



**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

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

**MEETING MINUTES DRAFT**

**Tuesday, October 27, 2020, 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), Dan Flanagan, Jillian Keller, Morgan Vaisset-Fauvel, Igor Lacan, Ildiko Polony, Pamela Nagle, Edgar Xochitl Flores, Mike Sullivan, Blake Troxel (Presidio Trust), Damon Spigelman (San Francisco Public Utilities Commission), Oscar Hernandez-Gomez (San Francisco Planning Department), Chris Fischer (Port of San Francisco) and Matthew Stephens (San Francisco Recreation and Park Department).

**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 was called to order at 6:03 p.m.

Present: Chair Sullivan, Vice Chair Crawford, Member Keller, Member Vaisset-Fauvel, Member Lacan, Member Xochitl Flores, Member Spigelman, Member Mike Sullivan, Member Fischer, Member Nagle and Member Hernandez-Gomez. Excused: Members Flanagan, Polony, Stephens, and Troxel.

**2. Adoption of Minutes of the September 25, 2020 Urban Forestry Council Regular Meeting.**

(Explanatory Document: September 25, 2020 Draft Minutes) (Discussion and Action)

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

(Ayes: Chair Sullivan, Vice Chair Crawford, Member Keller, Member Vaisset-Fauvel, Member Lacan, Member Xochitl Flores, Member Spigelman, Member Mike Sullivan, Member Fischer, Member Nagle and Member Hernandez-Gomez; Noes: None; Excused: Members Flanagan, Polony, Stephens, and Troxel)

**3. 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.

Public Comment Received via Webex:

Josh Klipp stated that by 2023, the Climate Action Plan will have been in place for 9 years and there are only 5 years left before climate change is irreversible. He added that Rec and Park should have a 2-1 replacement goal and that funding should be spent on replanting trees that are now nearing their end of life. He also added that the Environment Code lays out that it is the UFC's responsibility to ensure that all Departments adhere by the Environment Code and the Environment Department's recommendations.

**4. Discussion and possible action to recommend, for adoption by the Board of Supervisors, uniform criteria, rules, and procedures, governing determinations to remove Landmark trees pursuant to San Francisco Public Works Code Article 16 Section 810(f)(1).** Speaker, Mike Sullivan (Explanatory Document, Public Works Code Article 16 Section 810(f)(1); Memo re Proposed Changes to Article 16; and Proposed Changes to Article 16 with In Line Text Changes) (Discussion and Possible Action)

Member Mike Sullivan introduced this item and asked that Peter review the additional recommended changes.

Peter Brastow reviewed the changes that are included in the memo as well as additional changes including a spelling out of "ISA" as "International Society of Arboriculture," removing the "o" after section "802," and correcting the spelling of "supersede" in paragraph F3.

Member Sullivan mentioned that the previous discussion was very robust and hopes that this is ready for adoption.

Upon a motion by Vice Chair Crawford, Second by Members Keller and Vaisset-Fauvel to recommend the criteria, rules, and procedures governing determinations to remove Landmark trees including the additional changes mentioned above, the motion was approved unanimously. (Ayes: Chair Sullivan, Vice Chair Crawford, Member Keller, Member Vaisset-Fauvel, Member Lacan, Member Xochitl Flores, Member Spigelman, Member Mike Sullivan, Member Fischer, Member Nagle and Member Hernandez-Gomez; Noes: None; Excused: Members Flanagan, Polony, Stephens, and Troxel)

Public Comment received via telephone:

Susan Karasoff expressed her support for the earlier public comment that Rec and Park should track the trees they add and remove and that they should only be planting native plants.

Public Comments received via email are attached.

Peter Brastow expressed his appreciation for the Council and explained next steps.

Member Mike Sullivan expressed his appreciation for Peter's work on this.

**5. Review and vote on approving the 2020 Annual Urban Forest Report.** Speaker: Peter Brastow, Urban Forestry Coordinator, Department of Environment (Explanatory Document: 2020 Annual Urban Forest Report FINAL) (Discussion and Action)

Peter Brastow gave an update on the report and the data included in the report.

