

1/26/07

URBAN FORESTRY COUNCIL CRITERIA FOR LANDMARK TREE EVALUATION

Pursuant to Ordinance 0017-06 and Public Works Code Section 810, the UFC has 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 comment sections, as appropriate, to explain or support evaluation. Attach sheets if more space is needed.

Evaluator's name: Mike Boss

Scientific name: Quercus agrifolia Common name: Coast Live Oak

Street address: 20-26 Rosemont

Cross streets: 14th St.

Block: _____ Lot(s): _____

Rare: Yes No Other: Uncommon.
Unusual species in San Francisco. Also consider rarity in California, North America, world.

Comment: maybe not rare, but not common.
• Rare to find one of this size.

Size: Large Not large
Notable size compared to other trees of the same species.

Comment: Large trunk, expansive canopy

Age: Significantly advanced Not significantly advanced
Significantly advanced age (known or estimated)

Comment: guesstimate 100+ yrs.

Report: 80 yr old neighbors remembers oak existing as small (40 old) boy.

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

Describe nature of appreciation: likely the tree pre-dates most or all
existing buildings

Ethnic appreciation: Yes None apparent

Particular value to certain ethnic groups in neighborhood or city.

Describe nature of appreciation: _____

Neighborhood appreciation: ___ Yes ___ None apparent

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

Describe nature of appreciation. Attach documentation: Reported (Marty Osborne) - quotes

+5 non-local.
That 15 local residents have expressed interest in tree;

Planting defines neighborhood character: Yes ___ No

Contributes to neighborhood aesthetic.

Describe contribution: Signature tree in a unique

Profiled in a publication or other media: ___ Yes ___ None apparent

Tree has received print, internet, video media coverage.

Describe coverage. Attach documentation if appropriate. Be specific.

High traffic area: ___ Yes No

High visibility, possible traffic calming effect.

Describe: _____

Low tree density: Yes ___ No

Tree exists in a neighborhood with very few trees.

Describe: Local grove is isolated in very urban Area - just off

Market St.

Extends between multiple properties: Yes ___ No

High visibility, multiple neighbors share tree.

Describe: Spreading canopy extends over 2 ~~more~~ additional properties -
3 total.

Accessible from public right-of-way. ___ Yes No

High visibility.

Describe: _____

Important wildlife habitat: Yes No

Wildlife shelter and/or food (observed or potential)

Describe. Be as specific as possible.

note,
Crows, Pigeon falcon.

Interdependent group of trees: Yes No

This tree forms a supercanopy and removing it may have an adverse impact on adjacent trees.

Describe:

signature

Erosion control: Yes No

Tree prevents soil erosion

Describe:

Wind or sound barrier: Yes No

Tree reduces wind speed or mitigates undesirable noise

Describe:

possible

Prominent landscape feature: Yes No

A striking and outstanding natural feature

Describe, attach photo if possible:

Character-defining form: Yes No

Tree is an example of good form for its particular species.

Describe:

Tree condition: Good Poor Hazard

Consider overall tree health and structure, and whether or not tree poses a hazard

Describe: