Resolution endorsing landmark tree status for the California Buckeye (Aesculus Californica) located behind 757 Pennsylvania Street, Assessor’s Block 4168, Lot 11.

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

WHEREAS, The California Buckeye (Aesculus Californica) located behind 757 Pennsylvania Street fulfills the landmark tree criteria that includes:

Rare: The tree is an uncommon, possibly rare, tree in San Francisco;

Size: The tree was quite a large specimen for this species with a huge canopy spread and great trunk girth;

Age: The tree appeared to be quite old, though no estimation of age was postulated;

Historical Association: The tree was of natural historical significance as being a likely genetic and possibly naturally-occurring remnant of the original San Francisco forest.

California Buckeyes are native to Potrero Hill, and this specimen is quite possibly a progeny of these locally-native trees;

Ethnic Appreciation: California Buckeyes were also used by the Ohlone Indians for fishing and for food;

High traffic area and accessible from public right of way: The tree is in a high traffic area, is accessible from a public right of way and is very visible from the station platform as well as from the train;

Important wildlife habitat: The tree provided habitat and food for multiple varieties of wildlife, including indigenous species;

December 12, 2008
Prominent landscape feature: The tree was a prominent landscape feature occurring in an area of low tree density;

Character-defining form: The tree has a striking character; despite obvious abuse and structural problems, much of the tree appears sound, and is not a hazard;

Profiled in a publication or other media: The tree was profiled, with a photo, in the publication "A History of Potrero Hill" by Peter Linenthal and Abigail Johnston.

WHEREAS, The California Buckeye (Aesculus Californica) located behind 757 Pennsylvania Street, Assessor’s Block 4168, Lot 11 provides social, environmental and economic benefits to the property, neighborhood and city; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED, The Urban Forestry Council recommends the California Buckeye (Aesculus Californica) located behind 757 Pennsylvania Street, Assessor’s Block 4168, Lot 11 for landmark tree status to the Board of Supervisors.

I hereby certify that this Resolution was adopted at the Urban Forestry Council’s Regular Meeting on December 12, 2008.

Monica Fish, Council Secretary

VOTE: Approved (6-0) (4 Absent) (1 Vacant)

Ayes: Chair Milne, Members Blair, Boss, Cohen, D’Agostino, and Hillan,

Noes: None

Absent: Members LeBeau, Rodgers, Sherk, and Short

December 12, 2008
Report of Findings for the California Buckeye at the Cal Trans Station, behind 757 Pennsylvania Street

The Landmark Tree Committee of the Urban Forestry Council met on Monday Nov 17, 2008 and considered the nomination for Landmark Status of the California Buckeye (Aesculus californica) at the 22nd Street Cal Trans Station, behind 757 Pennsylvania Street.

The committee voted unanimously to recommend landmark status. The vote was 4-0.

The committee members voted for recommendation of landmark status, found that the tree met standards that would merit Landmark Tree Status. These standards included:

- The tree is an uncommon, possibly rare, tree in San Francisco
- The tree was quite a large specimen for this species with a huge canopy spread and great trunk girth
- The tree appeared to be quite old, though no estimation of age was postulated
- The tree was of natural historical significance as being a likely genetic and possibly naturally-occurring remnant of the original San Francisco forest. California Buckeyes are native to Potrero Hill, and this specimen is quite possibly a progeny of these locally-native trees. California Buckeyes were also used by the Ohlone Indians for fishing and for food.
- The tree is in a high traffic area, is accessible from a public right of way and is very visible from the station platform as well as from the train.
- The tree provided habitat and food for multiple varieties of wildlife, including indigenous species
- The tree was a prominent landscape feature occurring in an area of low tree density.
- The tree was profiled, with a photo, in the publication “A History of Potrero Hill” by Peter Linenthal and Abigail Johnston
- The tree has a striking character; despite obvious abuse and structural problems, much of the tree appears sound, and is not a hazard.

