Urban Forestry Council Landmark Tree Evaluation Form and Criteria

Unusual species in San Francisco or other geographic regions.

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	07/29/2020
Start time of evaluation	11:00 a.m.
End time of evaluation	12:30 p.m.
Botanical name	Pinus ponderosa
Common name	Ponderosa Pine
Street address	2253 Filbert Street SF
Cross streets	Filbert/Steiner

Rarity

□ Rare

☑ Uncommon☐ Other	n
Comments	Not a common tree in SF
Physical	Attributes
Size: Notabl	Attributes e size compared to other trees of the same species in San Francisco.
Size: Notabl ☑ Large	
Size: Notabl	
Size: Notabl ☑ Large	

Age: Signific	cantly advanced age for the species.
□ No	
Comments	
Distinguish otherwise unic ☑ Yes ☐ No Comments	ned form: Tree is an example of good form for its species, has majestic quality or que structure.
Comments	
Tree condit ☐ Good ☐ Poor ☐ Potential H	tion: Consider overall tree health and structure, including hazard potential.
Comments	Tree does need crown thinning of crossing limbs and dead wood
	CATEGORY RATING sical attributes of this tree support a recommendation for Landmark status?
	Attributes
event, etc. □ Yes	association: Any relation to a historic or cultural building, site, street, person,
None approximation None approxi	parent
Comments	
	a publication or other media for its historic value: Tree has received rint, internet, media, etc. Attach documentation or provide links if appropriate.

\boxtimes Unknown	
Comments	
	CATEGORY RATING Pric attributes of this tree support a recommendation for Landmark status?
Environm	ental Attributes
Prominent ⊠ Yes □ No	landscape feature: A striking and outstanding natural feature.
Comments	
Low tree d □ Low □ Moderate □ High	ensity: Tree exists in a neighborhood with very few trees.
Comments	Low street tree density on this block, tree recommended for Landmark status is in rear of yard and not visible from the street
	dent group of trees: This tree is an integral member of a group of trees and ay have an adverse impact on the adjacent trees.
Comments	
Visible or o ☐ Yes ☒ No	accessible from public right-of-way: High visibility and/or accessibility.
Comments	

	c area: Tree is in an area that has a large volume of vehicle, pedestrian, or bike
	a potential traffic-calming effect.
☐ Yes☒ No	
Comments	In rear yard
	wildlife habitat: Species has a known relationship with wildlife to which it shelter, nesting potential, etc.
⊠ Yes	
□ No	
Comments	
	ntrol: Tree prevents soil erosion.
☐ Yes	
⊠ No	
Comments	
Wind or so	und barrier: Tree reduces wind speed or mitigates undesirable noise.
⊠ Yes	gailes en actions in the special en in this gailes en action action in the special entire in the special entir
□ No	
Comments	
	ATEGORY RATING
	conmental attributes of this tree support a recommendation for Landmark
status?	
☐ Yes	
☐ Partially	
⊠ No	
Cultural A	Attributes
	ood appreciation: Multiple indicators such as letters of support, petition(s),
-	rings, celebrations adjacent or related to the tree, etc. Attach documentation.
⊠ Yes	
□ None app	arent

Comments	
Cultural app ☐ Yes ☒ None appa	reciation: Tree is of value to a certain cultural or ethnic group(s) in the City.
Comments	
	publication or other media for its <i>cultural</i> value: Tree has ge in print, internet, media, etc. Attach documentation or provide links if
Comments	
	TEGORY RATING all attributes of this tree support a recommendation for Landmark status?
Additional co	omments: