

**Robbins, Joanne**

---

**From:** Mary J Mohler <mrymohler@att.net>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 09, 2020 3:41 PM  
**To:** City Hall  
**Subject:** "Public Comment – Agenda item #8A".

To Whom It May Concern,

I highly doubt that PG&E needs to remove as many of those mature oaks, etc., as they claim. It is my understanding that they already are in compliance with tree removal and do not need to remove more. They are flexing their muscle because they have had to "pay" for the fires and reimburse those that have suffered under their mishandling of infrastructure and their negligence. Enough is enough. Do not let them steamroll this town...a town that PG&E does not like. We are better than this. I hope the state takes over the giant. They do not deserve to be able to run the utility.

Regards,

Mary Mohler  
Lafayette Valley Estates.

**Robbins, Joanne**

---

**From:** Jamie Smith <jfajfa@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 09, 2020 6:55 PM  
**To:** City Hall  
**Subject:** Public Comment Agenda item #8A

To Whom,

Please do not authorize PG&E's removal of over 80 mature trees along St. Mary's Road at the City Council Meeting on Monday, 4/13/2020. Surely there can be a compromise for less trees to be removed, to retain the natural beauty of the area and still accommodate Pg&E's needs.

This is ridiculous. The City of Lafayette has allowed PG&E to massively disrupt traffic for the past several years, not to mention the eye sore they have under construction at Reliez Station and Olympic.

Give us a break! Everyone is much more concerned with survival right now through this pandemic. Please don't take advantage of that, and allow PG&E to sneak more tree removal in during this time.

Respectfully,  
Dean and Jamie Smith  
Burton Valley Residents

**Robbins, Joanne**

---

**From:** mkayess <mkayess@sbcglobal.net>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 10, 2020 4:05 PM  
**To:** City Hall  
**Subject:** PGE TREE REMOVAL

Please ask PGE to reduce the number of trees that are planned to be cut down. The trees are what makes that road/ and our city so beautiful!! I take that road every day and the beauty of the trees and landscape make it so peaceful and serene. ANY removal will destroy that calming serenity

Thank you,

**Sandra Moeller**  
City of Lafayette Resident

Sent via the Samsung Galaxy S10, an AT&T 5G Evolution capable smartphone

**Robbins, Joanne**

---

**From:** Morgan Milligan <artmilligan15@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 10, 2020 4:52 PM  
**To:** City Hall  
**Subject:** Public Comment - Agenda item #8A

Please STOP PG&E's senseless removal of 80 trees on St. Mary's Rd.

These mature trees are not causing any fire danger. They contribute to health and well-being of our natural environment (birds, rodents, deer, habitat) !!

Please take charge and monitor this situation closely!

Morgan Milligan  
Saranap

## Robbins, Joanne

---

**From:** Teli Thayer <telithayer@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 10, 2020 9:07 PM  
**To:** City Hall  
**Subject:** Public Comment - Agenda item #8A

Dear City Council,

I am writing to share my disappointment upon hearing that PG&E is proposing to cut down 80 mature trees along St. Mary's road. For at least a couple of years now, the citizens of Lafayette have been quite vocal about their desire to maintain as many mature Oak trees as possible and have questioned PG&E's claims that these trees need to be removed for "safety" reasons. Time and again, the legitimacy of the safety concerns has been raised by the citizens and examined by our City Council. More often than not, citizen advocacy has resulted in PG&E significantly scaling back the number of trees that need to be removed. Once again, I am quite skeptical that PG&E's needs to remove the bulk of these trees to adequately complete its project.

I ask the City Council to very thoroughly and diligently question PG&E's claims regarding removal of these 80 or so trees. On behalf of the citizens, I would like you to question the reasons each tree needs to be removed. Is it for convenience for the PG&E proposed project? Will the proposal make the project more affordable for PG & E? Are there other ways for PG&E to complete the said project without removing trees or removing less trees?