Respectfully submitted,
Mike Boss
Chair, Landmark Tree Committee of the San Francisco Urban Forestry Council
November 19, 2008
Urban Forestry Council
Landmark Tree Evaluation Form and Criteria

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: Mei Ling Hui
Date of evaluation: 11/6/08
Scientific name: Aesculus californica
Common name: California Buckeye
Street address: 757 Pennsylvania
Cross streets:  

✓

Rare: ✓ Rare ___ Uncommon ___ Common ___ Other

Unusual species in San Francisco. Also consider rarity in California, North America, world.
Comment: Not many locations in San Francisco can support this low and spreading tree. There are a few, but I believe they are uncommon enough to be considered rare.

Size: ✓ Large ___ Medium ___ Small

Notable size (height, diameter, canopy width) compared to other trees of the same species.
Comment: This very old tree is growing on a hillside and has had many branches die out over the years. The trunk is gnarled and wide with many branches emanating from a low point on the trunk. It was not possible to measure the DBH due to the landscape and shape of the tree, but I estimate it to be about 10'. I estimate the height to be between 25-30'. The tree runs the entire length with two sections of property: one distinct section of building and one parking lot. According to the property owner, these two areas are roughly 100' in length together, which is the width of the canopy.

Age: ✓ Significantly advanced ___ Not significantly advanced

Significantly advanced age for this species (known or estimated).
Comment: This tree is very significantly advanced in age. The tree is extremely large and the trunk shows signs of old branches which were replaced by branches that are now 30'+ long.

Historical Association: ___ Yes ___ None apparent

Related to a historic or cultural building, site, street, person, event, etc.
Describe nature of appreciation: ____________________________________________
Urban Forestry Council  
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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. Attach documentation:
Describe:

Planting defines neighborhood character:  _____Yes  _____No
Contributes to neighborhood aesthetic.
Describe contribution: I wouldn’t say this tree defines the neighborhood character, I would say it delightfully detracts from the character of its immediate surroundings and creates its own. This tree is a welcome respite to the industrial, under-the-freeway, alongside-train-tracks, and generally unpleasant aesthetics of the area it grows in.

Profiled in a publication or other media:  _____Yes  _____Unknown
Tree has received print, internet, and/or video media coverage. Attach documentation if appropriate.
Describe coverage:

-------------------------------

High traffic area:  _____Yes  _____No
High visibility, possible traffic calming effect.
Describe: While the tree is in an incredibly high traffic area, under the freeway and alongside the Cal Train tracks, it can’t reduce traffic speeds in anyway.

It can make things nicer for those utilizing the public transportation system.

Low tree density:  _____Low  _____Moderate  _____High
Tree exists in a neighborhood with very few trees.
Describe: Very low density. Standing at the base of the hill where this tree is growing, there are very few other trees even visible.

Extends between multiple properties:  _____Yes  _____No
High visibility, multiple neighbors share tree.
Describe: It has very high visibility, given its position near the train tracks. It is resting on one property with a large portion of branches in another.

Accessible from public right-of-way:  _____Yes  _____No
Urban Forestry Council
Landmark Tree Evaluation Form and Criteria

High visibility.
Describe: Pedestrian access to rain tracks, not street.

**Important wildlife habitat:**

___ Yes ___ No

Wildlife shelter and/or food (observed or potential). Describe and be as specific as possible.

**Interdependent group of trees:**

___ Yes ___ No

This tree forms a supercanopy and removing it may have an adverse impact on adjacent trees.
Describe: No other trees around.

**Erosion control:**

✓ Yes ___ No

Tree prevents soil erosion.
Describe: Absolutely. It’s growing on a very steep hill.

**Wind or sound barrier:**

___ Yes ___ No

Tree reduces wind speed or mitigates undesirable noise.
Describe: While it’s large and low, and there is a building adjacent to the tree, the level and type of noise and wind that passes near the tree is not something the tree would likely mitigate to any noticeable degree. – CalTrain is extremely loud.

