PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION
AGENDA

Wednesday, September 19, 2018 • 6:30 p.m. • San Bruno City Hall, Room 115, 567 El Camino Real

WELCOME TO OUR COMMISSION MEETING
If you wish to speak on an item under discussion by the Commission and appearing on the agenda, you may do so upon receiving recognition from the Commission Chair. If you wish to speak on a matter not appearing on the agenda, you may do so during PUBLIC COMMENT. Please state your name and address. If you are representing an organization, please state the name of the organization. In compliance with American Disabilities Act, individuals requiring accommodations for this meeting should notify us 48 hours prior to meeting (616-7186).

Please note: Commission policy allows a maximum of three (3) minutes for individual comments.

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL: Chair Mike Palmer, Vice Chair Kris Gonzales, Lorry Greenberg, Jessica Martinucci, Alexander Melendrez, David Nigel, Lucy Zamattia, Michael Zastrow, Youth Representative Kathy Lin

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

3. REVIEW OF AGENDA:

4. ACCEPTANCE OF THE MINUTES: August 15, 2018

5. CONSENT CALENDAR:

6. PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON AGENDA: (Note: Commission’s policy is to refer matters raised in this forum to staff for investigation and/or action where appropriate. State Law, known as the “Brown Act”, prohibits Commission from discussing or acting upon any matter that is not on the agenda. Non-agenda issues raised by members of the public or by the Commission may, at the discretion of the Commission, be scheduled for consideration at future meetings.)

7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:
   a. Update on Status of Earl/Glenview Park – Oral
   b. Florida Avenue Park – Selection of Preferred park Layout and Approval of Recommended Design Changes and Alternatives – CM Grogan

8. NEW BUSINESS:

9. ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS:
   a. Adopt a Park Revised Form – Oral – Chair Palmer

10. ITEMS FROM STAFF:

11. ADJOURNMENT

** POSTED PURSUANT TO LAW **
MINUTES
Parks and Recreation Commission
August 15, 2018

1. Call to Order/Roll Call: Chair Palmer called the meeting of the Parks and Recreation Commission to order at 6:30 p.m. Commissioners Present: Chair Palmer, Vice Chair Gonzales, Greenberg, Melendrez, Nigel, and Zastrow. Commissioners Excused: Commissioner Martinucci. City Council Present: Salazar. Staff Present: Grogan and Brewer.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Commissioner Zastrow led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. REVIEW OF AGENDA: No changes.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: MSC Nigel/Melendrez to approve the minute from June 20, 2018 and Special Meeting June 20, 2018 with corrections. Approved unanimously.

5. CONSENT CALENDAR: None.

6. PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON AGENDA:
   • Russell Stines expressed concerns regarding removal of trees at Florida Park.
   • Doe Newiger expressed concerns regarding removal of trees at Florida Park.
   • Reina Burgos expressed concerns regarding removal of trees at Florida Park.
   • Chair Palmer introduced new City Manager and Interim Community Services Director, Jovan Grogan.
   • City Manager/Interim Community Services Director Grogan spoke about the new Community Services Director, Joanne Magrini.
   • Santha Takahashi expressed concerns regarding removal of trees at Florida Park.
   • City Manager/Interim Community Services Director Grogan explained that exact process will be identified and mapped out for the final decision about Florida Park trees.
   • Tim O'Brien suggested that the trees remain at Florida Park.
   • Sandra Perez-Vergas expressed concerns regarding removal of trees at Florida Park.
   • Stephen Seymour suggested that the trees remain at Florida Park.
   • Ryan Mrsky suggested more investigation before decisions are made.
   • Channel 4 Reporter Hermela Aregawi asked for an official comment.

7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:
   a. Update on Status of Earl/Glenview Park - Oral – Staff Brewer explained that it will be ready for a dedication in October. City Manager/Interim Community Services Director Grogan provided additional details on the progress of the project.
Services Director Grogan explained the event will celebrate all of the Crestmoor projects. Commissioner Greenberg is concerned about the size of the basketball court.

b. Update on Florida Avenue Park - Oral – City Manager/Interim Community Services Director Grogan is in the design phase. Commissioner Nigel appreciates the input and understands that the trees are wanted. Commissioner Gonzalez would like a copy of the arborist’s report. Commissioner Greenberg would also like a copy of the arborist’s report.

c. Update on Status of Commodore and Grundy Park Path Pavement Project - Oral – Staff Brewer reported that both parks are complete with the resurfacing. Final slurry seal will be done next week in one day.

8. NEW BUSINESS
   a. Approve Recommendation for Expanded Use of Inflatable Jumpers in More San Bruno Parks – Staff Brewer recommends inflatable jumpers at City Park picnic Areas 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, Grundy Park Area 1, and Commodore Area 3 (back side of area and not the field side). Commissioners in favor of allowing inflatable jumpers.

9. ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS:
   Commissioner Nigel went to Connie Jackson’s family party. Many dignitaries were there. Commissioner Nigel took a tour of Grundy Park and followed chairman’s policy. Commissioner Nigel spoke about scholarships given by CPRS.

   Commissioner Gonzalez stated the summer program for kids is amazing. She would like list of parks that have been inspected. Grundy Park for National Night Out on the first Tuesday in August looked amazing.

   Commissioner Melendez noted Concerts in the Park is a wonderful event with a growing attendance. He would like a status update about recycling cans in the parks.

