

# ANNUAL URBAN FOREST REPORT

JULY 1, 2012-JUNE 30, 2013



*Submitted to Mayor Edwin M. Lee and the Board of Supervisors by the Department of the Environment, pursuant to San Francisco Environment Code Chapter 12 Sec. 1209.*

The **Urban Forestry Council** advises city departments, including the Board of Supervisors and the mayor. Its tasks are to develop a comprehensive urban forest plan; educate the public; develop tree-care standards; identify funding needs, staffing needs, and opportunities for urban forest programs; secure adequate resources for urban forest programs; facilitate coordination of tree-management responsibilities among agencies; and report on the state of the urban forest



Urban Forestry Council members from left to right:

Mike Barrow, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

Sandy Sherwin, Technology Fulfillment Manager at Ingersoll Rand

William Most, Environmental Attorney at Briscoe Ivester & Bazel LLP

Dan Kida, Sr. Program Manager, Vegetation Management Quality Control, PG&E

Jon Swae, Urban Forest Plan Manager, San Francisco Planning Department

Dan Flanagan, Executive Director of Friends of the Urban Forest – CHAIR

Carla Short, Urban Forester, San Francisco Department of Public Works

John Leffingwell, Consulting Arborist, HortScience

Ana M. Alvarez, Parks & Open Spaces Superintendent, San Francisco Recreation and Park Department (alternate member)

Malcolm Hillan, Environmental Horticulture Professor, City College of San Francisco

Rose Hillson, Community Activist

Andrew Sullivan, Landscape Architect

Not pictured:

Larry Costello, UC Coop Ext. Env. Horticulture Advisor Emeritus –VICE-CHAIR

Philip A. Ginsburg, General Manager, San Francisco Recreation and Park Department

Urban Forestry Council Staff Support:

Mei Ling Hui, SF Environment Urban Forest and Agriculture Coordinator

Monica Fish, SF Environment Commission Secretary

Cover photo by Lisa Guide, courtesy of Friends of the Urban Forest

**Table of Contents:**

Executive Summary: Overview of San Francisco’s Urban Forest Fiscal year 2012-2013 ..... Page 4

List of Participating Organizations ..... Page 6

Major opportunities and challenges reported by participating organizations .... Page 7

**Data Tables**

Table 1: Staffing and Budget ..... Page 11

Table 2: Species Selection and Diversity ..... Page 12

Table 3: Work Plan, including Tree Plantings, Tree Care, and Tree Removal Activities ..... Page 14

Table 4: Ratings for Commonly Cited Concerns ..... Page 16

Table 5: Ratings for Commonly Cited Limitations ..... Page 17

Please note: While this report seeks to be as comprehensive as possible, it is based on data provided by responding agencies and does not include complete information on all urban forestry work performed within the San Francisco.

## **Overview of San Francisco's Urban Forest, FY 2012-2013**

SF Environment staff surveyed 20 city departments, public agencies, and non-government organizations that oversee or manage a portion of the urban forest in San Francisco on forestry budget, resources, and maintenance activities for fiscal year 2011-2012. Of the 20 organizations surveyed, 16 provided full or partial responses. (For a complete list of groups see Appendix I) This data is tracked to:

- Better understand the resources used to maintain the urban forest across city departments.
- Track the priorities, needs, and concerns of city departments and local nonprofits, and monitor how they change over time.
- Better understand threats to the future well-being of our urban forest.
- Find ways to increase the contributions that trees provide to our community.

This year, the survey included new questions about species diversification and health. The results show a variety of responses identifying most commonly planted trees, struggling trees, and trees each organization is experimenting with planting.

In fiscal year 2012-2013, reporting organizations **planted 3,916 trees** and **removed 1,509 trees**. The 15 responding organizations with forestry management programs provided care for **13,035 trees, including pruning, inspection, watering**.

San Francisco agencies reported approximately **106 full-time staff** equivalent (FTE) positions that dedicated a portion of their time to urban forest program. Of these staff positions, approximately **75.5 FTEs are dedicated to planting and maintaining trees**.

**As in all previous Annual Urban Forest reports, departments and agencies identified funding and staffing constraints as their greatest limitations, with a 20% increase in overall concern for inadequate funding of forestry programs.** Additionally, inability to provide adequate care for newly planted trees and the loss of trees due to age and/or disease were the most significant concerns for forestry managers.