**Prominent landscape feature:**

✓ Yes ___ No

A striking and outstanding natural feature.
Describe, attach photo if possible: Absolutely. Its form and size are singularly notable. It’s an amazing specimen.

**Character-defining form:**

✓ Yes ___ No

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

Describe: It exhibits a noticeably heavier level of growth on the uphill side, is not branched evenly on all sides, due to removal of large branches on the down hill side, on the side closer to the train tracks. It’s unclear if the branches were removed for the health of the tree or for some other purpose.

**Tree condition:**

___ Good ___ Poor ___ Hazard

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

Describe: While the tree condition isn’t very good, I don’t know if I would call it poor. The tree has many issues with broken branches or improperly removed branches – branch breakouts and trunk wounding associated with failures. There are two sections of lumber, which are possibly railroad ties, that were placed among the tree branches many years ago, which the tree is now subsuming. However, the tree does have a lot of healthy, lush growth. The canopy is thick with year old growth and there are some buckeye nuts hanging in the branches.

While the tree may have some potential health or structural problems, it appears stable and sound. The naturally wide and low-seated tree has a majority of large branches that dip and rest on the ground as it
Urban Forestry Council
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is. There isn't really anything for the branches to tear out and fall on, and again, most of the branches are already contacting the ground. Additionally, there is a gully and stream separating the tree on the downhill side from the train tracks – any branches failures that do move away from the tree would likely slide into the gully and not into the adjacent foot traffic area which is above grade of the gully area.

Additional comments

Adjacent property owner reported that the tree did not appear to suffer when the 280 retrofitting of supporting columns resulting in significant root cutting and loss, this happened roughly 10 years ago.
Urban Forestry Council
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Evaluator's name: CAROLYN BLAIR
State of evaluation: SUNDAY 16, 2008
Scientific name: 
Common name: CALIFORNIA BUCKEYE
Street address: 757 PENNSYLVANIA
Cross streets: 22ND STREET VISIBLE AT 22TH STREET CAL TRAIN STATION

Rare: _X_ Rare ___ Uncommon ___ Common ___ Other
Unusual species in San Francisco. Also consider rarity in California, North America, world.
Comment: BECAUSE SAN FRANCISCO HAS ONLY 1% LARGE MATURE TREES WITH ANY GRANDEUR OR CHACTER – THIS IS A RARE AND AN ENDANGERED SPECIES –ONE OF LANDMARK QUALITY.

Size: _X_ Large ___ Medium ___ Small
Notable size (height, diameter, canopy width) compared to other trees of the same species.
Comment:

Age: ___ ?_ Significantly advanced ___ ?_ Not significantly advanced
Significantly advanced age for this species (known or estimated).
Comment: _DON'T KNOW THE AGE_

Historical Association: ___ ?_ Yes ___ ?_ None apparent
Related to a historic or cultural building, site, street, person, event, etc.
Describe nature of appreciation:

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. Attach documentation:
Describe:

Planting defines neighborhood character: _X_ Yes ___ No
Contributes to neighborhood aesthetic.
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Describe contribution: THE TREE IS AN AMAZING SIZE, UNLIKE ALL OTHERS NEAR BY, WITH GREAT CHA CTER THAT MAKES A STATEMENT THAT SOMEONE REALLY CARED ENOUGH TO PLANT SUCH A GREAT TREE AND IT IS STILL THERE!!!

Profiled in a publication or other media: ? Yes ? Unknown

Tree has received print, internet, and/or video media coverage. Attach documentation if appropriate.

Describe coverage: DON'T KNOW

High traffic area: X Yes No

High visibility, possible traffic calming effect.

Describe: UNUSUAL LOCATION AT THE 22TH STREET CAL TRAIN STATION.

Low tree density: X Low Moderate High

Tree exists in a neighborhood with very few trees.

Describe:

Extends between multiple properties: Yes No

High visibility, multiple neighbors share tree.

