mike Sullivan summarized the discussion at the February 3rd Committee meeting. The tree is on the same property as the giant sequoia with a very old house from the mid-1800s. The committee found the tree to be much healthier than the giant sequoia. The committee wanted the tree to be better taken care of.

Member Lacan asked for clarification about which species the tree is.

Committee members noted that they would welcome a revisit of a nomination for Landmark status for the tree in several years after their recommendations for tree care were followed.

Upon a motion by Chair Sullivan, seconded by Member Vaisset-Fauvel, the Council voted 11-0 to reject the deodara cedar for meeting the criteria for designation as a landmark tree.

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

There was no public comment.

10. Committee Reports: (Discussion)

Planning & Funding Committee. Igor Lacan, Committee Chair.
Landmark Tree Ad Hoc Committee. Mike Sullivan, Committee Chair.

Planning and Funding Committee Chair Lacan explained that tree mortality was the main item on the agenda of the most recent meeting.

Landmark Tree Ad Hoc Committee Chair Mike Sullivan discussed the agenda from the previous committee meeting, including the three trees that were the subject of the current meeting as well as an item about improving website language and communication about why (and why not) one would nominate a tree for Landmark status. Committee Chair Sullivan also discussed the committee's discussion about the buckeye on McAllister and North Willard and that it is still not a Landmark Tree, but that it is getting closer with the district supervisor.

There was no public comment.

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

Peter Brastow discussed work on the Landmark tree nominations, improving the language on the website and generally performing lots of administrative clean up and stream-lining in preparation for the new Commission Affairs Officer, who starts soon.

There was no public comment.

12. Urban Forestry Council Member Announcements. (Discussion)

Vice Chair Crawford discussed the excitement and energy around the new street tree nursery at 5th and Harrison/Bryant, including Governor Newsom's press conference on the site.

Member Vaisset-Fauvel reported meeting with the California Native Plant Society-Yerba Buena Chapter and providing them with some native trees, e.g., CA buckeye.

There was no public comment.

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

Chair Sullivan mentioned the street tree nursery as a future item, and asked Peter Brastow to relay which items had been discussed recently. He mentioned the City of Los Angeles urban forester. Member Vaisset-Fauvel asked to focus on funding for planting trees for the next meeting. Chair Sullivan underscored the importance of funding tree planting as a future agenda item. Member Lacan agreed that the Planning and Funding Committee could initiate that conversation. Chair Sullivan discussed the Strategic Plan as a likely item for the next meeting.

Public Comment:
Lance Carnes agreed that Rachel Malarich from LA would be great to host at the UFC. He suggested that SF put some "webinars" about urban forestry on the City's websites, like what LA has. Mr. Carnes thanked the Council for the discussions on this item.

14. Adjournment.

The Meeting adjourned at 7:59 pm.

The next meeting of the Urban Forestry Council is scheduled for Tuesday, March 25, 2022, at 8:30 a.m. Find out about upcoming deadlines, public hearings, and meetings. Search the SFEnvironronment.org website archived minutes and agenda.

Remote Access to Information and Participation

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

Attending the Meeting: Watch or Listen

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

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

https://ccsf.webex.com/ccsf/onstage/g.php?MTID=e7460d4a3b853f9ec1a9eb767254577c0

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

Option 2: Join the meeting by phone if you do not have access to a computer or smart device.
Dial: **415-655-0001** and then enter the Access Code: **2484 743 2383**

Participating During Public Comment

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

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

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

Copies of explanatory documents are available, 1) on the Urban Forestry Council webpage https://sfenvironment.org/about/taskforce/urban-forestry-council; or (2) upon request to the Urban Forestry Coordinator, at telephone number 415-355-3733, or via e-mail at peter.brastow@sfgov.org.

Important Information

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

Public Comment

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

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

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

Disability Access

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

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

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

Language Access

Per the Language Access Ordinance (Chapter 91 of the San Francisco Administrative Code), Chinese, Spanish and or Filipino (Tagalog) interpreters will be available upon requests. Meeting Minutes may be translated, if requested, after they have been adopted by the Commission. Assistance in additional languages may be honored whenever possible. To request assistance with these services please contact the Commission Affairs

Manager at 415-355-3700 or peter.brastow@sfgov.org, at least 48 hours in advance of the hearing. Late requests will be honored if possible.

