

Laurel Gazza

From: Frances Herbert
Sent: Friday, June 10, 2016 9:30 AM
To: Agenda Management Support
Subject: 6.14.16 Item 36

From: Tamara Myers [<mailto:tfmyers@cruzio.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, June 01, 2016 9:10 PM
To: Collette Streight <cstreight@yahoo.com>
Cc: cmathews@cityofsantacruz.com; cchase@cityofsantacruz.com; mposner@cityofsantacruz.com; dterrazas@cityofsantacruz.com; pcomstock@cityofsantacruz.com; dlane@cityofsantacruz.com; rnoroyan@cityofsantacruz.com; acondotti@abc-law.com; parksandrec@cityofsantacruz.com; ebottorff167@yahoo.com; sharlan@ci.capitola.ca.us; michael@triadelectric.com; cmcbroom@lanaifinancialsolutions.com; jbertrand@ci.capitola.ca.us; Dennis Norton 2 <dnortondesigns@msn.com>; duharriet@ci.capitola.ca.us; dilindslind@earthlink.net; rlj12@comcast.net; seajems@pacbell.net; dene@bustichi.com; jimreedSV@gmail.com; shamby@scottsvally.org; tbateman@scottsvally.org; kpowell@loganpowell.com; Zach Friend <Zach.Friend@santacruzcounty.us>; Allyson Violante <Allyson.Violante@santacruzcounty.us>; Patrick Mulhearn <Patrick.Mulhearn@santacruzcounty.us>; Ryan Coonerty <Ryan.Coonerty@santacruzcounty.us>; Greg Caput <Greg.Caput@santacruzcounty.us>; Martin Garcia <Martin.Garcia@santacruzcounty.us>; Tony Gregorio <Tony.Gregorio@santacruzcounty.us>; Melanie Martinez <Melanie.Martinez@santacruzcounty.us>; Bruce McPherson <Bruce.McPherson@santacruzcounty.us>; Robin Musitelli <Robin.Musitelli@santacruzcounty.us>; Dana McRae <Dana.McRae@santacruzcounty.us>; Dana McRae <Dana.McRae@santacruzcounty.us>; Kathy Previsich <Kathy.Previsich@santacruzcounty.us>; DPWWeb <dpwweb@santacruzcounty.us>; John Leopold <John.Leopold@santacruzcounty.us>; Rachel Christopher <Rachel.Christopher@santacruzcounty.us>; NBBM <NBBM@cruzio.com>; Colleen Miller <wildwoodranchbc@wildblue.net>; Bats <bats3@cruzio.com>
Subject: Re: PG&E Community Pipeline Safety Initiative - Community Resistance

Dear Supervisors, Council Members, and City and County Staff,

I strongly agree with Collette's recommendations and also encourage you to take action toward creating an agreement to reduce the number of trees that PG&E plans to kill. I am a property owner who has met with PG&E several times about this issue and can say that it is very intimidating to feel like I'm on my own trying to figure out what my rights are and what is the best thing to do. After meeting with PG&E representatives 3 times, attending a community meeting, plus doing a lot of internet research on my own, I am not convinced the trees they want to remove from my property are the safety issue they claim. They have made a lot of mistakes in their analysis of my property and they don't give straight answers to my questions. I wonder if I'm being manipulated to sign an agreement I don't want to sign, but I don't really know what I can legally do. Even though they told me that they won't kill any trees without my signature, another friend was told that if he continued to refuse to let them kill his trees it would "go to legal." When I told them I wanted a more accurate analysis of my trees because of the errors of the first analysis they did, they sent a team to survey my yard, but the workers said they were only there to map and measure the easement, not the pipeline location near the tree I was questioning. That made me wonder if they're trying to find something to leverage their pressure on me to sign an agreement letting them kill the trees. After surveying my friend's yard, he was told that his house and parts of his patio were on the easement (I believe he bought the house like that, same as me). Every time they send someone to talk to me they send three people, which is also a bit intimidating.