Describe:

Accessible from public right-of-way: X Yes No

High visibility.

Describe: LOCATED AT THE 22TH STREET CAL TRAIN STATION.

Important wildlife habitat: ? Yes ? No

Wildlife shelter and/or food (observed or potential). Describe and be as specific as possible.

DON'T KNOW

Interdependent group of trees: Yes No

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

Describe: THE TREE HAS A SUPER CANOPY OF ITS SELF

Erosion control: X Yes No

Tree prevents soil erosion.

Describe:

Wind or sound barrier: X Yes No

Tree reduces wind speed or mitigates undesirable noise.

Describe: SOUND OF THE TRAIN GOING BY
Urban Forestry Council
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Prominent landscape feature:  X Yes  No
A striking and outstanding natural feature.
Describe, attach photo if possible:  IS OUTSTANDING AND STRIKING

Character-defining form:  X Yes  No
Tree is an example of good form for its particular species.
Describe:  NEEDS PROPER PRUNING

Tree condition:  X Good  Poor  Hazard
Consider overall tree health and structure, and whether or not tree poses a hazard
Describe:

Additional comments
DESERVES TO BE LANDMARKED – GREAT, GRAND TREE.
Urban Forestry Council
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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: HILLAN
Date of evaluation: 11.06.08
Scientific name: Aesculus californica
Common name: Calif. Buckeye
Street address: 22nd & Pennsylvania (@ Caltrain stop)

Rare: Rare □ Uncommon □ Common □ Other
Unusual species in San Francisco. Also consider rarity in California, North America, world.
Comment: NOT RARE, BUT RELATIVELY FEW LEFT IN SAN FRANCISCO. CA AND SAN FRANCISCO NATIVE

Size: □ Large □ Medium □ Small
Notable size (height, diameter, canopy width) compared to other trees of the same species.
Comment: VERY WIDE & MULTI-TRUNKED, REFLECTING AGE

Age: □ Significantly advanced □ Not significantly advanced
Significantly advanced age for this species (known or estimated).
Comment: 

Historical Association: □ Yes □ None apparent
Related to a historic or cultural building, site, street, person, event, etc.
Describe nature of appreciation: 

Urban Forestry Council  
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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. Attach documentation:  
Describe:  


Planting defines neighborhood character:  Yes   ✔ No  
Contributes to neighborhood aesthetic.  
Describe contribution:  


Profiled in a publication or other media:  Yes   ✔ Unknown  
Tree has received print, internet, and/or video media coverage. Attach documentation if appropriate.  
Describe coverage:  


High traffic area:  Yes   ✔ No  
High visibility, possible traffic calming effect.  
Describe:  This distinctive tree adds interest to an otherwise depressing landscape  

Low tree density:  ✔ Low   Moderate   High  
Tree exists in a neighborhood with very few trees.  
Describe:  This easement aches for vegetation.  

Extends between multiple properties:  Yes   ✔ No   ??  
High visibility, multiple neighbors share tree.
Urban Forestry Council
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Describe: ____________________________________________
____________________________________________________

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 and be as specific as possible.
____________________________________________________

Interdependent group of trees:  Yes  No
This tree forms a supercanopy and removing it may have an adverse impact on adjacent trees.
Describe: __________________________________________

Erosion control:  Yes  No
Tree prevents soil erosion.
Describe: __________________________________________

Wind or sound barrier:  Yes  No
Tree reduces wind speed or mitigates undesirable noise.
Describe: __________________________________________

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.