These trees are irreplaceable. They date back many generations and are part of the character of our community. These trees hold a significance to residents and if removed will be a true loss to our history and our future. These trees represent a piece of our community's heritage. I for one would like to make absolutely sure no tree is removed without an analysis of the tree's community value versus its value to this specific PG&E project. PG&E may have some legitimate claims, but based on their past assertions and actions, I would like strong evidence that removal is critical before approval is granted.

I would appreciate if you could keep me and the community apprised of developments regarding this project.

Thank you for considering my concerns.

Sincerely,  
Teli Thayer  
3149 Somerset Place  
Lafayette, CA 94549

## Robbins, Joanne

---

**From:** Laura levandowski <laura\_lev@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 11, 2020 9:46 AM  
**To:** City Hall  
**Subject:** Public Comment – Agenda item #8A

Dear Lafayette City Council Members,

We are writing to respectfully ask you to not authorize the road closure at St. Mary's Rd for PG&E until PG&E re examines their plan and agrees to remove less than the 80 mature trees they have marked for removal.

PG&E already trimmed and removed trees in 2019 as part of their wildfire mitigation, so they are in compliance. PG&E is legally required to maintain 4' - 12' distance from trees to lines, but this was already done, so the City has the ability to refuse this work.

PG&E needs to be held accountable and the leaders and citizens of our beautiful city need to ensure they are removing the bare minimum of trees necessary. Removing all the trees marked on St. Mary's Rd will forever impact the natural beauty along St. Mary's Rd.

For PG&E, the mature trees that line St. Mary's Rd are just blue dots on a map that need to be removed. For our semi rural, nature loving community, removing these mature trees is much more personal and impactful. It is tragic to see the loss of mature oaks and redwoods and mess that has become of the property at Olympic and Reliez Station Road.

Thank you for your diligence and service to our community, we appreciate your hard work.

Stay safe and well,

Laura & Randy Levandowski  
566 Silverado Dr  
Lafayette

## Robbins, Joanne

---

**From:** Jamie Smith <jfajfa@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 11, 2020 10:01 AM  
**To:** City Hall  
**Cc:** Jamie Smith  
**Subject:** Re: Public Comment Agenda item #8A

To Whom,

As an addendum to my previous email (see below), I have also now learned that PG&E intends to complete the gas line project between Rohrer and South Lucille, that was stopped last year, at the same time that they plan to cut down 80 old growth trees along St. Mary's Road.

I also see that the proposed working dates/hours are June 1 – August, 7am-6pm Monday-Saturday!

We are already under a tremendous burden with the shelter in place for COVID19. While I appreciate that it can be a good time to complete much needed construction projects, this would be UNDULY BURDENSOME given the current climate. I implore you to:

1. Demand that PG&E either trim the proposed 80 trees they want to remove, or look at alternatives (bury the wires, if it would preserve trees and protect from wildfires, for example)
2. Limit PG&E to ONE major project at a time, that so severely impacts transportation between Lafayette and Moraga. Finish the already contentious substation at Reliez Station and Olympic and don't start any other projects that limit access between Moraga and Lafayette until we are well finished with the COVID Shelter In Place.

Thank you, for working on this during such an unprecedented time. We appreciate your service to our community.

Sincerely,  
-Jamie and Dean Smith

---

**From:** Jamie Smith <jfajfa@comcast.net>  
**Date:** Thursday, April 9, 2020 at 6:54 PM  
**To:** <cityhall@lovelafayette.org>  
**Subject:** Public Comment – Agenda item #8A

To Whom,

Please do not authorize PG&E's removal of over 80 mature trees along St. Mary's Road at the City Council Meeting on Monday, 4/13/2020. Surely there can be a compromise for less trees to be removed, to retain the natural beauty of the area and still accommodate Pg&E's needs.

This is ridiculous. The City of Lafayette has allowed PG&E to massively disrupt traffic for the past several years, not to mention the eye sore they have under construction at Reliez Station and Olympic.

Give us a break! Everyone is much more concerned with survival right now through this pandemic. Please don't take advantage of that, and allow PG&E to sneak more tree removal in during this time.