   Commissioner Greenberg wrote a report on Lomita Park. Also noted people are no longer driving on the lawn at Commodore Park. She had to call police about unleashed dog. No parking on Saturdays at Commodore Park and cars are speeding. She likes the way the Activity Guide is set up.

   City Manager/Interim Community Services Director Grogan stated signs are up at Earl Glenview Park, but can be changed if there is the desire for a park naming. Thank you for the warm reception.

   Commissioner Nigel would like to thank City Council Member Salazar for attending the meetings.

10. ITEMS FROM STAFF: None.

11. ADJOURNMENT: With no other business to be conducted, Chair Palmer adjourned the meeting at 7:56 p.m.
DATE: September 19, 2018

TO: Parks and Recreation Commission

FROM: Jovan D. Grogan, City Manager

SUBJECT: Florida Avenue Park – Selection of Preferred Park Layout and Approval of Recommended Design Changes or Alternates

BACKGROUND:

On October 28, 2014, the City Council adopted a Resolution authorizing the City Manager and City Attorney to complete the purchase of 324 Florida Avenue for future use as a neighborhood park. The property consists of eight parcels (approximately ½ acre in total land area) and is located in a relatively dense residential neighborhood. At the time of acquisition, the property included four buildings: the main residence, a duplex, a garage and a workshop. The large yard was primarily undeveloped with various types of trees including two heritage trees (exceeding 30” in diameter). The condition of the property had fallen into disrepair due to lack of upkeep and vandalism. Additionally, the buildings were left vacant in a deteriorated condition for an extended period of time, which became a nuisance for the neighbors. While certain items on the property were identified as salvageable, a vast majority of the buildings and materials could no longer be used.

In order to prepare the property for future use, the existing structures needed to be demolished, on-site soils remediated and salvage of materials from the structures needed to be performed. On May 24, 2016, the City Council authorized the City Manager to execute a contract with Pacific States Environmental Contractors, Inc. for remediation of the site. The scope included demolishing the existing buildings, properly removing and disposing of contaminated soil and asbestos associated with the property, grading, temporarily securing the site with fencing and salvaging the solid mahogany wooden tableau in the workshop.

Subsequently, the City Council approved a contract with ARG Conservations Services, Inc. on August 23, 2016 to remove, transport, fumigate and treat the hand carved wooden tableau. The carving weighs 3,000 pounds and is titled “Independence of Switzerland.” It was carved by a former resident of 324 Florida Avenue, Francois Perroset, a master wood carver. Mr. Perroset completed the carving in 1915. The carving was shown at the 1938-39 Golden Gate International Exhibition in San Francisco. Once the carving was treated, ARG returned the carving to the City and it is currently on display in the lobby of City Hall.

Concurrently with the demolition phase at the site, staff along with representatives from the landscape architecture design firm MIG, Inc. conducted an extensive community engagement process with the residents surrounding the future park site. A multi-step process of data collection, analysis, meeting facilitation, and conceptual park design was commenced leading to the development of the Florida Avenue Park Draft Master Plan. The neighborhood was invited
to attend meetings to provide input on their preferred design and amenities for their future park. The first meeting was held on June 22, 2016, where residents were asked to articulate their vision for the park and share concerns regarding neighborhood impacts, safety and maintenance. The residents were also asked for their preferences on placement of various park elements such as play areas and features for young children, teens and adults, social and gathering areas, spaces for solitude and quiet contemplation and open space and natural elements. Residents were also asked to develop a park design layout by placing color-coded pieces of paper on a site map which represented park features.

Between the first and second neighborhood meetings, a single concept plan was developed for the park. During the second neighborhood meeting on August 16, 2016, the concept plan was introduced. Meeting participants were very pleased with the design and expressed a strong interest in seeing the park constructed in a manner consistent with the presented design concept. On October 25, 2016, staff presented and the City Council approved the Florida Avenue Draft Master Plan. This included the park design concept as well as the architectural design services contract with MIG, Inc. for the design phase. The scope of work for the design phase included civil and architectural design including grading plans, planting plans and plant palette, landscape layout, materials plans, irrigation area plans, lighting and electrical plans, and equipment selection such as play equipment, benches, trash receptacles and picnic tables. Once completed, design drawings were to be used to bid and construct the park.

On August 22, 2017, the City Council approved a construction contract a Star Construction, Inc. for the Florida Avenue Park Project. During the project submittal phase, the Contractor requested changes and clarifications related to the design and construction documents. The City did not issue the notice to proceed for the construction work and decided to terminate the contract for convenience on November 7, 2017.

Since that time, the City has been working with the landscape architecture firm, MIG, Inc., to identify revisions to construction documents and work through various concerns that were raised about the design and the site. One of the more significant concerns involves the potential removal of two heritage trees on the site. This decision is linked to the preferred layout of the park. Through this report and the September 19, 2018 Parks and Recreation Commission meeting, staff seeks direction on the preferred layout in order to move forward with preparation of final design plans/specifications as well as preparation of the site and documents to rebid the project for construction.

The total approved budget for Florida Avenue Park for planning, design and construction is $1,373,432.

Image 1 shows the location of the site in relation to the surround neighborhood. Image 2 shows the master plan for the layout of the park.
Image 1: Florida Avenue Park Site
DISCUSSION:

At present, design and construction plan for the Florida Avenue Park consists of the following components:

- Park entrance with signage, seating and scored tone paving;
- A minimum of twelve (12) new trees per the City’s standards and preservation of two existing on-site heritage trees;
- Children’s play area with play equipment, rubberized play surfacing, seating, and play equipment;
- Adult exercise features including a cardio course, multi-generational play equipment and, space for sports activities including potentially a half basketball court;
- Community grove of small, proportionally sized, flowering trees, with fully accessible crushed stone paving;
- Neighborhood square with scored tone paving, seating, picnic tables and, shade from trees;
- Urban woodlands with low evergreen ground cover and multi-trunk native trees;
- Pedestrian paths with seating and scored ton paving; and,
- Great Lawn area with turf or drought tolerant grass.