With exception of the unfortunate pruning cuts
Urban Forestry Council
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Describe:

Tree condition:  [ ] Good  [ ] Poor  [ ] Hazard  [ ] Mixed
Consider overall tree health and structure, and whether or not tree poses a hazard
Describe:  NOT A HAZARD, TRAFLTY FOR ITS AGE

Additional comments

RECOMMEND FOR LANDMARK STATUS.
Urban Forestry Council
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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: Mark Sustach
Date of evaluation: November 14, 2008
Scientific name: Aesculus californica
Common name: California buckeye
Street address: Behind 757 Pennsylvania St.
Cross streets: 22nd St. South of CalTrain 22nd St. Station

Rare: √ Rare ___ Uncommon ___ Common ___ Other

Unusual species in San Francisco. Also consider rarity in California, North America, world.
Comment: Appears to be a relict of a once common bayside species

Size: √ Large ___ Medium ___ Small

Notable size (height, diameter, canopy width) compared to other trees of the same species.
Comment: Basal diameter approximately 68.5"
25'-30' tall x 80' wide x 30' wide

Age: √ Significantly advanced ___ Not significantly advanced

Significantly advanced age for this species (known or estimated).
Comment: Diameter of base indicates considerable age.

Date when the road cut was made could help indicate:

Historical Association: ___ Yes ___ None apparent

Related to a historic or cultural building, site, street, person, event, etc.
Describe nature of appreciation: Species was native to area. More common development of bay area.
Ethnic appreciation:  □ Yes  □ None apparent
Particular value to certain ethnic groups in neighborhood or city.
Describe nature of appreciation: The Ohlones used the seeds as food and crushed the seeds to stupefy fish in streams.

Neighborhood appreciation:  □ Yes  □ None apparent
Multiple indicators such as letters of support, petition, outdoor gatherings, celebrations adjacent or related to tree, etc. Attach documentation:
Describe: Visible from CalTrain 22nd St. Station and from train.

Planting defines neighborhood character:  □ Yes  □ No
Contributes to neighborhood aesthetic.
Describe contribution: The tree is native to Potrero Hill.

Profiled in a publication or other media:  □ Yes  □ Unknown
Tree has received print, internet, and/or video media coverage. Attach documentation if appropriate.
Describe coverage: Photographed and described on page 11 of San Francisco's Potrero Hill.

High traffic area:  □ Yes  □ No
High visibility, possible traffic calming effect.
Describe: CalTrain passes by tree. Can be seen from Iowa St.

Low tree density:  □ Low  □ Moderate  □ High
Tree exists in a neighborhood with very few trees.
Describe: Very few trees on this slope.

Extends between multiple properties:  □ Yes  □ No
High visibility, multiple neighbors share tree.
Describe: In back of private property, next to CalTrain and freeway ROW, (Right-of-Way)
Accessible from public right-of-way:  \( \checkmark \) Yes  \_No

High visibility.

Describe: Can be viewed and approached from ________________

CalTrain 22nd St. Station

Important wildlife habitat:  \( \checkmark \) Yes  \_No

Wildlife shelter and/or food (observed or potential). Describe and be as specific as possible.

Tree native to area, use of seeds as food by wildlife.

Unknown.

Interdependent group of trees:  \( \checkmark \) Yes  \_No

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

Describe: ____________________________________________

Erosion control:  \( \checkmark \) Yes  \_No

Tree prevents soil erosion.

Describe: ____________________________________________

Wind or sound barrier:  \( \checkmark \) Yes  \_No

Tree reduces wind speed or mitigates undesirable noise.

Describe: Tree is situated between railway and private property.

Prominent landscape feature:  \( \checkmark \) Yes  \_No

A striking and outstanding natural feature.

Describe, attach photo if possible: Very few trees on ROW. Must be striking when in leaf and flower.

Character-defining form:  \( \checkmark \) Yes  \_No

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

Describe: The large base of tree and prostrate growth form is unusual.
Urban Forestry Council
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Tree condition:  **Good**  ____ Poor  ____ Hazard
Consider overall tree health and structure, and whether or not tree poses a hazard

Describe: Poor pruning on Cal Train side. Fungal conks indicate some decay, ivy growing at base.