**Robbins, Joanne**

---

**From:** Michael Dawson <mdawson@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 11, 2020 2:44 PM  
**To:** City Hall  
**Subject:** Public Comment – Agenda item #8A

Dear Lafayette Mayor and City Council,

I respectfully request that the City denies PG&E the necessary encroachment permit to close St. Mary's Road this summer until, and unless, PG&E resubmits a more acceptable electrical tree removal plan. PG&E does not adequately explain the reason or explore the alternatives of removing nearly 80 trees, including many large and protected heritage oak trees valued by local residents.

PG&E's rationale as shown on page 12 of their presentation is suspect. PG&E does not state that the Enhanced Vegetation Management project on their electrical lines was completed along St. Mary's Road in 2019. Trees that are currently marked for removal are already in compliance with PG&E's 12-foot wildfire safety distances, and many are well beyond. Is PG&E conducting a discretionary wildfire program outside of the 12-foot limit, an action not endorsed by the CPUC? Is PG&E merely making their construction project more convenient? And since these are mostly privately-owned trees, will PG&E honor residents' wishes to not sign tree-cutting agreements?

Moreover, why is there yet again a lack of transparency with City Council and residents?

Updating our utility infrastructure is a positive step toward better safety. Yet, we are all aware that PG&E plans their projects from afar, completes them in a rush, and operates without oversight or accountability. It does not appear that PG&E has explored alternatives to permanently removing Lafayette's oldest residents including rerouting electrical lines, undergrounding, trimming, and exploring alternative construction techniques.

Please remember that PG&E started two fires in Lafayette last year with a newly-installed electrical pole. We require a more thorough reexamination that what PG&E has proposed today. I ask the City Council to hold PG&E accountable to their impact, demand they work smarter, and require that they remove far fewer trees. Please deny their encroachment request until they do so.

With sincerest regards,

Michael Dawson  
711 Los Palos Drive  
Lafayette, CA

## Robbins, Joanne

---

**From:** Linda Riebel <linda.riebel@earthlink.net>  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 11, 2020 6:58 PM  
**To:** City Hall; Robbins, Joanne  
**Subject:** Public Comment – Agenda item #8A

Dear Lafayette Mayor and City Council,

While I am glad PG&E is finally starting to realize its responsibilities, I object to their plan to remove MORE trees without consideration of alternatives. They could instead reroute lines, continue the tree trimming work that has been going on since the fires they caused in the last few years, and/or bury lines.

I ask Lafayette's government to delay giving a permit for this rash plan, require and perform oversight of this and other projects, and generally ensure that outside bodies, public and private, are not permitted to come to Lafayette and install destructive projects.

Sincerely,  
Linda Riebel, Ph.D.  
3350 Hermosa Way

\*Linda Riebel, Ph.D.\*

Past President, Friends of Opera San Jose

Faculty, Saybrook University

Board, SaveNature.Org

Board, Sustainable Lafayette (2008-2014)

## Robbins, Joanne

---

**From:** Dean Smith <dean@ddsecurity.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, April 12, 2020 6:24 PM  
**To:** City Hall  
**Subject:** PG&E Eeeeeeeekkkkk!

**Subject:** Re: Public Comment Agenda item #8A

To City Leadership,

We were surprised to learn of PG&E's removal of over 80 mature trees along St. Mary's Road at the City Council Meeting on Monday, 4/13/2020. I also couldn't believe the installation of the substation at Reliez Station and Olympic. It was bad enough to turn the intersection into something you would see in Times Square, and now we have a substation! I thought we lived in a democracy with public notification, etc. before the initiation of public works projects.

We now know, if we want some say in how our community looks, we need to attend every city council meeting. EEEEEKKK! The city obviously needs a communications coordinator to publicize Public Works projects.

Come on, give us a break! Everyone is much more concerned with survival right now through this pandemic. Please don't take advantage of that, and allow PG&E to sneak more tree removal in during this time.