While the design plans are at 100% completion and construction documents were prepared, as noted above, the prior contractor requested changes and clarifications related to the design and construction documents. Further, the City undertook a review of the project as well as future
maintenance requirements at the site. As a result, staff recommends the following changes to the park layout.

Design Changes:

1. **Revise design of walkway area long San Anselmo Avenue**
   Maintain existing walkway alignment and replace mulch at the tree planting strip with decomposed granite.

2. **Simplify planting inside the play area fence**
   Eliminate vines on the fence, delete two irrigation values and associated equipment. Reduce plant variety and alter all shrub landscaping to include only varieties that are not easily trampled.

3. **Revise fence plan between the park and the adjacent residence**
   Replace existing fence design at the property line (decorative metal fence), with a solid six foot wood fence.

4. **Revise irrigation and electrical plans**
   Amend electrical plans related to service meter dimensions and alter irrigation design to revise quick coupler union PVC grade.

5. **Remove existing heritage trees or amend plans for the location and/or inclusion of a children’s play areas.**

Items 1-4 are relatively minor to the overall concept and future use of the park. However, item 5 has significant implications on the usability and configuration of the park. More information is provided below.

*Heritage Trees*

Two large trees remain on the site. Both trees meet the City’s definition of a heritage tree as per Ordinance 1669 (Municipal Code Chapter 8.25). Removal of any heritage tree is subject to specific site/tree conditions and obtaining a City permit. In addition, replanting of either two twenty-four inch box trees or one thirty-six inch box tree for each heritage tree removed is required. If the City’s Public Works Director determines that reforestation is not possible, a payment equal to the cost of purchasing and installing the replacement tree(s) is required to be made to the City’s tree replanting fund. Additionally, if the removal permit is approved, the City shall notice the abutting property owners and provide a minimum of a 10-day period for any person to file an appeal. Heritage tree appeals are heard and decided by the City Council.

Image 3 shows the park site as represented in the 100% plans, with the location of the two existing heritage trees highlighted.
After the completion of the 100% plans, several individuals (including City staff) raised concerns about the location and condition of the two heritage trees, especially considering their proximity to the children’s play area. Earlier this year, a representative for the City suggested removal of the two trees. This information was conveyed to residents near the site as well as members of the Parks and Recreation Commission. Subsequently, several community members expressed concern that the trees would be removed and urged the City to reconsider.

In order to obtain an outside assessment of the current condition of the trees as well as the impact that installation of the park (as currently designed) would have, the City hired two certified arborists (Tree Management Experts and Kielty Arborist Services) to provide independent reports. Both reports are attached to this document as Attachments 1 and 2.

Following is a combined summary of their findings.
Norfolk Island Pine
The Norfolk Island pine (Araucaria heterophylla) is located at the north end of the property and is approximately 4 feet from the neighboring property. The tree is about 90 feet tall, and has had the top removed after it had died. The trunk is approximately 36.5 inches in diameter and the form of the tree is fair with a single straight trunk and very good limb spacing (common for the species). The tree has very large surface roots (12-14 inch diameter).

- “The Norfolk Island pine produces large seed pods that fall without warning. The species is also prone to Mealybugs, a sucking insect that excretes large volumes of honeydew (fecal matter). The honeydew is quite sticky causing damage to vehicles and landscape structures including play equipment.” (Kielty Arborist Services)

- “The Norfolk Island pine will be significantly impacted as the pad for the play structure will be within 6 feet of the trunk. The excavation depth for the pad will be approximately 2 feet and will sever the surface oriented roots. Root loss will be between 25-30 percent.” (Kielty Arborist Services)

- “The Norfolk Island pine is a poor choice for a park especially for a park with children play equipment. The 2-3 pound seed pods mature in September and will fall from the tree. The excretion of honeydew will also be a nuisance as surfaces and clothing will become a sticky mess. Root loss will be significant and will further reduce the tree vigor.” (Kielty Arborist Services)

- “Because the tree has lost its top, side limb development is likely to be faster and new tops will tend to develop. Both the new tops and proportionately longer limbs will be at an increased risk for failure.” (Tree Management Experts)

- “The health of the Norfolk Island pine will likely be impacted more significantly, and although it would likely survive and have minimal impact to structural roots, it will likely show thinning and decline...The tree will pose a much higher risk after construction due to the presence of people on a frequent basis, and particularly due to the large number of cones, any one of which could strike a person.” (Tree Management Experts)

- “This tree is at a maturity point where it is producing many cones, and there are likely more than 100 currently in the tree. These cones are about the size of a grapefruit and weigh about 1 to 2 pounds. As with all Araucaria species, most cones mature, dry out and then disintegrate and fall as cone scales. There are frequent exceptions to the disintegration, however, and green cones can fall. The presence of squirrel damage increases the risk that a green cone could be chewed free. These cones fall from near the top of the tree, or at about 50 to 80 feet. If a green cone were to hit someone it would cause serious harm or death.” (Tree Management Experts)
We recommend that the Norfolk Island pine be considered for removal due to the risks posed from the cones. (Tree Management Experts)

Image 4: Norfolk Island Pine

Image 5: Norfolk Island Pine's green cones and needles
Deodar Cedar
The Deodar cedar (Cedrus deodara) is located along the Martin Place frontage of the park site. The canopy spreads about 35 feet and the tree is approximately 40-45 feet tall. It has a diameter at breast height of 29.9 and 15.5 inches. There is a slight lean in the trunk toward the southeast, and the limbs are also predominantly toward the south.