Additional comments
Remove stubs, deadwood and broken branches.
Remove trash and ivy under canopy of tree.
Train branches away from wall of private property.
A perennial stream flows along base of slope.
I highly recommend this tree be granted Landmark Tree Status.
[Landmark Designation Nomination for the California Buckeye tree located behind 757 Pennsylvania Street]

Resolution of intent initiating the nomination of the California Buckeye tree (*Aesculus Californica*) located behind 757 Pennsylvania Street, (Assessor's Book 416B, Lot 11) for landmark tree status pursuant to Public Works Code Section 810(b), acknowledging temporary designation pursuant to Public Works Section 810(d), and authorizing other official acts in furtherance of the Resolution.

WHEREAS, Trees provide numerous environmental and social benefits such as reducing stormwater runoff, reducing energy use, reducing air pollution, improving air quality, increasing property values and providing wildlife habitat; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Supervisors passed Ordinance Number 17-06, an amendment to Public Works Code Section 810, landmark trees, significant trees, and penalties for violation in support of a landmark tree program, and a copy of said Ordinance is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in file number 051458 which is incorporated herein by reference; and,

WHEREAS, The Board of Supervisors adopted the Urban Forestry Council's landmark tree designation criteria, forms and procedures in Resolution Enacted Number 440-06. A copy of said Resolution is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File Number 060487 which is incorporated herein by reference on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 081305, which is hereby declared to be a part of this resolution as if set forth fully herein; and,

WHEREAS, The California Buckeye tree (*Aesculus Californica*) located behind 757 Pennsylvania Street, pictures of which are on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in
File Number 081305, is the only Buckeye variety native to the State of California and a relatively rare species in San Francisco, and contributes to the visual aesthetic of CalTrain riders waiting on the platform at the 22nd Street Station and the Potrero Hill community: now, therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board, pursuant to Public Works Code Section 810(b), hereby adopts this resolution of intent to initiate landmark tree designation for the California Buckeye tree (*Aesculus Californica*) located behind 757 Pennsylvania Street, (Assessor's Bock 416B, Lot 11) and acknowledges the temporary designation of such tree for landmark status pursuant to Public Works Code Section 810(d); and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board directs the Clerk to forward this Resolution and accompanying documents contained in the file to the Urban Forestry Council to begin the landmark tree designation process for the subject trees; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board urges the Director of Public Works to immediately notify the affected department of the pending nomination and inform said department of special approval requirement for removal of landmark trees under Public Works Code 810(f) if such notification has not yet occurred.

Supervisor Maxwell
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Page 2
10/7/2005
Resolution of intent initiating the nomination of the California Buckeye tree (Aesculus Californica) located behind 757 Pennsylvania Street, (Assessor's Book 416B, Lot 11) for landmark tree status pursuant to Public Works Code Section 810(b), acknowledging temporary designation pursuant to Public Works Section 810(d), and authorizing other official acts in furtherance of the Resolution.

October 21, 2008  Board of Supervisors — ADOPTED

Ayes: 11 - Alioto-Pier, Ammiano, Chu, Daly, Dufty, Elsbernd, Maxwell, McGoldrick, Mirkarimi, Peskin, Sandoval

File No. 081305

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was ADOPTED on October 21, 2008 by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board

Mayor Gavin Newsom

10/30/2008
Date Approved
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?

- An authorized nominator is a Supervisor, head of a City department or agency, Planning Commissioner, Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board member, or property owner.
- The Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission, Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board and the head of a City department or agency may nominate a tree.
- 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.

I am one of the following authorized nominators

☐ Property owner
☑ Board of Supervisor member
☐ Head of a city department or agency
☐ Planning Commission member
☐ Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board member

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

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

Authorized nominator (Supervisor, Planning Commission, Landmarks Advisory Board, Head of City Department, Property Owner):

× Sophie Maxwell
Name
City Hall
1 Carlton B. Goodlett Pl 279
Address
San Francisco, CA 94102
Address
415-554-7671
Phone (day)
Fax #
Sophie.maxwell@sf.gov
Email
cc: emily.rogers@sf.gov.org

Property owner:

Name

Address

Address

Phone (day)

Fax #

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

Joni Eisen

Name

92 Pennsylvania

Address

SF 94107

Phone (day) 415-648-6740

Fax #

Email joni.eisen@sbcglobal.net

I am an authorized nominator and I support this nomination.