We also see that the proposed working dates/hours are June 1 – August, 7am-6pm Monday-Saturday!

We are already under a tremendous burden with the shelter in place for COVID19. While I appreciate that it can be a good time to complete much needed construction projects, this would be UNDULY BURDENSOME given the current climate.

Please consider the following:

1. Demand that PG&E either trim the proposed 80 trees they want to remove, or look at alternatives (bury the wires, if it would preserve trees and protect from wildfires, for example)
2. Limit PG&E to ONE major project at a time, that so severely impacts transportation between Lafayette and Moraga. Finish the already contentious substation at Reliez Station and Olympic and don't start any other projects that limit access between Moraga and Lafayette until we are well finished with the COVID Shelter In Place.

Thank you, for working on this during such an unprecedented time.

Sincerely,

The Smith Family  
Lafayette Valley Estates

[www.ddsecurity.com](http://www.ddsecurity.com)

PO Box 1086  
Concord CA 94522

General Contractor  
Class B, License #844527

**Robbins, Joanne**

---

**From:** Steve Richard <steve.richard@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, April 12, 2020 8:20 PM  
**To:** City Hall  
**Subject:** Public Comment - Agenda item #8A

Dear Lafayette Mayor and City Council,

We are deeply concerned about PG&E's proposed "Enhanced Vegetation Management" plan along St. Mary's Road this summer and urge you to push back on this proposal and seek alternatives to cutting down so many trees.

After reviewing the presentation, we drove slowly down St. Mary's Road today to see for ourselves the trees marked with an "X." It was truly startling to imagine them all gone. Calling this "Enhanced Vegetation Management" is an insult to our community. Many of these trees are large beautiful oak trees that are likely hundreds of years old, and that our community values greatly. Removing them would forever alter the character and beauty of this corridor that we've driven and cycled along hundreds of times.

It is simply hard to believe that this is required for our safety or is the best plan that we can come up with. We know that we can do better.

Thank you for considering our input.

Regards,

Steve & Sharon Richard  
625 Lucas Drive  
Lafayette

## Robbins, Joanne

---

**From:** Alison Hill <alisonrhill@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, April 12, 2020 8:27 PM  
**To:** City Hall  
**Subject:** Public comment Agenda item 8A

Mayor Anderson and Council Members,

I am writing to express my concern about the proposed tree removal on Saint Mary's Road. The number of trees to be removed, and particularly heritage oaks, seems to be extreme.

There are probably some trees that need removal or trimming, but such a large number, and especially the heritage oaks that have been here much longer than we have, is concerning. The native oaks are much less of a fire hazard than introduced trees.

I recommend that there be an evaluation of each tree to determine whether it will be a safety hazard now or in the future. We need to find a balance between fire safety and increasing global warming by removing trees. A mass and indiscriminate program of tree removal does not equate with public safety.

Alison Hill  
932 Hawthorn Drive

Papa John Kiefer  
3441 Blackhawk Road

Sent from my iPad

## Robbins, Joanne

---

**From:** Gina Dawson <gdawson@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, April 12, 2020 9:02 PM  
**To:** City Hall  
**Subject:** Public Comment - Agenda Item8A

Hello City Council and Staff,

Many thanks for your efforts conducting "business as usual" under these unusual circumstances. With all due respect to the PG&E team participating in this meeting, I make the following comment:

For over a year, the volunteer Gas Safety Task Force has asked PG&E to provide clear and comprehensive identification of pipeline risks in Lafayette and to accordingly prioritize safety improvements. To date it has been residents that have proactively pointed out safety concerns to PG&E, such as pipeline situated in eroding hillside; exposed pipeline sections vulnerable to flooding in some areas, falling trees in others; and inadequate "High Consequence Area" identification, a designation that obligates PG&E to comply with higher safety standards - the same standards PG&E was criminally convicted for violating after the 2010 San Bruno pipeline explosion killed 8 people

Recently, in California Superior Court, PG&E agreed to plead guilty to 85 felony counts - one count for starting the 2018 Camp Fire, and 84 counts of involuntary manslaughter. State investigators again found PG&E negligent of laws, specifically failing to identify and correct hazardous conditions on their equipment.