- “The trunk of the tree was covered with ivy and some root crown damage occurred from the removal of the ivy. The abundance of deadwood may be an indicator of crown rot. The cedar was recently trimmed with several of the limbs being shortened. The cedar receives a condition rating of 50 on a 1-100 scale (poor-fair).” (Kiely Arborist Services)

- “The cedar tree has been heavily trimmed in the past. The topping of the tree has caused the form of the tree to be poor. The latest trimming was quite heavy reducing the heavy lateral limbs over the site and street. The latest trimming lessened the chances of limb failure but permanently disfigured the poorly formed tree.” (Kiely Arborist Services)

- “The cedar will have moderate impacts to the root zone. Several paths intersect within the dripline of the tree. Root loss during the path installation should be 10-15 percent.” (Kiely Arborist Services)

- “The cedar will not present a hazard as the severe trimming has temporarily reduces the chances of limb failure. Root damage will be moderate and the will survive the construction. The poor disfigured form of the cedar is permanent and will never improve.” (Kiely Arborist Services)

- “The tree was recently pruned and some lower limbs were removed. There are no dead branches or particularly end-heavy branches in the tree. One larger limb on the south side has a decayed and cracked area and should be removed. The tree has no other pruning needs at this time. Risk posed by this tree is currently low.” (Tree Management Experts)

- “The health of the Deodar cedar will likely be impacted in some way, but should be manageable if a TPR [Tree Protection Report] is implemented and if we are on site during excavation activities. The risk posed by this tree will increase due to people being beneath it on a frequent basis. The defective limb with decay present is a known potential failure point and should be removed before construction begins. Other maintenance needs have already been met with recent pruning.” (Tree Management Experts)

- “We recommend that the Deodar cedar be pruned to remove the decayed limb and that a Tree Protection Report be created and implemented.” (Tree Management Experts)
RECOMMENDATION:

Based on the aforementioned arborist reports and to provide the most appealing new park at the site, staff recommends that both heritage trees be removed if the current layout/design is selected. It is important to note that the current design includes the installation of more than twelve (12) new trees within the park and near the surrounding sidewalks.

If this recommended approach is taken (minor changes to current design and the removal of the two existing heritage trees) is selected, staff estimates that it will take approximately 3-5 weeks to revise the design/specifications and construction documents. The project will then be rebid for selection of a contractor, a 3-4 month process. It is estimated that construction would begin in the first quarter of 2019, with an estimated completion in the third quarter of 2019 (July-September).

ALTERNATIVES:

Staff has developed two conceptual alternates should the Park and Recreation Commission desire to retain the heritage trees.

Alternate 1: Relocate the children’s play area closer to the middle of the park site, thereby increasing the distance from the core root structure of the trees. This alternate also reduces the size of the lawn feature near the Florida Avenue side of the park. Under this alternate, staff would recommend that the fall zone for the Norfolk Island pine’s cones is several feet away from the children’s play area and the area around the trees be fenced off, making that portion of the
park unusable. Additionally, the change will add 2-3 months to the timeline so that revised design and specification documents as well as construction plans can be created. The additional cost is unknown at this time, however, staff estimates the increased cost to be between $50,000 and $75,000. A sketch of Alternate 1 can be found on Attachment 3 of this report.

Alternate 2: Eliminate all play equipment in the park and provide a large lawn from the middle of the site to the Florida Avenue frontage. This will create a dedicated area for the heritage trees in the rear of the site that will be enclosed with a fence and unusable. It is estimated that this change will add 1-2 months to the timeline so that revised design and specification documents as well as construction plans can be created. However, while the cost of the redesign and construction are unknown at this time, the total cost will be less than the recommended approach and Alternate 1 due to the removal of the play equipment. A sketch of Alternate 2 can be found on Attachment 4 of this report.

ATTACHMENTS:
1. Arborist Report - Tree Management Experts
2. Arborist Report - Kiely Arborist Services
3. Conceptual Sketch of Alternate 1
4. Conceptual Sketch of Alternate 2
City of San Bruno
Attn: Rene Walsh, Trees & Facilities Field Supervisor
1125 Crystal Springs Avenue
San Bruno, CA 94066-4247

Project: Florida Park
Existing tree evaluations

Date: 9/6/18

ARBORIST REPORT

Assignment

- Provide an evaluation of two existing trees at the Florida Park site.
- Evaluate current health and risk issues.
- Evaluate impacts from planned construction of new park infrastructure.
- Evaluate changes in tree viability and risk.
- Provide an Arborist Report of findings and recommendations.

Tree Health and Risk Factors

The site has two existing trees that have been preserved during demolition with the intent of preserving them as part of the new park. These trees are large, mature examples of their species, will be subject to construction impacts and will contribute to risks posed to those using the park.

**Deodar cedar (Cedrus deodara)**

The deodar cedar is along the Martin Place frontage. The main part of the tree is 29.2-inches in diameter with a smaller 15.5-inch secondary trunk on the south side. The canopy spreads about 35 feet and the tree is about 40 feet tall. There is a slight lean in the trunk toward the southeast, and the limbs are also predominantly toward the south.