The UFC is aware of emergent concerns where best management practices (BMPs) for urban forestry work may not align well with the BMPs of other public land use priorities. These issues are well illustrated in the current dialogue surrounding the intersection of forestry and natural areas work on Mt. Davidson and the Sutro Forest. The UFC will host a round table discussion on the issue of management options for the Mt. Sutro forest, with the goal of bringing vested partners together to identify and prioritize concerns and begin a dialogue on management options within the context of health, safety and urban forest best management practices.

At first glance, tree care and staffing statistics in fiscal year 2012-2013 appear to be generally on par with the previous year's reporting. However, responding organizations change from year to year. This report includes responses from two additional organizations than the 2011-2012 report. As such, it is more accurate to compare programming of the most active and consistently responsive departments and organizations: Friends of the Urban Forest (FUF), the Department of Public Works (DPW), the Recreation and Park Department (RPD), and the Presidio Trust.

Consistent with other organizations, staffing and funding among these four most active city departments and nonprofits remained relatively unchanged from the previous fiscal year. RPD increased their forestry staff by 2 FTE from the previous fiscal year. However, this is still 2 FTE less than RPD reported for forestry staff in fiscal year 2010-2011.

While tree planting and tree care activities also remained relatively consistent, **tree removal increased by a significant margin, from 597 trees removed by these four organizations in the previous reporting cycle, to 1070 trees removed in this fiscal year, a 79% increase in tree removal.** While DPW reduced the number of trees they removed between this fiscal year report and the last, RPD and the Presidio Trust saw a considerable increase in tree removal activities. The increase can be partially explained by a disturbing amount of vandalism to newly planted trees in Golden Gate Park, which necessitated the removal of 152 young trees.

2012 Annual Report	Planted	Cared For	Removed
DPW	923	3155	201
RPD	817	572	276
FUF	1170	2795	0
Trust	500	4600	120
<b>Total</b>	3410	11,122	597

2013 Annual Report	Planted	Cared For	Removed
DPW	1031	1959	139
RPD	876	546	571
FUF	1273	3356	0
Trust	500	4000	360
<b>Totals</b>	3680 – 8% increase	9861 -11% decrease	1070 – 79% increase

## **List of Participating Organizations**

The following organizations and city departments responded to the survey:

- California Department of Transportation, District 4 (CalTrans)
- Department of Public Health, General Hospital (DPH-GH)
- Department of Public Works (DPW)
- Friends of the Urban Forest (FUF)
- Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Fort Mason (GGNRA)
- Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (OCII) (Successor Agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency)
- Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E)
- Port of San Francisco (PORT)
- Presidio Trust (Trust)
- Public Utilities Commission, City Distribution Division (PUC)
- Recreation and Park Department (RPD)
- San Francisco International Airport (SFO)
- San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD)
- Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA)
- University of California, San Francisco (UCSF)
- San Francisco Planning Department

The following organizations and departments were queried and did not respond:

- City College of San Francisco (CCSF)
- Department of Public Health, Laguna Honda Hospital (DPH-LH)
- Municipal Transit Authority (MTA)
- San Francisco State University (SFSU)

## **Major opportunities and challenges reported by participating organizations**

Management of San Francisco's urban forest is divided among many stakeholders who provide direct care to trees within land under their jurisdiction, as well as nonprofit organizations who engage with agency partners to support forestry activities on city-owned land.

The **California Department of Transportation, District 4** (CalTrans) manages the care and oversight of trees and green spaces on state rights-of-way in the Bay Area and works with the Adopt-A-Highway division to allow neighborhood groups access to land for community gardening. In 2012-2013, CalTrans completed the Rincon Hill Dog Park in association with city departments and neighborhood associations, re-landscaped and installed new irrigation at the 5<sup>th</sup> street off ramp, removed hazardous trees at Progress Park, and improved irrigation at the Hospital Curve. CalTrans major forestry concerns are the loss of trees due to Pine Pitch Canker and the loss of trees and shrubs due to tree topping by billboard companies for visibility.

The **San Francisco Department of Public Health** (SFDPH) has many facilities with on-site trees, though the General Hospital Facility was the only site to respond to this year's survey. General Hospital reports concern for tree health due to ongoing construction of the new hospital facility. In 2013-2014, they will have an increased forestry operation budget, due to \$40K+ allocated for tree work from Bureau of Building Repair.