PG&E electrical equipment started two fires in Lafayette last year. In both instances, the power lines were inexplicably energized when the majority of Lafayette power was off per a "Public Safety Power Shut-off". The block I live in somehow stayed energized for most of the PSPS period until a nearby transformer blew. It is one thing to repair the lines, yet another to understand why the equipment failed, assess the rest of the system for similar failure risks, and make the necessary fixes across the system. Has PG&E done this in Lafayette?

PG&E's continuing failure to identify and fix threats on their equipment is a dangerous, deadly pattern. My concern is that this is happening in Lafayette. PG&E is not paying due diligence to identifying and reducing safety threats specific to the equipment they are charged to maintain in our community.

First hand knowledge of PG&E's inadequate threat identification plus their criminal record of safety law violations make me wary of projects presented to Council, that for the most part, seek permit approval - not optimal community protections.

Wide scale "safety" programs don't amount to a hill of beans if PG&E is not compelled to **proactively** identify, report, and remedy corroding gas pipeline in a neighbor's backyard or excessive slack in a downtown electrical line.

PG&E's long, shameful safety record that now includes Lafayette, mandates they earn our trust. We would be wise to verify, than trust, that PG&E puts our "safety first".

Thank You,

Gina Dawson

Lafayette resident, Los Palos Dr.  
Gas Safety Task Force member

**Robbins, Joanne**

---

**From:** Neven Borak <nborak@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, April 12, 2020 10:10 PM  
**To:** City Hall  
**Subject:** Public Comment- Agenda Item #8A

Dear City Council Members,

Even during these unfortunate events we need to stay focused on all other issues as well.

I urge you not to authorize the road closure requested by PG&E unless the utility company agrees to revise its current proposal to cut 80 trees on St Mary's road. The proposed number is staggering for our small community that embraces the beautiful landscape filled with magnificent trees. Plainly, the proposal is just not right from many aspects.

I don't think cutting that many trees is essential to accomplish the necessary prep work for the company's new electrical equipment. PG&E is overprotective of its own economic interest at the expense of our community. They already proved to all of us that they are incompetent of serving and protecting their customers. And this is just another example of the same business practices.

We need to unite and protect the little left natural beauty what makes our city unique.

As your constituents, we do appreciate all of your hard work.

Love Lafayette,

Neven & Denise

**Robbins, Joanne**

---

**From:** bart carr <bartcarr@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, April 12, 2020 10:29 PM  
**To:** City Hall  
**Cc:** bart carr  
**Subject:** Public Comment – Agenda item #8A

Mayor Anderson and City Council Members,

I have become aware of a proposal to remove 79 trees along St Mary's Road as part of a large PG&E infrastructure project during summer 2020. Although the removal of some trees for wildfire mitigation may require consideration, the proposed removal of 79 trees appears excessive. PG&E has shown little sensitivity to public concern related to tree removal in the past, and this proposal suggests that this behavior will continue. I request that City Council and staff carefully review this proposal, with recent history in mind, and request that alternative measures to tree removal be considered and adopted wherever possible.

Thank you,

Bart Carr  
3386 Sweet Dr., Lafayette, CA

## Robbins, Joanne

---

**From:** Lisa Hunter  
**Sent:** Sunday, April 12, 2020 10:36 PM  
**To:** City Hall  
**Subject:** Fwd: Agenda Item 8A PG&E - Construction Schedule

Dear City Council -

My family appreciates that you are continuing to meet during this challenging time. I'm reaching out regarding April 13th Agenda item 8A PG&E Gas & Electric Work.

My family lives at 375 St Marys Rd, and we are one of the closest residences to the proposed gas work. We understand that this is critical work for the safety of our neighborhood and the greater community.