The tree was recently pruned and some lower limbs were removed. There are no dead branches or particularly end-heavy branches in the tree. One larger limb on the south side has a decayed and cracked area and should be removed. The tree has no other pruning needs at this time.

Risk posed by this tree is currently low.
Norfolk Island pine (Araucaria heterophylla)

The Norfolk Island pine is at the north end of the property and near the neighboring home. The trunk is about 36.5 inches diameter, is straight and without any visible defects in the lower regions except for 2 bark wounds at the base. The tree is about 90 feet tall, and has had the top removed after it had died. Lower limbs have been removed, and with normal limbs and normal limb distribution in the upper 60 percent of the tree (60% live crown ratio or LCR). There was a heavy load of debris beneath the tree comprised of fallen branchlets and cones including some squirrel damaged foliage.

Because the tree has lost its top, side limb development is likely to be faster and new tops will tend to develop. Both the new tops and proportionately longer limbs will be at an increased risk for failure. Thinning the tree by "lion-tailing" limbs (taking out interior foliage) would concentrate wind forces at the ends and will increase the risk of limb failures. Thinning by removing selected limbs would increase forces acting on limbs and will also increase the risk of limb failures. Rather than thinning, branch tips could be shortened where they are particularly long and extend beyond the average canopy. Shortening these limbs would reduce the chance of failures and would only minimally manage the crown size.

This tree is at a maturity point where it is producing many cones, and there are likely more than 100 currently in the tree. These cones are about the size of a grapefruit and weigh about 1 to 2 pounds. As with all Araucaria species, most cones mature, dry out and then disintegrate and fall as cone scales. There are frequent exceptions to the disintegration, however, and green cones can fall. The presence of squirrel damage increases the risk that a green cone could be chewed free. These cones fall from near the top of the tree, or at about 50 to 80 feet. If a green cone were to hit someone it would cause serious harm or death.

Florida Park Construction Impacts

The general design of the new park places the play structures and benches beneath these two trees. These features will impact the root systems of the trees, and will place people beneath the trees.

Root system impacts will not remove structural roots, but will require deep curb construction and irrigation trenching well within the root zone of both trees. The trees are likely to have diminished health over the next several years. Based on the distances to construction, the Deodar cedar will likely have a smaller health impact than the Norfolk Island pine.

If either or both trees are retained, a Tree Protection Report (TPR) will be a critical path to successful preservation of a tree or trees. The TPR will specify what the tree needs are, what areas are off-limits during routine work, where we need to be present during construction, and how to mitigate for potential damage by modifying the work plan or by using specialized techniques.
Tree Health and Risk Changes

The health of the Deodar cedar will likely be impacted in some way, but should be manageable if a TPR is implemented and if we are on site during excavation activities. The risk posed by this tree will increase due to people being beneath it on a frequent basis. The defective limb with decay present is a known potential failure point and should be removed before construction begins. Other maintenance needs have already been met with recent pruning.

The health of the Norfolk Island pine will likely be impacted more significantly, and although it would likely survive and have minimal impact to structural roots, it will likely show thinning and decline. The size of the tree is considerably larger than the Deodar, yet the construction encroaches to nearly as close and will occur on 3 sides. The tree will pose a much higher risk after construction due to the presence of people on a frequent basis, and particularly due to the large number of cones, any one of which could strike a person.

Recommendations

We recommend that the Deodar cedar be pruned to remove the decayed limb and that a Tree Protection Report be created and implemented.

We recommend that the Norfolk Island pine be considered for removal due to the risks posed from the cones.
Wound at Base of Norfolk Island Pine
Wound at Base of Norfolk Island Pine
Assumptions and Limiting Conditions

1. Any legal description provided to the consultant is assumed to be correct. Title and ownership of all property considered are assumed to be good and marketable. No responsibility is assumed for matters legal in character. Any and all property is appraised or evaluated as though free and clear, under responsible ownership and competent management.

2. It is assumed that any property is not in violation of any applicable codes, ordinances, statutes or other governmental regulations.

3. Care has been taken to obtain all information from reliable sources. All data has been verified insofar as possible. The consultant can neither guarantee nor be responsible for the accuracy of information provided by others.

4. Various diagrams, sketches and photographs in this report are intended as visual aids and are not to scale, unless specifically stated as such on the drawing. These communication tools in no way substitute for nor should be construed as surveys, architectural or engineering drawings.

5. Loss or alteration of any part of this report invalidates the entire report.

6. Possession of this report or a copy thereof does not imply right of publication or use for any purpose by any other than the person to whom it is addressed, without the prior written or verbal consent of the consultant.

7. This report is confidential and to be distributed only to the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. Any or all of the contents of this report may be conveyed to another party only with the express prior written or verbal consent of the consultant. Such limitations apply to the original report, a copy, facsimile, scanned image or digital version thereof.

8. This report represents the opinion of the consultant. In no way is the consultant’s fee contingent upon a stipulated result, the occurrence of a subsequent event, nor upon any finding to be reported.

9. The consultant shall not be required to give testimony or to attend court by reason of this report unless subsequent contractual arrangements are made, including payment of an additional fee for such services as described in the fee schedule, an agreement or a contract.

10. Information contained in this report reflects observations made only to those items described and only reflects the condition of those items at the time of the site visit. Furthermore, the inspection is limited to visual examination of items and elements at the site, unless expressly stated otherwise. There is no expressed or implied warranty or guarantee that problems or deficiencies of the plants or property inspected may not arise in the future.