Vice Chair Crawford mentioned that he has the streetscape planting numbers and will send that to Peter.

Member Fischer expressed his appreciation for the work that Peter put into the report.

Vice Chair Crawford seconded that sentiment.

Member Mike Sullivan asked to clarify that there are an additional 600 trees that were planted by Public Works that have not yet been included in the report.

Peter confirmed that this is correct and there is another set of trees that has yet to be included in the report.

Member Mike Sullivan asked to confirm that the total number of trees for Public Works will increase to over 3200.

Peter confirmed that this is correct.

Member Mike Sullivan asked if the graph on page 7 of the report will change.

Peter confirmed that the graph will look different with the new information. Peter added that he also had to clarify the data from CalTrans and make it specific to San Francisco.

Member Vaisset-Fauvel mentioned that the UCSF numbers will most likely affect the data for the next few years because trees being removed cannot be immediately replaced and protecting larger trees requires more open space.

Peter added that there should be a discussion in December about next year's report and breaking down the data to compare open spaces and the built environment.

Chair Sullivan asked that there be a future agenda item that gives everyone an opportunity to review and digest the report.

Member Keller asked if there will be an opportunity to review the report before it has been approved.

Vice Chair Crawford expressed that the report can be revised after approval but leaving it unapproved would leave it open for ongoing additions of data. He added that revised versions allow the UFC to capture different iterations of the report.

Peter confirmed that the meaningful changes to the report have been discussed at this meeting and he does not anticipate additional substantial changes.

Member Vaisset-Fauvel expressed that there should be some additional discussion around the report to understand the meaning behind the data included in it.

Vice Chair Crawford supported this idea and would like the opportunity to hold stakeholders accountable for their data.

Member Vaisset-Fauvel added that a summary could be written afterwards, or conversations could be started around connecting different departments and brainstorming solutions.

Chair Sullivan supported having this discussion at the next UFC meeting and finding ways to share learnings with others.

Member Keller added that she would like additional time to review the report with the latest data and have an open discussion with the rest of the Council.

Vice Chair Crawford added that the report is meant to highlight data and trends. He mentioned that discussion can be around whether the City is happy with these trends.

Member Mike Sullivan added that this is the second year that removals have exceeded plantings, so there needs to be discussion around that and how this can be addressed.

Member Vaisset-Fauvel wondered if COVID and the rainy season had impacted the planting numbers. He added that climate change and drought will have an impact on this in the future.

Member Nagle asked to clarify if now is the time to approve the report and discuss how policy can be impacted moving forward

Upon a motion by Member Sullivan, Second by Vice Chair Crawford to approve the 2020 annual urban forest report with the discussed revisions as well as the additional information from two agencies, the motion was approved unanimously.

(Ayes: Chair Sullivan, Vice Chair Crawford, Member Keller, Member Vaisset-Fauvel, Member Lacan, Member Xochitl Flores, Member Spigelman, Member Mike Sullivan, Member Fischer, Member Nagle and Member Hernandez-Gomez; Noes: None; Excused: Members Flanagan, Polony, Stephens, and Troxel)

Public Comment via telephone:

Susan Karasoff from the California Native Plant Society asked the UFC to consider adding goals for biodiversity into the report so that city agencies are reminded of the biodiversity resolutions of San Francisco and California. She thanked the UFC for adding local native trees to the street tree list in 2019 and asked that plantings be restricted to local native trees.

Public Comment via Webex:

The caller mentioned that San Francisco has the smallest percentage of urban canopy of any major city in the US, and he encouraged the UFC to use the report to look at this holistically. He also mentioned that OCII attempted to take out several large trees, so their numbers are not insignificant. He said that Environment Code Section 1209 states that city agencies shall report to the Council regarding the trees they manage as part of the urban forest plan and there are mandatory deadlines for sharing this information. He expressed concern that the Council is going to miss their deadline to share the annual report, and so the City will not have this information to influence its policies and budgets. This data needs to be shared and used to protect the future of our urban forestry.

Peter confirmed that there have been no numbers from OCII, but he will do his best to reach out to them to have their survey completed.