The **Department of Public Works** (DPW) provides oversight and care to trees within the City's public rights-of way, including planting and maintaining street trees, issuing street tree planting and removal permits to residents, and providing emergency street tree response. In 2012-2013, DPW continued transferring maintenance responsibility of formerly DPW maintained trees to adjacent property owners and completed a partial inventory of street trees, including privately maintained trees as well as DPW maintained trees. Long term financing for tree care, public response to tree maintenance transfer and lack of funding remain their top concerns. Additionally, DPW is concerned with pest, disease, and fungal problems that are affecting certain tree species. *Myoporum* thrips are not well controlled and are negatively impacting *Myoporum* trees. Additionally, *Natrassia mangiferae* is causing sooty canker that is affecting *Ficus* trees. The city needs more information on this disease.

**Friends of the Urban Forest** (FUF) helps individuals and neighborhood groups plant and care for street trees and sidewalk gardens in San Francisco. One major opportunity for FUF is its new partnership with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to install sidewalk gardens in key locations throughout the city to capture storm water and thereby reduce the burden on the city's combined storm-sewer system. FUF is also taking advantage of the local building boom by partnering with developers to incorporate greening into their development projects. FUF is also pursuing potential new funding sources at the state level to make up for recent cuts in such funding. FUF's key focus in the coming year will be drawing attention to problems facing San Francisco's urban forest, including the way street

trees are maintained (and neglected), and proposing a solution to improve street tree health and care based on the forthcoming Urban Forest Master Plan.

The **Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure** (OCII) is the local successor agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency. As part of the 2011 Budget Act, and in order to protect funding for core public services at the local level, the Legislature approved the dissolution of the state's 400 plus RDAs, which were officially dissolved as of February 1, 2012. OCII is primarily concerned with significantly reduced funding overall, due to the dissolution of the Redevelopment Agency.

**Pacific Gas and Electric Company** (PG&E) works with property owners to resolve conflicts between trees and power lines. As in past reports, they identified concerns with public safety and service reliability due to conflicts between power lines and trees, especially palm trees, which, due to their structure and growth habit, cannot be effectively pruned away from power lines. PG&E is additionally concerned with safely pruning trees near cars that are parked alongside the curb.

**SF Planning Department** (Planning) plays a supportive role for urban forest managers in San Francisco, providing technical and financial assistance. The Planning Department, in collaboration with the DPW and FUF, is creating a plan to promote San Francisco's urban forest *with a primary focus on street trees*. The Urban Forest Plan will identify policies and strategies to proactively manage and grow the city's street tree population. The goal of the Plan is to create an expanded, healthy and thriving urban forest now and for the future. To support the Urban Forest Plan, Planning, DPW, and FUF performed a Street Tree Census, inventorying 25K street trees. Additionally, Planning provides technical assistant services related to urban forestry policy, planning, finance and geographic analysis to a wide range of urban forestry stakeholders in San Francisco. The Planning Department provided financial assistance to the Urban Forestry Council for general operations and the Recreation and Parks Department for a Parks Trees Financing Study. The Planning Department's key concern is the sustainability of urban forestry funding over the long-term to meet policy goals.

The **Port of San Francisco** (PORT) manages the care of trees along the San Francisco Bay waterfront. The Port is highly concerned with escalating loss of palm trees, due to *Fusarium* wilt fungal infections. Last fiscal year, the Port reported a loss of three trees; this year the Port has ten additional palms in acute decline. The Port is engaged in critical measures to examine each new tree planted, prevent the spread of the fungus, and replace damaged trees with similar and more resistant palm species. At an approximate replacement cost \$20K-\$30K per tree, this is a pressing and serious issue for the Port. Additionally, DPW has requested that the Port assume management responsibility for trees on Port jurisdiction where the maintenance responsibility had previously been DPW's. The Port is considering inclusion of forestry work in their capital plan to meet their increasing funding needs.