Disclosure Statement

Arborists are tree specialists who use their education, knowledge, training, and experience to examine trees, recommend measures to enhance the beauty and health of trees, and attempt to reduce the risk of living near trees. Clients may choose to accept or disregard the recommendations of the arborist, or to seek additional advice.

Arborists cannot detect every condition that could possibly lead to the structural failure of a tree. Trees are living organisms that fail in ways we do not fully understand. Conditions are often hidden within trees and below ground. Arborists cannot guarantee that a tree will be healthy or safe under all circumstances, or for a specified period of time. Likewise, remedial treatments, like any medicine, cannot be guaranteed.
Treatment, pruning, and removal of trees may involve considerations beyond the scope of the arborist's services such as property boundaries, property ownership, site lines, disputes between neighbors, and other issues. An arborist cannot take such considerations into account unless complete and accurate information is disclosed to the arborist. An arborist should then be expected to reasonably rely upon the completeness and accuracy of the information provided.

Trees can be managed, but they cannot be controlled. To live near trees is to accept some degree of risk. The only way to eliminate all risk associated with trees is to eliminate the trees.

**Certification of Performance**

I, Aaron Wang, Certify:

- That we have inspected the trees and/or property evaluated in this report. We have stated findings accurately, insofar as the limitations of the Assignment and within the extent and context identified by this report;
- That we have no current or prospective interest in the vegetation or any real estate that is the subject of this report, and have no personal interest or bias with respect to the parties involved;
- That the analysis, opinions and conclusions stated herein are original and are based on current scientific procedures and facts and according to commonly accepted arboricultural practices;
- That no significant professional assistance was provided, except as indicated by the inclusion of another professional report within this report;
- That compensation is not contingent upon the reporting of a predetermined conclusion that favors the cause of the client or any other party.

I am a member and Certified Arborist with the International Society of Arboriculture.

I have attained professional training in all areas of knowledge asserted through this report by completion of a Bachelor of Science degree in Forestry and Natural Resources, by routinely attending pertinent professional conferences and by reading current research from professional journals, books and other media.

I have rendered professional services in a full-time capacity in the field of horticulture and arboriculture for more than 3 years.

Signed: ____________________________

Date: 9/6/18
Certification of Performance

I, Roy C. Leggitt, III, Certify:

- That we have inspected the trees and/or property evaluated in this report. We have stated findings accurately, insofar as the limitations of the Assignment and within the extent and context identified by this report;

- That we have no current or prospective interest in the vegetation or any real estate that is the subject of this report, and have no personal interest or bias with respect to the parties involved;

- That the analysis, opinions and conclusions stated herein are original and are based on current scientific procedures and facts and according to commonly accepted arboricultural practices;

- That no significant professional assistance was provided, except as indicated by the inclusion of another professional report within this report;

- That compensation is not contingent upon the reporting of a predetermined conclusion that favors the cause of the client or any other party.

I am a member in good standing of the American Society of Consulting Arborists and a member and Certified Arborist with the International Society of Arboriculture.

I have attained professional training in all areas of knowledge asserted through this report by completion of a Bachelor of Science degree in Plant Science, by routinely attending pertinent professional conferences and by reading current research from professional journals, books and other media.

I have rendered professional services in a full-time capacity in the field of horticulture and arboriculture for more than 30 years.

Signed: [Signature]

Date: 9/6/18
Tree Assessment

Deodar Cedar and Norfolk Island Pine
324 Florida
San Bruno, CA

Prepared for:
San Bruno Parks and Recreation
Mr. Rene Walsh
567 El Camino Real
San Bruno, CA 94066

Prepared by:
Kielty Arborist Services
P.O. Box 6187
San Mateo, CA 94403

September 7, 2018
Tree Report
324 Florida
San Bruno, CA

Table of Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction and Assignment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Observations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of Species</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damages</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tests and Exploration</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trimming History</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Construction Impacts</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Habitat</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>5-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glossary</td>
<td>7-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure Statement</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Photos
- Cedar Tree as seen from street 1
- Cedar Crotch at 15 feet 2
- Norfolk Island Pine 2
- Norfolk Island Pine Seed Pods 3
- Large surface roots and playground location 4
September 7, 2018

San Bruno Parks and Recreation
Mr. Rene Walsh
567 El Camino Real
San Bruno, CA  94066

Site: 324 Florida, San Bruno, CA

Dear Mr. Walsh,

**Introduction and Assignment:**
As requested on Thursday, September 6, 2018, I visited the above site to inspect and comment on a large deodar cedar and a Norfolk Island pine in the rear of the property. A new park is planned for this site and your concern as to the future health and safety of the trees has prompted this visit.

**Method:**
The trees in question was located on a “Not-to-Scale” map provided by me. Each tree was measured for diameter at 54 inches above ground level. The tree was then tree was given a condition rating for form and vitality. The trees’ condition rating is based on 50 percent vitality and 50 percent form, using the following scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-29</td>
<td>Very Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-49</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-69</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-89</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-100</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The height of the trees were measured using a Nikon Forestry 550 Hypsometer.
The spread was paced off. Comments and recommendations for future maintenance are provided. The cedar was climbed to inspect the structure of the tree.