Vice Chair Crawford suggested noting mandatory compliance in the data request for next year.

Peter mentioned that COVID has played a role in the delay of the report this year, but that all parties must be held accountable.

**6. Discussion of the Urban Forestry Council Strategic Plan.** Speaker, Andrew Sullivan, Chair of Urban Forestry Council (Explanatory Document: UFC Strategic Plan Priority Matrix) (Discussion)

Chair Sullivan introduced this agenda item and asked for updates on the different parts of the strategic plan.

Member Nagle mentioned that policy committee recently had a meeting and hopes to have updates for the next UFC meeting.

Member Keller mentioned that she has had a difficult time scheduling time with everyone and is working on following up with Member Troxel on the latest Lidar data to help determine goals for the City.

Chair Sullivan added that he did not have any updates for strengthening the Council besides transitioning with Member Flanagan. He also spoke about the communications committee and mentioned that there has not been a recent meeting. He added that he will have more to report out in December.

Member Spigelman added that Tom Carter from the SF Port was involved with this before he retired.

Member Vaisset-Fauvel asked if Member Spigelman would like to be connected with UCSF's communication department.

Member Spigelman added that he will start with the PUC's communications team.

Member Vaisset-Fauvel said that he would like to wait for Member Troxel to give an update on the canopy cover committee.

Vice Chair Crawford mentioned that Davy Tree has a quarterly webinar series, and they would be willing to give the UFC a 15-minute time slot. He asked if it would be possible to have UFC sponsor this and have a for-profit partner.

Peter added that he doesn't see why this could be an issue.

Chair Sullivan added that he would like to touch base on the work being done on this.

Public Comment received via Webex:

The caller shared that there is currently no consideration for trees in the City's planning process and that the UFC should amplify these efforts. He added that this should be part of the UFC Strategic Plan section 9, and the UFC should assist with the formulation of legislation. He also added that changes could be made including tree protection bonds, modified penalty structures, and biomass replacement formulas which would help with funding sources as well as protect trees.

## **7. Committee Reports:** (Discussion)

**Planning & Funding Committee.** Igor Lacan, Committee Chair.

**Landmark Tree Ad Hoc Committee.** Mike Sullivan, Committee Chair.

Member Lacan said that the Committee heard about the Climate Action Plan and had further discussion on that. They discussed where trees fit into the planning process and he said that this might be worth bringing up again. He added that there is international interest in tree protection on private property.

Member Hernandez-Gomez asked if Member Lacan could send around the article he mentioned.

Member Lacan agreed that he would send the article to Peter for disbursement.

Member Mike Sullivan confirmed that he has no report because there was no meeting since the last UFC meeting.

Public comment received via Webex

The caller stated that the conversation around planning needs to happen now. He stated that the City is great with development and coming up with reasons why trees do not need to be preserved.

He added that Singapore is an example of what is possible, and without the UFC pressing on decisionmakers, trees will not be prioritized.

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

Peter mentioned that the Climate Action Plan is moving through an equity analysis process and then it will go through a public engagement phase in December. He also added that the Urban Forest report has been taking up a lot of time. He said that a colleague in Boulder has asked for carbon sequestration quantification information because he would like to develop a national funding campaign for this work.

There was no public comment.

**9. Urban Forestry Council Member Announcements.** (Discussion)

Vice Chair Crawford mentioned that Public Works worked with the SF Port to plant 3 replacement palms on Embarcadero. He also mentioned that he learned about a new pest and expressed concern. He added that Public Works has a new contract with SFMTA for line clearance to do much needed pruning while some bus lines are down. He then mentioned that Members Keller and Nagle were on a webinar representing the UFC.

Member Hernandez-Gomez mentioned he presented at the Funding Committee and connected with Member Troxel to add potential tree planting data to the data set he presented. He would like to bring this before the UFC in the future.

There was no public comment.

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

Peter mentioned that there are no UFC meetings in November. Member Vaisset-Fauvel will present at the Planning and Funding Committee meeting on December 1<sup>st</sup>. Other potential future items include additional discussion around a single agency, private trees in Australia, Vancouver's urban forestry work, the annual report discussion, a project at the Glen Park Greenway, and the combined potential tree planting data. Peter also mentioned that he received an email from Earth Law Center with a proposal to rewrite some of San Francisco's environment codes.

