

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	Morgan V. Fauvel
Date of evaluation	February 02
Start time of evaluation	11:15 am
End time of evaluation	11:25 am
Botanical (Latin) name	Sequoia sempervirens
Common name	Redwood
Street address	313 Scott Street
Cross streets	Oak Rd.

Rarity

Unusual species in San Francisco or other geographic regions.

- Rare
 Uncommon
 Common
 Other

Comments	Common in North Ca. & City.
-----------------	-----------------------------

Physical Attributes

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

- Large Medium Small

Comments	medium for a redwood.
-----------------	-----------------------

Age: Significantly advanced age for the species.

- Yes No

Comments	even the tree is large, not significant age
-----------------	---

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

Yes No

Comments	the tree has "top" and not as tall it should be.
----------	--

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

Good to Excellent
 Fair to Poor
 Potential hazard

Comments	the tree is in fair condition healthwise.
----------	---

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

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 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:

→ because the tree is very common & the defect related to previous pruning I do not believe the tree meet all categorie to be nominated.

Environmental Attributes

Prominent landscape feature: A striking and outstanding natural feature.

Yes No

Comments	Nice looking backyard tree -
----------	------------------------------

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

Low Moderate High

Comments	Put moderate for backyard, but street is high.
----------	--

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	Redwood support a lot of native insects & birds.
----------	--

Erosion control: Tree prevents soil erosion.

Yes No

Comments	
----------	--

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

Yes No

Comments	evenly canopy -
----------	-----------------

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	Morgan V. Fauvel
Date of evaluation	December 31 st 2021
Start time of evaluation	12.30 pm.
End time of evaluation	01.00 pm.
Botanical (Latin) name	Cedrus deodora
Common name	deodor cedar
Street address	3344 Folsom St
Cross streets	(Park)

Rarity

Unusual species in San Francisco or other geographic regions.

- Rare
 Uncommon
 Common
 Other

Comments	common landscap tree.
-----------------	-----------------------

Physical Attributes

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

- Large Medium Small

Comments	it is a large specimen.
-----------------	-------------------------

Age: Significantly advanced age for the species.

- Yes No

Comments	mid age on the large side
-----------------	---------------------------

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

Yes No

Comments	Multiple stems is common with that species, nice appearance.
----------	--

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

Good to Excellent
 Fair to Poor
 Potential hazard

Comments	Excellent.
----------	------------

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	Nice landscape feature -
----------	--------------------------

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	Partially, need to look hard -
----------	--------------------------------

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	backyard, low vising street.
----------	------------------------------

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

Yes No

Comments	Not to native species -
----------	-------------------------

Erosion control: Tree prevents soil erosion.

Yes No

Comments	
----------	--

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

Yes No

Comments	Evergreen -
----------	-------------

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 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:

→ Even the tree is looking very good, I would like to wait and see if we can't visit the tree in 5 to 10 years to re-assess it - but with the current condition it is just shy to be nominated.

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	Morgan V. Fausel
Date of evaluation	December 31 st 2021
Start time of evaluation	12:30 pm
End time of evaluation	1:00 pm
Botanical (Latin) name	Sequoiadendron giganteum.
Common name	Giant Sequoia
Street address	3344 Folsom St.
Cross streets	None - (Park)

Rarity

Unusual species in San Francisco or other geographic regions.

- Rare
- Uncommon
- Common
- Other

Comments	Rare in the city, common in CA -
----------	----------------------------------

Physical Attributes

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

- Large
- Medium
- Small

Comments	large mature specimen.
----------	------------------------

Age: Significantly advanced age for the species.

- Yes
- No

Comments	Even it is large, not significant age for the specie.
----------	---

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

Yes No

Comments	Tree is in distress - Not impress with the codominant.
----------	--

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

Good to Excellent

Fair to Poor

Potential hazard

Comments	Poor health, light canopy.
----------	----------------------------

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	moshit likely planted after house was constructed.
----------	--

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	You can see the tree from the street
----------	--------------------------------------

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

Low Moderate High

Comments	many trees in backyard & street.
----------	----------------------------------

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	only visible.
----------	---------------

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	Not to local bay area species.
----------	--------------------------------

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 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:

→ Even the tree is rare in the city & large
It is appearing "Heath" is in decline -
I don't see any immediate hazard beside
brush that could fall -