The **Presidio Trust** (Trust) oversees approximately 70K trees in the Presidio of San Francisco, 1,491 acre National Historic Landmark located within GGNRA lands. The Trust actively manages more than 10K trees. The Trust has been engaged in ambitious reforestation work based on their Vegetation Management Plan, which was adopted in 2011. Their greatest concern is the age and vitality of the Presidio's Historic Forest. Natural regeneration in the Presidio's forested areas has been limited and without intervention the aging forest will decline. The Vegetation Management Plan seeks to improve the health and biological diversity of the Historic Forest areas, through rehabilitation and planting efforts with an eye to improving the size diversity, age ranges, and density of forested areas, while maintaining wind breaks, vistas, natural habitat, and historic character.

The **San Francisco Public Utilities Commission** (SFPUC) manages trees and green space around reservoirs. The PUC continues to express a lack of adequate funding for their forestry maintenance programs, including an inability to fill an open requisition for their lead urban forester staff position.

The **Recreation and Parks Department** (RPD) gained approval to backfill three arborist staff positions that had been vacant. They expressed serious ongoing concerns with funding and staffing, and tree loss due to age, disease, and vandalism. RPD reported losses of over 150 newly planted trees due to vandalism and cited additional critical concerns for the health and safety of the trees in their over-aged canopy. As of March 2013, the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department tree inventory was augmented by the acceptance of the transfer of tree-maintenance responsibility from the Department of Public Works for 1,639 street trees located adjacent city parklands; these trees are now considered part of the city parklands' biomass. Regretfully, the transfer of the maintenance responsibility and ownership was not inclusive of funding sources for their care.

The **San Francisco International Airport** (SFO) manages natural areas, trees, and landscaped areas surrounding the San Francisco Airport. SFO is focused on improving pollution and pest management within difficult environmental conditions. As landscape trees grow in areas adjacent to roadways and signage, SFO focused on ensuring visibility and safety of these vital structures while improving the health of the trees and open space under their management.

The **San Francisco Unified School District** (SFUSD) provides care and maintenance for approximately 3K trees on 430 acres of school district property. Through support from the Prop A bond fund, passed in 2006 and 2011, SFUSD has dedicated \$12M to build more school gardens and increase focus on education in an outdoor setting. Despite the success with the school greening and school garden program supported by Prop A, as in past years, SFUSD remains highly concerned with ongoing staffing and funding needs for forestry work, with a static budget that hasn't increased in years, despite increased tree maintenance requirements.

The **Treasure Island Development Authority's** (TIDA) oversees the care of all trees on Treasure Island. TIDA seeks to maintain the health of their existing trees and identify solutions to mitigate tree disease within their property. For fiscal year 2013-2014, TIDA has allocated approximately \$305K that will be work ordered to DPW to implement a Treasure Island Tree Maintenance Program, allowing TIDA to assess their trees Island wide, remove dead trees, and prune tree limbs to both mitigate hazards to facilities and overhead utility infrastructure as well as to further beautify the Island.

The **University of California, San Francisco** (UCSF) owns a largely undeveloped 61-acre area just south of the Parnassus Heights campus called the Mount Sutro Open Space Reserve. UCSF is committed to maintaining the Reserve as a safe and accessible resource that San Francisco residents and visitors can enjoy. UCSF is concerned with their aging urban forest and the need to address potential fire hazards, in the midst of conflicting community engagement and funding constraints.

## Responses from the 2013 Annual Urban Forest Report Survey

Table 1: Respondents were asked about staffing and budget

Department	Urban forest-related staff positions	# Staff (or FTE equiv) performing only forestry work	Total department budget	Urban forestry related budget	Est. % of UF budget spent on tree planting, care, and removal	
					Amount	%
Cal Trans	4	2.5	\$5M	Unknown	Unknown	10-30%*
DPH-GH	2.5 FTE	0	\$1M	\$100K	\$40K	40%
DPW	41	26	\$140.7M	\$5.8M**	\$1.1M**	19%
FUF	12 FTE, 3 PTE	6 FTE	\$1.8M	\$1.4M	\$1.4M	100%
GGNRA	0	0	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
OCII/SFRA	0	0	\$153M	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
PG&E	1FTE	5 FTE	No answer	Varies	No answer	No answer
Planning	.5FTE	0	No answer	\$295K	0	0%
PORT	2 FTE	0	\$88.6M	\$137K	\$44K	32%
Trust	10 FTE	9 FTE	\$90M	\$750K	No answer	No answer
PUC	0	0	Unknown	\$114K**	\$114K**	100%
RPD	27 FTE	27 FTE	\$138.5M	\$3.5M**	\$3.5M**	100%
SFO	1.5 FTE	0	"N/A"	\$125K	\$125K	100%
SFUSD	0	0	\$1M	\$60K	\$60K	100%
TIDA	2 FTE	0	\$1M	No answer	No Answer	~30%
UCSF	1 FTE	<1	\$8M	\$100K	\$100K	\$100K
<b>TOTAL***:</b>	106FTE	75.5FTE	\$628,7M	\$12.6M	\$6.7M	—