**Disfigured Deodara cedar tree near southwestern property line.**
Observations:
The tree in question is a Deodar cedar (*Cedrus deodara*) with diameters at breast height of 29.9 and 15.5 inches. The tree is located in the rear of the property near the southwestern property line. The estimated height of the cedar is 45 feet with a total crown spread of 45 feet. The vigor of the tree is poor-fair with several dead limbs recently being removed. The form of the cedar is poor with multiple leaders at the base and again at 15 feet from a past topping.

The cedar was climbed to inspect crotch formations and possible decay.

The trunk of the tree was covered with ivy and some root crown damage occurred from the removal of the ivy. The abundance of deadwood may be an indicator of crown rot. The cedar was recently trimmed with several of the limbs being shortened. The cedar receives a condition rating of 50 on a 1-100 scale (poor-fair).

Tree #2 is a Norfolk Island pine (*Araucaria heterophylla*) with a diameter at breast height of 37.4 inches. The tree is located in the rear of the lot 4 feet from the property line and the neighboring home. The vigor of the tree is fair with normal shoot growth for the species. The form of the tree is fair with a single straight trunk and very good limb spacing (common for the species). The tree has very large surface roots (12-14 inch diameter). The location of the tree is poor, near the property line and very close to the neighboring home. Large seed pods are visible throughout the tree.

Norfolk Island pine 4 feet from the property line and neighboring home.
Site Observations:
The site was a former home acquired by the city to build a neighborhood park. The home and other landscape shrubs were removed to facilitate the building of the park. The two trees in question are the only trees remaining. The cleared site has had the hardscape areas marked on the bare ground with paint. The marking of the hardscaped area gives a good idea of paths and play structure bases that encroach on the trees dripline.

Discussion of Species:
Cedrus deodara is a native of Asia where the tree is common in the Himalayan area. The tree is commonly used as a landscape tree throughout the world. Cedars have a spreading form and large diameter roots. The species is subject to limb breakage as the wood is quite brittle. Topping of this species increases the chances of limb or leader failure as the tree becomes codominant and lateral limbs become over-extended. The species is susceptible to root rot primarily oak root fungus. The tree does not react well to large scale root cutting. Root cutting for this species will cause a lowered vitality and increases the trees chances of failure from wind throw.

Four large seed pods were pulled from the ends of the limbs of the tree. All four 2-3 pound pods were on the end of the same limb.

The Norfolk Island pine is native to the south pacific. The tree is often used as an indoor plant as the species is sensitive to cold weather. All of the araucaria species produce large seed pods that fall without warning. The species is prone to mealy bug a sucking insect that excretes large volumes of honey dew (fecal matter). The honeydew is quite sticky causing damage to vehicles and landscape structures including play equipment.

Testing or Exploration:
The cedar was climbed to inspect the structure of the tree including the crotch formation at 15 feet and the topping locations. The Norfolk Island pine had several of the large seed pods removed by using a tree climber’s throw line. The throw line was able to reach pods at approximately 40 feet.
Trimming History:
The cedar tree has been heavily trimmed in the past. The topping of the tree has caused the form of the tree to be poor. The latest trimming was quite heavy reducing the heavy lateral limbs over the site and street. The latest trimming lessened the chances of limb failure but permanently disfigured the poorly formed tree. The Norfolk Island pine does not appear to have been recently trimmed however the lower limbs have been removed and the fringe has been raised over the neighboring home and over the site to match.

Proposed Construction Impacts:
The Norfolk Island pine will be significantly impacted as the pad for the play structure will be within 6 feet of the trunk. The excavation depth for the pad will be approximately 2 feet and will sever the surface oriented roots. Root loss will be between 25-30 percent.

The cedar will have moderate impacts to the root zone. Several paths intersect within the dripline of the tree. Root loss during the path installation should be 10-15 percent.

The line in the foreground is the edge of the playground pad well within the tree dripline and the probable target for falling pods. Excavation will be 2 feet deep and will cause significant root loss.

Wildlife habitat:
During my two visits to the site I saw no wildlife utilizing the trees. No nests or remnants of nests were noticed. Raccoon scat and mealy bug fecal matter was observed on the site.

Summary:
The Norfolk Island pine is a poor choice for a park especially a park with children play equipment. The 2-3 pound seed pods mature in September and will fall from the tree. The excretion of honeydew will also be a nuisance as surfaces and clothing will become a sticky mess. Root loss will be significant and will further reduce the tree vigor.

The cedar will not present a hazard as the severe trimming has temporarily reduces the chances of limb failure. Root damage will be moderate and the will survive the construction. The poor disfigured form of the cedar is permanent and will never improve.
Remove and replace the two trees. The Norfolk Island pine will be a constant hazard and will suffer significant root loss. The cedar will always have poor form and will never be an attractive tree. A brand new park should have new safe trees for the neighborhood to enjoy.

The information included in this report is believed to be true and based on sound arboricultural principles and practices.

Sincerely,

Kevin R. Kielty
Certified Arborist WE#0476A
## Glossary

**Adventitious**  
Arising from parts of the root or stem and having no connection to apical meristems.

**Air Excavator**  
A device that directs a jet of highly compressed air to excavate soil.

**ANSI**  
An acronym for American National Standards Institute.

**ANSI A300**  
In the United States, industry developed national consensus standards of practice for tree care.

**Bifurcation**  
A natural division of branch or stem into two or more stems or parts.

**Branch union**  
A point where a branch originates from the trunk or another branch. Fork. Crotch.

**Brown rot**  
A fungal wood rot characterized by the breakdown of cellulose.

**Buttress roots**  
Roots at the trunk base that help support the tree and equalize mechanical stress.

**Butt rot**  
Decay of the lower trunk, trunk flare or buttress roots.

**Cabling**  
Installation of steel or synthetic cable in a tree to provide supplemental support to week branches or crotches.