I am also concerned that my neighbors, who have never lived in Santa Cruz, have signed the agreement to let PG&E kill their trees without really knowing the true cost of losing the many benefits those trees provide the whole neighborhood (wildlife habitat- including migrating birds, canopy protection and erosion control of Rodeo Creek, carbon sequestration, etc. Even though PG&E says they will pay property owners money to “replace” the trees they kill, there is no follow up to ensure that more trees are planted on private property, so the mitigation they say they are offering is not enforced. My neighbors could just take the money and run, as I was advised to do by some people I’ve spoken with. That’s why I think it’s important for our local government to set guidelines with PG&E and be sure the overall environmental impacts are taken into consideration.

Thank you for your time and efforts in this matter! I am so thankful that there is a group of people coming together to investigate and prevent needless killing of trees. I feel some sense of hope that we can move toward a more sustainable way of living on Earth!!

~Tamara Myers
tfmyers@cruzio.com

"People say walking on water is a miracle, but to me walking peacefully on earth is the real miracle."
~Thich Nhat Hanh

On Jun 1, 2016, at 10:22 AM, Collette Streight <cstreight@yahoo.com> wrote:

Dear County Supervisors, City Council Members, and City and County staff,

I live on a property through which a PG&E natural gas transmission line runs. The transmission line, as with all transmission lines in Santa Cruz County, has been recently tested by PG&E and is in great working order. Despite this, PG&E wants to kill four of our trees (along with thousands of others throughout the County) that grow close to the line as a way to ensure our health and safety.

My many conversations with PG&E and the research I’ve read about this have demonstrated that trees have *never* significantly damaged transmission lines nor have they *ever* inhibited access to transmission lines in any significant way during an emergency throughout PG&E’s history.

I am not alone in my *deep* concern about the negative impacts that PG&E's misguided actions will have on our community, wildlife, water, air, and long-term health and safety, especially during this time of intensifying climate change.

I would love to see the County and the four cities within the County coordinate to create a framework agreement with PG&E that makes sure our needs and our local and state environmental laws/ordinances are met. PG&E is legally required to meet these laws/ordinances, despite what they may say!

PG&E plans to start killing our community’s tree within the next month so the need to act now is urgent.

As you may be aware, the City of Palo Alto is working on such a framework agreement, modeled after one that a cooperative of East Bay cities created. This is how things have gone in Palo Alto so far, according to Catherine Martineau, the Executive Director of the nonprofit Canopy:

“There was a lot of activity at the end of last year which culminated with a community meeting where PG&E gave a presentation to neighbors and other stakeholders, City of Palo Alto elected officials and staff, and Canopy representatives. Following that meeting the City told PG&E to:

1. Not cut any trees
2. Stop entering into separate agreements with private property owners
3. Cancel any prior agreement they had signed
4. Work with City staff on a model agreement that would incorporate specific guidelines for potential removal and mitigation”

I recommend that you do the same thing asap and then work on creating an agreement that will meet our community’s needs.

Here is a brief synopsis, from Walter Passmore, the City of Palo Alto's Urban Forester, of what their agreement will do:

“All the trees proposed for removal (public and private) will be reviewed by the City of Palo Alto with the intent to minimize the number to only those that present a clear and verified safety concern that cannot be otherwise mitigated. The framework agreement describes the level of proof or justification PG&E needs to provide.”

Walter has let me know that you can be in touch with Jessica Mullan (Jessica.Mullan@CityofPaloAlto.org) to request a copy of their draft agreement to see what it entails. If she is not able to provide a copy, then I recommend asking the City of Walnut Creek or the City of Hayward folks to see their agreements. I also recommend being in touch with their attorneys for guidance on how we can proceed efficiently and effectively.

Supervisors Leopold and McPherson are in conversation about this as is County Counsel, Dana McRae, so the ball has already begun to roll.

Please let me know how you plan to move forward and if there is anyway I (and my fellow concerned and impacted residents) may be of help.

Thank you for your time and attention to this critical matter.

~ Collette Streight

P.S. I was unable to get email addresses for City of Watsonville council members and staff. Please forward this to them since they need to be included.