\*Figure estimate is for all of the CalTrans District 4, Southwest Region, including San Francisco, San Mateo, and Santa Clara counties.

\*\* The UF budgets of PUC, DPW, and RPD include interdepartmental work ordered funding, which may or may not have been identified by the other departments in their report.

\*\*\*Total may not add up due to rounding.

Table 2: Respondents were asked about species selection

Department	Most commonly planted species	Struggling species	Experimental species
CalTrans	Elms, Pines and Redwoods	Eucalyptus and palms	None
DPH-GH	<i>Arbutus 'Marina'</i>	Ficus	None
DPW	<i>Corymbia ficifolia*</i> <i>Lophostemon confertus</i> <i>Tristaniopsis laurina</i> <i>Pittosporum undulatum</i>	None, but constantly assessing species in different conditions, and trying to choose the best species for the climate and goals.	<i>Lagunaria patersonii</i> , not new, but less common (not experimenting, but using more)
FUF	<i>Prunus serrulata</i> 'Kwanzan', <i>Arbutus 'Marina'</i> , <i>Olea europaea</i> 'Majestic Beauty', <i>Magnolia grandiflora</i> . 'Little Gem'	<i>Acacia baileyana</i> , <i>Rhamnus alaternus</i> , <i>Pyrus kawakamii</i> and <i>Pyrus calleryana</i> we have reduced greatly due to disease	<i>Fraxinus ornus</i> , <i>Elaeocarpus decipens</i> , <i>Quillaja saponaria</i> , more <i>Tilia cordata</i>
GGNRA	No answer	No answer	No answer
OCII/SFRA	Unknown	Poplar (Mission Bay – invasive root system)  Sycamore (Rincon Point – fungus/mildew)	No answer
PG&E	No answer	No answer	No answer
PORT	True Date Palm ( <i>Phoenix dactylifera</i> )	Canary Island Date Palm	No answer**
Trust	Monterey pine (Pitch canker tolerant), Monterey cypress, Eucalyptus sp.	No answer	<i>Eucalyptus diversicolor</i> , <i>Eucalyptus dalrympleana</i> , <i>Pinus contorta</i>
PUC	No trees planted	<i>Quercus agrifolia</i> struggle in places with irrigation and heavy dog use, we recommend against planting them in areas of public use.	None

<b>RPD</b>	Monterey Cypress, Oak, and Coast Redwood	Pines – Pine Pitch Canker	Canker-inoculated/resistant Pines
<b>SFO</b>	Coast live oak ( <i>Quercus agrifolia</i> )  Madrone ( <i>Arbutus menziesii</i> )  California buckeye ( <i>Aesculus californica</i> )	No answer	We are planting more California natives such as Oak , Madrone , buckeye , Catalina ironwood , and Incense cedar.  Norfolk Island hibiscus ( <i>Lagunaria patersonii</i> ) seems to be doing well in San Francisco.
<b>SFUSD</b>	None	Ficus, Eucalyptus	None
<b>TIDA</b>	None planted	If we were to plant new trees, it would definitely not be eucalyptus.	None
<b>UCSF</b>	No answer	No answer	No answer

\* *Corymbia ficifolia* was listed as a common species this year due to extensive planting of medians on Junipero Serra Blvd. with this species. DPW does not usually use so many of this particular species in a year.