1. We are asking that Council consider proposed construction schedule 2 or 3.  
Construction Schedule 1 - consists of work from 7am-6pm Mon-Sat, which would be unbearable on the weekends. If council was to agreed to option 2, the work would not occur on Saturdays and the schedule/duration would only be a week longer in the summer ending on Friday August 14th [Option 2] instead of Wednesday August 5th [Option 1]. We are also supportive of Option 3. We understand that this work is disruptive to everyone, but limiting this work from occurring on Saturday would allow some normalcy for the greater St Marys/Burton Valley area, especially as the shelter in place may extend past the May 1st.
2. Pole Work - replacing 80 poles. Does the replacement of a pole also include the complete removal of the existing pole that is to be replaced? Our home is located between two poles, and we want to confirm that the remnants of the old poles will not stay, including any stubs from poles.
3. Tree Removal - the proposed project describes 11,000 feet of larger covered power lines. While some trees will need to be removed, shouldn't the larger covered power lines reduce the need to remove 80 trees as that will significantly change the landscape of St Marys Rd?

**I would also like to request that above points 2 Pole Work & 3 Tree Removal be submitted as a public comment for PG&E to address. Please let me know if another email needs to be sent to facilitate this request.**

Regards,

Aaron Hunter

**Robbins, Joanne**

---

**From:** paulmelmed@comcast.net  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2020 12:10 AM  
**To:** Robbins, Joanne  
**Subject:** City Council Item # 8A PGE Tree removal proposal

To: City Council

From: Paul J. Melmed

Date: 4/12/2020

Public Comment on Agenda item #8A

Item #8A PGE tree removal proposal

Deny PG&E's encroachment permit to close St. Mary's Road between Rohrer Dr. and Rheem Blvd. for yet another massive tree removal project. They already completed their Enhanced Vegetation Management Project in 2019 along the St. Mary's Road. I saw PG&E do the same thing two years ago at the end of Springhill Road just before the Girl Scout Camp. PG&E contract crews, usually Davey Tree Co., to cut trees for what would seem to be only a discretionary construction project convince rather than a well defined wildfire safety program; without regard to environmental impact, outside of the 12-foot limit . What has happened on Springhill Road without these grand old oak tree coverings? Now there is no wind-break in the hot summer and fall months which only exacerbates the potential for wildfires. In addition, without the treetop protection, the heavy rains simply wash away and erode the soil surrounding the stump-trunks that the crews leave. Selectively trimming branches would have made much more sense.

Ask PG&E to submit to the City, more acceptable electrical safety alternative tree removal plans before they are allowed to completely destroy almost 79 more large protected trees, many of which are heritage oaks.

Paul Melmed

35 Prado Way

Lafayette

## Robbins, Joanne

---

**From:** Lynn Hiden <dandlhidden@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2020 8:52 AM  
**To:** Robbins, Joanne; Candell, Susan; Bliss, Steven; Mike Anderson; Anderson, Mike; Teresa Gerringer; Cam Burks; Cameron Burks  
**Subject:** City Council Agenda item 8A, Presentation, PGE, re removal of Lafayette trees

Hi, Joanne,

Would you please ensure that the City Council receive this letter, below?      Many thanks, Lynn Hiden

April 13, 2020  
City Council Agenda Item 8A, Presentation, PGE

Honorable Mayor Anderson and Members of the Lafayette City Council,

Dave and I share the concerns and recommended direction of Michael and Gina Dawson, Paul Melmed, several of our Burton Valley neighbors of similar persuasion, and of our neighbor in Orinda, Nick Waranoff, in negotiating with PGE this evening. We believe that selective, skillful pruning of the trees along St Mary's Road between Rohrer Drive in Lafayette and Rheem Boulevard in the town of Moraga is the better choice in order to prevent both fires and soil erosion along our Las Trampas Creek embankments and the St. Mary's Road trajectory.