語言服務

根據語言服務條例(三藩市行政法典第91章)，中文、西班牙語和/或菲律賓語（泰加洛語）傳譯人員在收到要求後將會提供傳譯服務。翻譯版本的會議記錄可在委員會通過後透過要求而提供。其他語言協助在可能的情況下也將可提供。上述的要求，請於會議前最少48小時致電 415-355-3709或電郵至 peter.brastow@sfgov.org 向委員會秘書提出。逾期提出的請求，若可能的話，亦會被考慮接納。

Acceso A Idioma

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

Access Sa Wika

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

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

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

Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Requirements

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

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

Posted: February 18, 2022

Urban Forestry Council
Landmark Tree Evaluation Form and Criteria

Pursuant to Public Works Code, Article 16, Section 810, the Urban Forestry Council developed these criteria for evaluating potential landmark trees in San Francisco. When evaluating trees, please consider a tree within the context of its site using the criteria below. Use the comment sections, as appropriate, to explain or support your evaluation.

Evaluator's name	Jillian Keller
Date of evaluation	1/26/2022
Start time of evaluation	9:45AM
End time of evaluation	10:15AM
Botanical (Latin) name	Sequoia sempervirens
Common name	Coast redwood
Street address	313 Scott Street
Cross streets	Oak Street and Page Street

Rarity
Unusual species in San Francisco or other geographic regions.

☐ Rare
☑ Uncommon
☐ Common
☐ Other

Comments	

Physical Attributes

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

☑ Large ☐ Medium ☐ Small

Comments	Large for other trees of the same species in SF, but average for its age/species

Age: Significantly advanced age for the species.

☐ Yes ☑ No

Comments	Mature in development, but not over-mature

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

☑ Yes ☐ No

Comments	Significant feature of the landscape

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

☑ Good to Excellent
☐ Fair to Poor
☐ Potential hazard

Comments	Well maintained, average vigor, typical form for the species, rounded top

OVERALL CATEGORY RATING

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

☑ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No

Historical Attributes

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

☑ Yes ☐ None apparent

Comments	Potenitally an exposition redwood seedling	

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

☐ Yes ☑ Unknown

Comments	

OVERALL CATEGORY RATING

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

☐ Yes ☑ Partially ☐ No

Environmental Attributes

Prominent landscape feature: A striking and outstanding natural feature.

☑ Yes ☐ No

Comments	

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

☐ Low ☑ Moderate ☐ High

Comments	

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

☐ Yes ☑ No

Comments	

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

☐ Yes ☑ No

Comments	

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

☐ Yes ☑ No

Comments	

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

☑ Yes ☐ No

Comments	

Erosion control: Tree prevents soil erosion.

☐ Yes ☑ No

Comments	

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

☑ Yes ☐ No

Comments	

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

Cultural Attributes

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

Comments	Neighbors seem to appreciate tree

Cultural appreciation: Tree has value to a local cultural or ethnic group(s).
☐ Yes ☑ None apparent

Comments	

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

Comments	

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

Additional comments:

→ I think the coast redwood should be granted landmark tree status.

Urban Forestry Council
Landmark Tree Evaluation Form and Criteria

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

Evaluator's name	Pam Nagle
Date of evaluation	1/26/2022
Start time of evaluation	9:30 AM
End time of evaluation	10:00 AM
Botanical name	*Sequoia sempervirens*
Common name	Coast redwood
Street address	313 Scott Street, San Francisco
Cross streets	Oak/Page

Rarity

Unusual species in San Francisco or other geographic regions.

☐ Rare
☐ Uncommon
☒ Common
☐ Other

Comments	

Physical Attributes

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

☐ Large
☒ Medium
☐ Small

Comments	DBH: 39". In rear yard (southwest corner) growing at fence. Enlarged base, slightly sinuous upper trunk, vigorous, dense

	crown. Possible codominant stems in upper crown, difficult to see.

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

Comments	Fast-growing, long-lived species. Age is likely not significant.

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

Comments	Upright form typical of the species; crown rounded at top.

