

**Laurel Gazza**

---

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

**Importance:** High

---

**From:** Jennifer Parks  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 1, 2016 5:19:33 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)  
**To:** Bruce McPherson; Zach Friend; John Leopold; Ryan Coonerty; Greg Caput  
**Cc:** Dana McRae; Robin Musitelli; [jen@jmparks.com](mailto:jen@jmparks.com); NBBM  
**Subject:** PG&E - urgent issue!

Dear Supervisors of Santa Cruz County,

I truly appreciate the efforts of Supervisor McPherson and Robin Musitelli to organize a meeting with PG&E on May 24 about their plan to remove hundreds of trees (what amounts to a small forest!) along Graham Hill Road. I understand the Supervisor Leopold also organized a similar meeting. While these meetings were appreciated, it was apparent at both meetings that PG&E is not really considering any public input and is intent on forging ahead with their tree removal plans.

This is very alarming! There are many critical concerns about this massive destruction, but two that concern me the most are: the lack of environment oversight, and the over-inflated safety assertions about trees preventing pipeline access, that divert from the real safety issues.

1. The only environmental assessment of this massive removal was done internally by PG&E. Any other project in the County with such a huge environmental impact (including the danger of significant erosion along Graham Hill and impact on countless wildlife in the area) would require a published environmental report that includes public input. Even the timber industry would be required to do a THP for harvesting this many trees. Why is PG&E exempt from them same standards required of any other entity removing this many trees? These EIR and THP requirements are the minimum required to protect our environment and to preserve all that makes Santa Cruz County a wonderful place to live.
2. PG&E is using the guise of alleged "safety" as the reason for this decimation of trees. Yet, they have said that the pipelines are in fine shape. They also confirmed that no tree roots are damaging the lines and that no trees have prevented access to the lines. So WHY does PG&E suddenly need to cut all these trees? This appears to be some sort of misguided "PR" move to create the appearance of safety. The real issue is likely that PG&E needs to improve their shut-off/evacuation of gas procedures first; if they do so they will not need to cut the trees before any access is ever needed. Not to mention that it's only been 75 years (give or take), without any access being needed!!

In conclusion, the majority of these trees set for needless destruction are on County property. PG&E is abusing the scope of their "easement" on County property by destroying these trees and is also circumventing established EIR and THP

protections. **BUT - There is a solution that you as County Supervisors can put in place!** The City of Palo Alto responded to this same issue by requiring PG&E to submit all trees proposed for removal for their review so the City could assess the environmental impact and minimize trees removed to only those that present a clear and verified safety concern that cannot otherwise be mitigated. **Please, please do the right thing for our community and act now to intervene and require County oversight review before PG&E engages in the unfettered and unmonitored environmental destruction of our beautiful community!**

Your actions can and will help!!

Thank you for your consideration and attention to this urgent and critical matter.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Parks