In the early years of Lafayette's incorporation we witnessed many landslides along both St. Mary's Road and Moraga Road in Lafayette. Landslides are both arduous to endure, since our travelways in LMO are few and far between, expensive to repair, and long lines formed in both N and S directions, over many weeks, until both arterials were again open. On one occasion, one such incident resulted in the death of a Lafayette father of eight children. Since trees have populated the areas that were bare of them during those years and prior, Lafayette has suffered far fewer landslides along its roads.

We ask that the City Council explore requiring PGE to do only careful, selective/targeted pruning, so as to continue to protect our arterials against landslide, while removing enough growth to ensure wire clearance, even in heavy winds. For those trees that are located on private land, we would suggest that those landowners be notified that it is their civic responsibility to prune their trees in such a way as to ensure that the PGE wiring, as well as the integrity of the trees and the soils, are protected.

If contract agreements specify that PGE is to cover the cost of this pruning, so be it. The added cost of doing a suitably skilled, yet attractive job, might very well be covered by reducing by a very small portion the *disproportionate and astronomical salary awarded to PGE's recently appointed CEO* who has come to us from the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Sincerely,

Lynn and David Hiden

To: City Council

From: Paul J. Melmed

Date: 4/12/2020

Public Comment on Agenda item #8A

Item #8A PGE tree removal proposal

Deny PG&E's encroachment permit to close St. Mary's Road between Rohrer Dr. and Rheem Blvd. for yet another massive tree removal project. They already completed their Enhanced Vegetation Management Project in 2019 along the St. Mary's Road. I saw PG&E do the same thing two years ago at the end of Springhill Road just before the Girl Scout Camp. PG&E contract crews, usually Davey Tree Co., to cut trees for what would seem to be only a discretionary construction project convince rather than a well defined wildfire safety program; without regard to environmental impact, outside of the 12-foot limit . What has happened on Springhill Road without these grand old oak tree coverings? Now there is no wind-break in the hot summer and fall months which only exacerbates the potential for wildfires. In addition, without the treetop protection, the heavy rains simply wash away and erode the soil surrounding the stump-trunks that the crews leave. Selectively trimming branches would have made much more sense.

Ask PG&E to submit to the City, more acceptable electrical safety alternative tree removal plans before they are allowed to completely destroy almost 79 more large protected trees, many of which are heritage oaks.

Paul Melmed

35 Prado Way

Lafayette

## Robbins, Joanne

---

**From:** John Eaton <eaton.john@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2020 10:04 AM  
**To:** City Hall  
**Subject:** Public Comment – Agenda item #8A

Why is it that when it comes to PG&E and Lafayette, it feels like the movie Groundhog Day? Certainly we should have learned by now from the continuing patterns. City Council seems always to acquiesce too quickly to PG&E's requests. And PG&E, for its part, has a clear pattern of irresponsible behavior that continues to harm our community. So let's consider a modest proposal:

1. City Council should ask that PG&E to rank the 80 trees along St. Mary's Road from most needing to be removed to least needing to be removed.
2. PG&E should agree to provide their 10 year plan that shows improvements to the safety and efficiency of Lafayette's electrical grid including the budget allocated for such things as burying power lines, the ability to shut off pin pointed sections of the grid during high fire alerts, removal or trimming trees, etc.

Once this information is provided to all interested parties, Put together a citizens' committee to work on a compromise solution that feels both safe and fair.

Thanks for listening.

John Eaton  
3510 Hamlin Road  
Lafayette, CA 94549

**Robbins, Joanne**

---

**From:** Nancy Spittler <nanooks@pacbell.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2020 11:48 AM  
**To:** City Hall  
**Subject:** Public Comment on Agenda item #8A.

Removing these trees in Burton Valley is completely unacceptable! It maybe more expeditious for PG&E, but the residents of Lafayette are entitled to keep our trees!

PG&E has been aware of this situation for many years and needs to take responsibility for resolution to the satisfaction of its customers, not the shareholders!