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

Comments	

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

Historical Attributes

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

Comments	

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

☐ Yes

☒ Unknown

Comments	

OVERALL CATEGORY RATING

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

☐ Yes

☐ Partially

☒ No

Environmental Attributes

Prominent landscape feature: A striking and outstanding natural feature.

☒ Yes

☐ No

Comments	The tree is vigorous, and visible to neighboring properties and surrounding buildings.

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

☐ Low

☒ Moderate

☐ High

Comments	The Haight contains a good number of mature street/frontage and back yard trees.

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

☐ Yes

☒ No

Comments	

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

☐ Yes

☒ No

Comments	Not tall enough to be visible from surrounding streets.

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

☐ Yes

☒ No

Comments	

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

☒ Yes

☐ No

Comments	The redwood adds wildlife habitat value in this urban setting.

Erosion control: Tree prevents soil erosion.

☐ Yes

☒ No

Comments	

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

☒ Yes

☐ No

Comments	Tree possibly reduces noise of area traffic for surrounding buildings.

OVERALL CATEGORY RATING

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

☒ Yes

☐ Partially

☐ No

Cultural Attributes

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

☐ Yes
☒ None apparent

Comments	Applicants may have submitted testimonials from neighbors.

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

Comments	

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

Comments	

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

Additional comments:

→

I support the nomination of this Coast Redwood for landmark status.

Urban Forestry Council
Landmark Tree Evaluation Form and Criteria

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

Evaluator's name	Damon Spigelman
Date of evaluation	01-02-2020
Start time of evaluation	9:45 am
End time of evaluation	10:15am
Botanical name	Sequoia sempervirens
Common name	Coastal Redwood
Street address	1313 Scott Street
Cross streets	Oak Street

Rarity

Unusual species in San Francisco or other geographic regions.

☐ Rare
☐ Uncommon
☒ Common
☐ Other

Comments	

Physical Attributes

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

☒ Large
☐ Medium
☐ Small

Comments	

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

Comments	Large Root Flair suggesting significant age

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

Comments	

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

Comments	

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

Historical Attributes

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

Comments	

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

Comments	

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

Environmental Attributes

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

Comments	

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

Comments	

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

Comments	

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

Comments	

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

Comments	

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

☒ Yes

☐ No

Comments	Species could sustain significant habitat

Erosion control: Tree prevents soil erosion.

☐ Yes

☒ No

Comments	

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

☒ Yes

☐ No

Comments	

OVERALL CATEGORY RATING

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

☒ Yes

☐ Partially

☐ No

Cultural Attributes

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

☐ Yes

☒ None apparent

Comments	

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

☐ Yes
☒ None apparent

Comments	

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

☐ Yes
☒ Unknown

Comments	

OVERALL CATEGORY RATING

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

☐ Yes
☒ Partially
☐ No

Additional comments:

→

Urban Forestry Council

Landmark Tree Evaluation Form and Criteria

Pursuant to Public Works Code, Article 16, Section 810, the Urban Forestry Council developed these criteria for evaluating potential landmark trees in San Francisco. When evaluating trees, please consider a tree within the context of its site using the criteria below. Use the comment sections, as appropriate, to explain or support your evaluation.

Evaluator's name	Michael Sullivan
Date of evaluation	1/23/22
Start time of evaluation	9AM
End time of evaluation	9:20AM
Botanical (Latin) name	Sequoia sempervirns
Common name	Coast redwood
Street address	313 Scott Street

Cross streets

Rarity

Unusual species in San Francisco or other geographic regions.

☐ Rare
☐ Uncommon
☐ Common
☐ Other

Comments	Common tree in San Francisco

Physical Attributes

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

☐ Large ☐ Medium ☐ Small

Comments	A bit larger than most

Age: Significantly advanced age for the species.

☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments	Not advanced age for the species in habitat, but it's a relatively old specimen for San Francisco

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

☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments	Excellent structure

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

☐ Good to Excellent

☐ Fair to Poor

☐ Potential hazard

Comments	Excellent health and structure; no hazards observed. I believe the physical attributes of this tree support a recommendation.

OVERALL CATEGORY RATING

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

☐ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No

Historical Attributes

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

☐ Yes ☐ None apparent

Comments	None apparent.	