Chair Sullivan agreed that the annual report should be discussed at a full Council meeting.

Member Vaisset-Fauvel brought up the potential to discuss protecting trees by improving where they are planted in sidewalks with new technology.

Member Hernandez-Gomez asked if the UFC would be giving recommendations around this.

Vice Chair Crawford added that this should be brought up as a potential future agenda item.

Peter asked how this agenda item could take shape.

Vice Chair Crawford said that this discussion could start at the Planning and Funding Committee meeting.

Chair Sullivan asked if Member Vaisset-Fauvel would be present at the Planning and Funding Committee meeting.

Member Vaisset-Fauvel confirmed that he would be.

Peter asked if this would be a discussion item or if there would be an outside speaker.

Member Vaisset-Fauvel said that this would be a discussion item.

Public Comment Received via Webex

The caller encouraged the UFC to work with the organization that had offered to potentially rewrite some of San Francisco's codes so that more could be done to grow and protect trees. He added that this should be a future agenda item.

## 11. Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:52 p.m.

**The next meeting of the Urban Forestry Council is scheduled for Friday, December 11, 2020 at 8:30 a.m. In compliance with the San Francisco Health Officer's Order No. C19-07c, directing all individuals to "shelter in place", Public meetings, panels and other advisory bodies will continue on a remote conferencing basis only. Find out about upcoming deadlines, public hearings, and meetings. Search the SFEnvironment.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=ecad835efc5374ea8baec0ed2b17f8691>

- 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: **146 348 6025**

## Participating During Public Comment

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

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

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

In accordance with Governor Gavin Newsom's statewide order for all residents to "Stay at Home" - and the numerous local and state proclamations, orders and supplemental directions - aggressive directives have been issued to slow down and reduce the spread of the COVID-19 virus. Copies of explanatory documents are available, 1) on the Urban Forestry Council webpage <https://sfenvironment.org/about/taskforce/urban-forestry-council>; or (2) upon request to the Commission Affairs Manager, at telephone number 415-355-3709, or via e-mail at [katie.chansler@sfgov.org](mailto:katie.chansler@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 agenda 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, [katie.chansler@sfgov.org](mailto:katie.chansler@sfgov.org), by 5:00 p.m. on the day prior to the hearing. Written public comment received by the Council will be posted as an attachment to the minutes.

The Brown Act forbids the Committee from taking action or discussing any item or issue not appearing on the posted agenda. This rule applies to issues raised in public comment as well. In response to public comment, not on an agenda 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) 355-3709 or [katie.chansler@sfgov.org](mailto:katie.chansler@sfgov.org) to make arrangements for the accommodation. Late requests will be honored, if possible.

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

### **Language Access**

Per the Language Access Ordinance (Chapter 91 of the San Francisco Administrative Code), Chinese, Spanish and or Filipino (Tagalog) interpreters will be available upon requests. Meeting Minutes may be translated, if requested, after they have been adopted by the Commission. Assistance in additional languages may be honored whenever possible. To request assistance with these services please contact the Commission Affairs Manager at 415-355-3700 or [katie.chansler@sfgov.org](mailto:katie.chansler@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[katie.chansler@sfgov.org](mailto:katie.chansler@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 415-355-3709, o [katie.chansler@sfgov.org](mailto:katie.chansler@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 415-355-3709, o [katie.chansler@sfgov.org](mailto:katie.chansler@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: [soff@sfgov.org](mailto:soff@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](http://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](http://www.sfgov.org/ethics).

---

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

**Subject:** ACTION: Please circulate to UFC Members - Section "810" Changes to Landmark Tree Removals  
**Date:** Monday, November 9, 2020 at 2:36:00 PM Pacific Standard Time  
**Priority:** High

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Monday, October 26, 2020 12:26 PM  
**To:** Chansler, Katie (ENV) <katie.chansler@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** ACTION: Please circulate to UFC Members - Section "810" Changes to Landmark Tree Removals  
**Importance:** High

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Katie,  
Please forward this message to the UFC *immediately* (so they get it in enough time prior to tomorrow's meeting to have digested it).  
Thank you.