__________________________  Signature

__________________________  Date

October 7, 2008

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

__________________________  Signature

__________________________  Date

TREE DESCRIPTION

Tree name (species and common name): California Buckeye

Number of trees: 1

Street address: (behind) 757 Pennsylvania

Location of Tree: ☑ Public right-of-way  ☑ Public lands  ☑ Not sure

☐ Other: at California platform level, approx. 136 ft S. of 75th

GPS units (OPTIONAL):

Height 40 feet

Average canopy width 75 feet

Circumference at chest level

Circumference at ground level

1 Distance from one edge to opposite edge of tree canopy
2 Distance around trunk at 4.5 ft off the ground. http://www.iss-arbor.com/publications/tree-out/heritage.aspx
3 Distance around trunk on the ground where the trunk meets the soil.

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.

Updated June 2007
Rarity: __ Rare    √ Uncommon    __ Common    __ Other
Unusual species in San Francisco. Also consider rarity in California, North America, world.
Comment: Calif and Potrero Hill native

Size: √ Large    __ Medium    __ Small
Notable size (height, diameter, canopy width) compared to other trees of the same species.
Comment: Great width but not height

Age: Significantly advanced age for this species (known or estimated).
Comment:

Historical Association: __ Yes    √ None apparent
Related to a historic or cultural building, site, street, person, event, etc.
Describe nature of appreciation:

Ethnic appreciation: __ Yes    __ None apparent
Particular value to certain ethnic groups in neighborhood or city.
Describe nature of appreciation: Used for Ohlone food and fishing

Neighborhood appreciation: __ Yes    __ None apparent
Multiple indicators such as letters of support, petition, outdoor gatherings, celebrations adjacent or related to tree, etc. Attach documentation:
Describe:

Planting defines neighborhood character: __ Yes    √ No
Contributes to neighborhood aesthetic.
Describe contribution:

Profiled in a publication or other media: √ Yes    Unknown
Tree has received print, internet, and/or video media coverage. Attach documentation if appropriate.
Describe coverage: Pill of History of Potrero Hill by Peter Linenthal + Abigail Johnston

Updated June 2007
High traffic area:  

☑ Yes ☐ No  
High visibility, possible traffic calming effect.  
Describe:  train riders

Low tree density:  

☑ Low ☐ Moderate ☐ High  
Tree exists in a neighborhood with very few trees.  
Describe:

Extends between multiple properties:  

☐ Yes ☐ No  
High visibility, multiple neighbors share tree.  
Describe:

Accessible from public right-of-way:  

☑ Yes ☐ No  
High visibility.  
Describe:  from train platform only

Important wildlife habitat:  

☐ Yes ☐ No  
Wildlife shelter and/or food (observed or potential). Describe and be as specific as possible.

Interdependent group of trees:  

☐ Yes ☐ No  
This tree forms a supercanopy and removing it may have an adverse impact on adjacent trees.  
Describe:

Erosion control:  

☐ Yes ☐ No  
Tree prevents soil erosion.  
Describe:

Wind or sound barrier:  

☐ Yes ☐ No  
Tree reduces wind speed or mitigates undesirable noise.  
Describe:
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Prominent landscape feature:  

Yes  No

A striking and outstanding natural feature.

Describe, attach photo if possible:  

Significant tree.

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:  

Evidence of insects + poor pruning, needs work but is not a hazard.

Additional comments

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.

A 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, c/o Mei Ling Hui, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, CA 94102
OR mailing.hui@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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application received date</th>
<th>Received by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tree evaluation form</td>
<td>UFC recommendation date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Supervisors Decision</td>
<td>Title recorded date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Updated June 2007