\*\* Identified use of *Phoenix dactylifera* for *Fusarium* resistance

Table 3: Respondents were asked about work plans

Dept.	How many trees within the department's purview were:			Work the department performed for others:	Work other departments performed for the departments or org:
	Planted	Cared for	Removed		
CalTrans	7	25	7	No answer	None
DPH-GH	6	30	12	No answer	DPW – provided care for 24 trees and removed 2 trees
DPW	1031	1959	139	PUC – removed 44 trees SFHA – cared for 38, removed 12 SFFD – cared for 15, removed 16 SF Public Library – cared for 10, removed 1 CalTrans – removed 40 Port of SF – cared for 55 TIDA – removed 6 SFPD – cared for 25	FUF – planted 1108
FUF	1,273	3,356	0	SFE – planted 165 trees for Urban Orchards program	None
GGNRA	15	19	22	None	None
OCII/SFRA	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	None	Private contractors performed forestry work within a larger landscaping budget.
PG&E	0	2,200	240	None	Private contractors prescribe work; additional private contractor perform prescribed tree work.
PORT	3	100	10	None	DPW - planted 3 trees, cared for 50, and removed 3 trees

<b>Trust</b>	500	4000	360	None	None
<b>PUC</b>	0	No Answer	63	No answer	RPD – removed 14 trees Private contractor- removed 49 trees
<b>RPD</b>	876	546	571*	PUC – removed 14 trees	None
<b>SFO</b>	150	500	15	CalTrans - planted 50 trees and cared for 450 trees.	No answer
<b>SFUSD</b>	30	No answer	40	No answer	FUF - planted 30 trees Private contractor - removed 10 trees
<b>TIDA</b>	0	~700	~5	No answer	DPW – cared for ~200 trees and removed ~5 trees Private contractors – cared for ~500 trees
<b>UCSF</b>	25	~300	30	No answer	Private contractors – planted 25 trees, cared for 300, and removed 30.
<b>TOTAL:</b>	3916	13035	938		

\*Of the 571 trees removed on RPD, 152 trees were newly planted trees that were subject to severe vandalism, which necessitated removal.

Table 4: Respondents were asked to rate commonly cited urban forest-related concerns on a 1-5 scale, with 1 being “not significant” and 5 being “extremely significant”

Department	Inability to provide adequate care to established trees	Loss of significant numbers of trees due to age and/or disease	Inability to provide adequate care to newly planted trees	Inefficiencies in the way forestry programs operate on a city-wide basis	Loss of significant numbers of trees due to vandalism, illegal pruning, and/or illegal removal	Loss of significant numbers of trees due to development
CalTrans	3	4	5	3	3	2
DPH-GH	3	2	2	1	1	4
DPW	5	3	4	3	4	5
FUF	5	5	2	3	5	3
GGNRA	No answer	No answer	No answer	No answer	No answer	No answer
OCII/SFRA	4	2	2	3	1	1
PG&E	No answer	No answer	No answer	No answer	No answer	No answer
PORT	4	5	2	5	1	3
Trust	2	5	3	1	1	2
PUC	5	4	4	1	1	1
RPD	5	5	4	3	5	2
SFO	2	1	2	No answer	1	2
SFUSD	5	1	5	5	1	1
TIDA	3	5	1	1	1	1
UCSF	2	5	2	3	4	2
<b>TOTAL:</b>	48	47	36	32	29	29
<b>AVERAGED TOTAL</b>	3.7	3.6	2.9	2.7	2.2	2.2



Table 5: Respondents were asked commonly cited limitations that affect their forestry programming on a 1-5 scale, with 1 being “not significant” and 5 being “extremely significant”

Department	Funding constraints	Staffing constraints	Lack of coordinated efforts to protect and manage the overall urban forest	Prioritization of urban forestry programs within your agency/the city at large	Lack of management plan	Lack of tree inventory
CalTrans	5	5	2	4	1	1
DPH-GH	3	3	3	3	3	1
DPW	5	5	4	5	3	4
FUF	5	1	5	1	5	5
GGNRA	5	No answer	No answer	No answer	No answer	No answer
OCII/SFRA	4	4	4	2	1	2
PG&E	No answer	No answer	No answer	No answer	No answer	No answer
PORT	5	4	4	5	3	1
Trust	4	5	1	2	1	1
PUC	5	5	2	4	3	2
RPD	5	5	3	3	2	2
SFO	2	3	2	2	2	3
SFUSD	5	5	5	4	4	2
TIDA	3	1	1	2	1	3
UCSF	5	5	4	2	2	2
<b>TOTAL:</b>	61	51	40	39	31	29
<b>AVERAGED TOTAL</b>	4.4	3.9	3.1	3	2.4	2.2