Dear Urban Forestry Council,

As you deliberate the amendments to Section "810" of the Urban Forestry Ordinance...

While the item on your Oct. 27, 2020 Agenda (& your prior Landmark Tree Committee Full Council Agendas) references only Section 810(f)(1) of the Public Works Code of Article 16 for discussion and/or possible action, I believe that perhaps not all members of the Council may be aware of the EXACT definition of "HAZARD."

No "Supporting Documents" from prior meetings had posted Section 802 for use by the Committee nor the full Council to assist in any way the members as they deliberate the changes.

It is important, IMHO, that as your agenda item during your deliberations to change the text of "810" as described in your agendas thus far, that you include and have the membership have a copy of Section 802 to see exactly what "hazard" is AS DEFINED IN 802. I do not see this part of the Public Works Code as having been provided to date to the Council members either in Committee or the Full Council.

Per Public Works Code Article 16: Urban Forestry Ordinance, Sec. 802, "Definitions":

(o) "Hazard tree" shall mean any tree that poses an imminent hazard to person or property. The Director may determine that a tree is a hazard if it or any part of it: (1) appears dead, dangerous, or likely to fall, even after proper maintenance activities are performed to eliminate dead or dangerous parts; (2) obstructs or damages a street, sidewalk, or other existing structure; (3) harbors a serious disease or infestation threatening the health of other trees; (4) interferes with vehicular or pedestrian traffic; or (5) poses any other significant hazard or potential hazard, as determined by the Director; provided, however, that feasible measures have been applied to abate any such hazard, such as applicable maintenance activities listed in Section 802(1) of this Article. The Director's determination shall be in writing.

Keeping this definition of "hazard" in mind, does what your changes being offered actually

work to protect the landmark tree from removal as much as possible?  
Or is this another way for somebody to take down a landmark tree because it is a "hazard" per 802?

Again, does 802(o) change the amendments and consequences of the amendments you have thus far? Have you covered for removal as "hazard" AS DEFINED IN 802?  
A layman's idea of "hazard" might mean only if somebody's life is in jeopardy but the 802 definition is broader...

What criteria will be considered or no longer considered in removal of landmark trees?  
Will the Board of Supervisors be involved in removal of landmark trees?  
Will everything hinge on the decision of one person -- the Director of Public Works -- to make the decision?  
Please clarify in your meeting(s).

Thank you all for your valuable time.  
Rose

**Subject:** UFC meeting 10/27 /20, my comments on item 4  
**Date:** Monday, November 9, 2020 at 2:39:46 PM Pacific Standard Time  
**From:** Chansler, Katie (ENV)

---

**From:** Nancy Wuerfel  
**Reply-To:** Nancy Wuerfel  
**Date:** Monday, October 26, 2020 at 4:48 PM  
**To:** "Chansler, Katie (ENV)" <katie.chansler@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** UFC meeting 10/27 /20, my comments on item 4

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hi Katie,

Please forward this email this afternoon to the members of the Urban Forestry Council containing my comments regarding item 4 - Recommendations for Changes to the Public Works Code, Article 16, Section 810. Thanks very much for your help today.

Sincerely,

Nancy Wuerfel

----

TO - Members of the Urban Forestry Council

I support the UFC's efforts to improve the protections for preserving Landmark Trees from removal by revising parts of Article 16 to clarify the process and ensure removal is only a last resort. I request that UFC recommendations be amended to reflect the current revisions in sections of the Public Works Code and for the Council to take note of all my comments.

### **Proposed Changes to Article 16**

1) LEAVE ➤ The authority and requirement for the UFC to recommend revisions to section 810(f)(1) comes from this section, so it makes not sense to delete the following sentence:

"The Urban Forestry Council shall develop and recommend for adoption by the Board of Supervisors uniform criteria, rules, and procedures governing determinations to remove landmark trees." Please let this sentence remain.