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

☐ Yes ☐ Unknown

Comments	None. I don't believe that the historic attributes support a recommendation for landmark status

OVERALL CATEGORY RATING

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

☐ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No

Environmental Attributes

Prominent landscape feature: A striking and outstanding natural feature.

☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments	yes

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

☐ Low ☐ Moderate ☐ High

Comments	No - lots of trees in the neighborhood

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

☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments	no

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

☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments	no

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

☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments	no

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

☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments	Yes, as a Bay Area native, I suppose so - although I don't know that redwoods existed in SF in pre-European times

Erosion control: Tree prevents soil erosion.

☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments	no

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

☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments	No.

OVERALL CATEGORY RATING

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

☐ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No

Cultural Attributes

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

☐ Yes ☐ None apparent

Comments	None that I'm aware of

Cultural appreciation: Tree has value to a local cultural or ethnic group(s).

☐ Yes ☐ None apparent

Comments	no

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

☐ Yes ☐ Unknown

Comments	no

OVERALL CATEGORY RATING

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

☐ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No

Additional comments:

→

SAN FRANCISCO URBAN FORESTRY COUNCIL

Landmark Tree Nomination Form

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

Who can nominate a landmark tree?

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

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

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

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

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

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

Name	DOUGLAS DURKIN
Department	PROPERTY OWNER
Email	douglas@durkindesign.com
Phone	415·412·7520

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

Name	Douglas Durkin
Address	313 Scott Street
Email	douglas@durkindesign.com
Phone	415·412·7520

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

Signature

11/2/2021

Date

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

Signature

11/2/2021

Date

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

TREE DESCRIPTION

Botanical name	Sequoia Sempervirens
Common name	Coast Redwood
Number of trees	1
Street address	313 Scott Street, San Francisco CA 94117
Reason for Nomination	I love this tree and it is beautiful. All my neighbors love the tree too. If someone was to move I don't want any issues or be forced to cut it down.

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

If the tree extends into multiple properties:

Which part of the tree does?
☐ Trunk ☒ Canopy

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

Latitude and Longitude (OPTIONAL):

Height (in feet)	
Average canopy width (in feet) Distance from one edge to opposite edge of tree canopy	70 to 80 feet
Circumference at chest level (in inches) Distance around trunk at 4.5' from ground http://www.isa-arbor.com/publications/tree-ord/heritage.aspx	20 to 25 feet
Circumference at ground level (in inches) Distance around trunk where the trunk meets the soil.	8 feet

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.

Rarity

Unusual species in San Francisco or other geographic regions.

☐ Rare
☒ Uncommon
☐ Common
☐ Other

Comments	I have been told they exist in SF but are not very common.

Physical Attributes

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

☐ Large
☒ Medium
☐ Small

Comments	

Age: Significantly advanced age for the species.

☐ Yes
☒ No

Comments	Circa 1915 - Planted from the Pan. Pacific International Exposition in SF.

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

☒ Yes
☐ No

Comments	

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

☒ Good
☐ Poor
☐ Potential hazard

Comments	

Historical Attributes

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

☐ Yes
☒ None apparent

Comments	

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

☐ Yes
☒ Unknown

Comments	

Environmental Attributes

Prominent landscape feature: A striking and outstanding natural feature.

☒ Yes
☐ No

Comments	

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

☐ Low
☒ Moderate
☐ High

Comments	

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

☐ Yes
☒ No

Comments	

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

☒ Yes
☐ No

Comments	It can be seen from numerous neighbors gardens and the street

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

☐ Yes
☒ No

Comments	

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

☒ Yes
☐ No

Comments	Lots of birds, squirrels, etc live there

Erosion control: Tree prevents soil erosion.

☐ Yes
☒ No

Comments	

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

☒ Yes
☐ No

Comments	

Cultural Attributes

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

☐ Yes
☒ None apparent

Comments	All of my neighbors love the tree

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

☒ Yes
☐ None apparent

Comments	Area1 SanFrancisco piece of History

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

☐ Yes

☒ Unknown

Comments	

Additional comments:

I understand from various landscapes that this tree has been called an "exposition" redwood. Saplings were given out at the 1915 pan-Pacific exposition and planted in Victorian Gardens in SF. This tree is a nice bit of history.

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.

At least one 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, 1155 Market Street, 3rd Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103
OR environment@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 _____