**Canker**  
A dead, discolored, often sunken area (lesion) on a branch, root, stem or trunk.

**Canopy**  
The part of the crown composed of leaves and small twigs.

**Cavity**  
Open or closed hollow within a tree stem, usually associated with decay.

**Compartmentalize**  
Natural defense process in trees which chemical and physical boundaries are created that act to limit the spread of disease and decay organisms.

**Decay**  
An area of wood that is undergoing decomposition.

**Epicormic shoot**  
Shoot arising from latent or adventitious bud (growth point).

**Eradicate**  
Total removal of a species from a particular area. May refer to pathogens, insects, pests or unwanted plants.
Hypoxylon  Black hemispherical fruiting bodies that develop on the surface of dead bark or wood. The fungus causes a white rot of the sap wood of living trees and dead wood.

Included bark  Bark that becomes embedded in a crotch between branch and trunk or between codominant stems. Causes weak structure.

Infectious  Capable of being spread to plants from other plants or organisms.

Lateral  Secondary or subordinate branch or root.

Live crown ratio  Ratio of the height of the crown containing live foliage to the overall height of the tree.

Mycelium  Vegetative body of a fungus.

Watersprout  Upright, epicormic shoot arising from the trunk or branches of a plant above the root graft or soil line.
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Kielty Arborist Services
P.O. Box 6187
San Mateo, CA 94403
650-515-9783

ARBORIST DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Arborists are tree specialists who use their education, knowledge, training and experience to examine trees, recommend measures to enhance the beauty and health of trees, and attempt to reduce the risk of living near trees. Clients may choose to accept or disregard the recommendations of the arborist, or seek additional advice.

Arborists cannot detect every condition that could possibly lead to the structural failure of a tree. Trees are living organisms that fail in ways we do not fully understand. Conditions are often hidden within trees and below ground. Arborists cannot guarantee that a tree will be healthy or safe under all circumstances, or for a specified period of time. Likewise, remedial treatments, like a medicine, cannot be guaranteed.

Treatment, pruning, and removal of trees may involve considerations beyond the scope of the arborist’s services such as property boundaries, property ownership, site lines, disputes between neighbors, landlord-tenant matters, etc. Arborists cannot take such issues into account unless complete and accurate information is given to the arborist. The person hiring the arborist accepts full responsibility for authorizing the recommended treatment or remedial measures.

Trees can be managed, but they cannot be controlled. To live near a tree is to accept some degree of risk. The only way to eliminate all risks is to eliminate all trees.

Arborist:  
Kevin R. Kielty

Date: September 7, 2018
ATTACHMENT 3
# PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION

## PARK TOUR FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Amenities</th>
<th>Notes, Comments &amp; Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Facilities (Overall condition, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches, picnic tables/BBQs (Loose anchors, cut/rough edges, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedication Plaque(s) (Loose, damaged, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fences, Railings &amp; Gates (Describe condition)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti &amp; Other Markings (Describe area)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation System/Water Foun. (Leaking sprinklers, brown areas, operation, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lights, Light Poles &amp; Fixtures (Proper operation, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways &amp; walkways (Uneven edges, cracks, tree roots, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawn, plants, trees &amp; shrubs (Overgrown areas, damaged, general condition)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play structure(s) (Overall condition, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restroom Facilities (Overall condition, cleanliness, operation, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage (Installation, legible mess., etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash &amp; recycling containers (Empty/full, condition, location, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other notes and comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revised 9/10/18
### CITY of SAN BRUNO

**PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION**

**PARK VISIT GRID 2018 - 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park/Facility</th>
<th>Palmer</th>
<th>Gonzales</th>
<th>Nigel</th>
<th>Melendrez</th>
<th>Zastrow</th>
<th>Zamattia</th>
<th>Greenberg</th>
<th>Martinucci</th>
<th>Lin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bayshore Circle Park</td>
<td>9/10/2018 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/7/18</td>
<td>9/10/2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belle Air Park/Lion's Field</td>
<td>9/4/2018 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/4/2018 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckeye Park</td>
<td>9/24/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/16/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalpa Tot Lot</td>
<td>9/17/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/6/18</td>
<td>11/23/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Park</td>
<td>12/3/2017 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/3/2017 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commodore Park</td>
<td>9/24/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl/Glenview Park</td>
<td>N O T R E A D Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleetwood Park</td>
<td>9/17/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/6/18</td>
<td>11/23/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Avenue Park</td>
<td>N O T R E A D Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Lane Park</td>
<td>9/10/2018 (2)</td>
<td>9/4/18</td>
<td>9/10/2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grundy Park</td>
<td>9/24/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>8/10/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herman Tot Lot</td>
<td>9/10/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/5/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lomita Park</td>
<td>9/10/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/7/18</td>
<td>2/18/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Verde Park</td>
<td>9/17/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/9/2017 (3)</td>
<td>12/9/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Heights Park</td>
<td>9/17/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponderosa Park</td>
<td>9/17/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/26/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12/24/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posy Park</td>
<td>N O V I S I T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Avenue Park</td>
<td>9/10/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/29/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5/6/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th &amp; Walnut Park</td>
<td>9/10/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/29/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5/6/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
(1) - Mike & Dave visited this facility together
(2) - Mike & Alex visited this facility together
(3) - Dave & Alex visited this facility together