

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: **Dan Kida**

Date of evaluation: **September 30, 2016**

Scientific name: *Sequoia sempervirens*

Common name: **Coast Redwood**

Street address: **4 Montclair Terrace**

Cross streets: **Lombard St, Hyde St**

Rarity ___ Yes **X** Partially ___ No

Rarity: ___ Rare ___ Uncommon ___ Common **X** Other

Unusual species in San Francisco or other geographic regions.

Comment: **_Not uncommon to San Francisco or Northern California but rare in that they only occupy 470' by 47' range in the world. Species is unique to California and Southern Oregon. One other sempervirens listed as landmark tree in SF.**

Physical Attributes **X** Yes ___ Partially ___ No

Size: ___ Large **X** Medium ___ Small

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

Comment: **I don't have a list of all species in SF but likely same or slightly larger than others in SF. Quite large for backyard tree in general.**

Age: ___ Yes **X** No

Significantly advanced age for the species.

Comment: **Quite young for trees of these species relative to others in California**

Distinguished form: **X** Yes ___ No

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

Describe: **Symmetrical with good distribution of limbs and taper. Hard to tell but may have been topped in past. Maybe have co-dominate stem at top.**

Urban Forestry Council
Landmark Tree Evaluation Form and Criteria

2

Tree condition: Good Poor Hazard

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

Describe: **Tree appears in good health. Some flagging (brown limbs) but this is typical of species – drops dead limbs naturally.**

Historical Yes Partially No

Historical Association: Yes None apparent

Related to a historic or cultural building, site, street, person, event, etc.

Describe nature of appreciation: **Adjacent to section of Lombard street, famous and unique to SF. Tree can be seen in most photos of street.**

Profiled in a publication or other media: Yes Unknown

Tree has received coverage in print, internet, video media, etc. **Attach documentation** if appropriate.

Describe coverage: **As mentioned above, Can't find any specific mention of tree but appears in many photos of Lombard street.**

Environmental Yes Partially No

Prominent landscape feature: Yes No

A striking and outstanding natural feature.

Describe, attach photo if possible: **Depends on vantage point. Slope on street and adjacent streets can obscure view. Most prominent view is from bottom of Lombard.**

Low tree density: Low Moderate High

Tree exists in a neighborhood with very few trees.

Describe: **Moderate for urban neighborhood**

Interdependent group of trees: Yes No

This tree in an integral member of a group of trees and removing it may have an adverse impact on adjacent trees.

Describe: **Tree mainly surrounded by landscape and ornamental trees.**

Visible or Accessible from public right-of-way: Yes No

High visibility and/or accessibility from public property.

Describe: **Easily seen from Lombard street walking path or road**

High traffic area: Yes No

Tree is located in an area that has a high volume of vehicle, pedestrian or bike traffic and has a potential traffic calming effect.

Describe: **Busy tourist destination. Several folks in area during site visit. Popular SF location. Iconic.**

Important wildlife habitat: Yes No

Species has a known relationship with a particular local wildlife species or it provides food, shelter, or nesting to specific known wildlife individuals.

**Urban Forestry Council
Landmark Tree Evaluation Form and Criteria**

3

Did not see any wildlife but heard birds. Likely that tree is used by squirrels and birds. Crowds/noise may scare some wildlife during day.

Erosion control: Yes No

Tree prevents soil erosion.

Describe: **Not that I could identify.**

Wind or sound barrier: Yes No

Tree reduces wind speed or mitigates undesirable noise.

Describe: **slope may prevent from being rue wind barrier but could not hear much sounds from Lombard, despite crowds. Likely tree shields sound while in backyard.**

Cultural Yes Partially No

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: **No other letters or shows of support from folks in neighborhood.**

Cultural appreciation: Yes None apparent

Particular value to certain cultural or ethnic groups in the city.

Describe nature of appreciation:

Planting contributes to neighborhood character: Yes No

Tree contributes significantly to, or represents, neighborhood aesthetic.

Describe contribution: **tree can be seen in many photos of Lombard street.**

Profiled in a publication or other media: Yes Unknown

Tree has received coverage in print, internet, video media, etc. **Attach documentation** if appropriate.

Describe coverage: **Could not identify anything related to tree**

Prominent landscape feature: Yes No

A striking and outstanding natural feature.

Describe, attach photo if possible: **part of tableau of Lombard street.**

Additional comments

Tree has a very compelling personal history associated with it