2) REVISE ➤ All the language in section 810(f)(1) has not been cited. There is wording that requires revision because Ordinance 119-15 approved 7/15/15 changed the definition of "hazard tree" and deleted Section 802(o) from Article 16. I recommend that the UFC revision read as follows:

*Removal criteria shall require consideration and written findings on all of the*

*factors related to the landmark tree as set forth in Section 810(f)(4), below, and shall not authorize the removal of a landmark tree unless ~~the~~ it constitutes a hazard tree pursuant to Section 802(ø). as revised by Ordinance 119-15 approved 7/15/15 that changed the definition of "hazard tree" and deleted section 802(o) from Article 16.*

3) REVISE ➤ There is additional important information about Public Notice, hearings, appeals, and tree removals in other sections of 806 that should be included in the UFC revision. I recommend that the UFC revision read as follows: To Section 810(f)(1), add after "806(a)(2); 806(a)(3); 806(a)(4); 806(a)(5); 806(b)(1); and 806(b)(3)(A, B) as revised by Ordinance 245-17 approved on 12/22/17.

4) REVISE ➤ Since there are new subsections to inserted after Section 810(f)(1) that pertain specifically to hazard trees, and not to just **any kind of desire** to remove a Landmark Tree, I recommend new Section 810(f)(1), subsection A be qualified as follows. Also, since the Public Works Code is a legal document, I believe it is important to be spell out any abbreviations when they are first used.

*"A. If either a private property owner or a City agency desires because of a hazard to remove a Landmark Tree on its respective property, the owner or the agency, respectively, shall apply to the Department for a Landmark Tree Removal Permit, as per Section 806 for street trees, and shall obtain a tree risk assessment, per the most recent version of the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) tree risk assessment manual, performed by an ISA certified arborist who is Tree Risk Assessment Qualified. The assessment shall inform the Director's determination of whether or not a Landmark Tree is a hazard tree, as per the revised Sections 802 and 806."*

"B. The Director shall incorporate the tree risk assessment into the written finding that determines (as per revised Sections 802 and 806) whether the Landmark Tree is a hazard tree. The Director's finding shall include an explanation of whether the hazardous condition could be mitigated by another method (e.g., cabling or heavy pruning) other than total removal of the tree. If the Director's finding indicates that the hazardous condition could be mitigated by an action or actions other than total removal of the tree, then the finding shall include specific recommendations for such actions."

5) LEAVE ➤ Since it is unknown how long it will take for the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor to adopt changes to Article 16, I recommend that this sentence remain in place. Strike the last sentence from Section 810 (f)(2): "Pending adoption of criteria for removal of landmark trees, the Department shall rely on the general criteria set forth in Section 810(f)(4)(A)-(F)." Please let this sentence remain.

6) OK ➤ Delete and replace phrase in Section 810(f)(3): Substitute the word "in" in place of the phrase "adopted by the Board of Supervisors pursuant to".

7) LEAVE ➤ Since it is unknown how long it will take for the Board of Supervisors

and the Mayor to adopt changes to Article 16, I recommend that this sentence remain in place. Please do not strike the second to last sentence from Section 810(f)(3): "Pending the Board of Supervisor's adoption of the criteria, rules, and procedures pursuant to Section 810(f)(1), the agency, commission, or department shall follow the general criteria of Subsection (f)(4)(A)-(F) and similar rules and procedures for removal of street trees as set forth in Section 806(c) and for removal of hazard trees as set forth in this Section 806(a)(4)." Please let this sentence remain.

8) REVISE ➤ There is additional important information about tree maintenance in revised Sections 802 and 806 that should be included in the UFC revision. I recommend that the UFC revision read as follows:

*Add new subsection 810(f)(4)(G): "(G) Whether the tree appears to have had routine maintenance and/or major maintenance as defined in the revised Sections 802 and 806."*

9) OK ➤ Add into appropriate footnotes in the code: "This ordinance was modified by the Board of Supervisors on recommendation from the Urban Forestry Council on X Date etc. etc."

I thank the Council for considering my comments on this important matter.

Nancy Wuerfel