Nancy S. Spittler

Sent from my iPad

**Robbins, Joanne**

---

**From:** Kristine R <krasmuss1@icloud.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2020 11:54 AM  
**To:** City Hall  
**Subject:** Cutting Trees by PG & E - City Council

Dear City Council Members and Mayor Anderson,

Please, please, please, DO NOT let PG& E cut down our oak trees on St. Marys Road! They are naturally fire resistant and add to the natural resources necessary for this precious ecosystem we live in, not to mention the beauty they add to our city!

PG & E is not doing what's right for safety or this community. It is doing what is cheap and easiest for them.

Thank you  
Kristine Rasmussen  
609 Lancaster Drive  
Lafayette CA 94549

**From:** Bill Shurtleff <billshurts@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2020 11:55 AM  
**To:** City Hall  
**Subject:** Public Comment on Agenda item #8A.

Having studied the matter, I am **STRONGLY** opposed to PG&E cutting any more trees anywhere in Lafayette. The world needs more trees and fewer people.

Bill Shurtleff

Lafayette citizen since 1950

--

Bill Shurtleff  
Soyinfo Center  
P.O. Box 234  
Lafayette, CA 94549 USA  
[www.soyinfocenter.com](http://www.soyinfocenter.com)  
Phone: 925-283-2991

## Robbins, Joanne

---

**From:** Kathi Torres <kathitorres@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2020 12:08 PM  
**To:** City Hall  
**Subject:** Public Comment - Agenda Item #8A

Dear Lafayette City Council Members,

We are writing to urgently ask you NOT to authorize the road closure at St. Mary's Rd for PG&E until PG&E re-examines their plan and agrees to remove fewer than the 80 mature trees they have marked. PG&E has not demonstrated a commitment to due diligence in the past, and our community deserves more than wanton tree removal.

PG&E already trimmed and removed trees in 2019 as part of their wildfire mitigation, so they are in compliance. PG&E is legally required to maintain 4' - 12' distance from trees to lines. Since this was already done, the City has the ability and (we believe) the obligation to refuse further decimation of Lafayette's trees.

PG&E needs to be held accountable! The leaders and citizens of our beautiful city need to ensure they are removing the bare minimum of trees necessary. Removing all the trees marked on St. Mary's Rd will forever spoil the natural beauty of our community and have negative environmental impact.

For PG&E, the mature trees that line St. Mary's Rd. are just dots on a map. For our semi-rural, nature-loving community, removing these mature trees is much more personal and impactful. It is tragic to witness the loss of heritage oaks and mature redwoods, and see the mess that has become of the property at Olympic and Reliez Station Road.

Please do NOT allow the same destruction to occur on St. Mary's Road.

Thank you for your diligence and service to our community. We appreciate your hard work.

*Kathi & Jorge Torres  
564 Silverado Drive  
Lafayette, CA. 94549*

Kathi Torres  
C: (925) 451-6449

**Robbins, Joanne**

---

**From:** Steven J. McDonald <zzzsjm@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2020 12:11 PM  
**To:** City Hall  
**Subject:** Public Comment – Agenda item #8A

City Council,

It is your responsibility to work for the best interests of our community. It is why you were elected. As history repeats itself time and again, PG&E cannot be trusted to do what is best for a given community let alone protect us. PG&E has violated the law and disregarded common sense countless times over the years. It would be negligence per se to not put PG&E's plans under a microscope. PG&E should not be given a date for construction or an encroachment permit until they properly evaluate the fate of these important trees.

PG&E already did wildfire safety trimming in this area in 2019. Many of the targeted trees are more than the required 12' away from PG&E electrical lines. Obviously, PG&E's continued shoddy planning process consists of their merely looking at an aerial map - or they are intentionally misleading our City. Moreover, PG&E must demonstrate that they actually considered viable alternatives including re-routing, burying and other installation alternatives.

It seems as if ever since PG&E's criminal negligence caused massive wildfires and death that PG&E's "plan" is to just cut down trees - without any showing that it would improve wild fire safety - and many governing bodies are now too fearful to require PG&E to follow a more prudent course.

Steve McDonald  
3175 Somerset Drive  
Lafayette, CA  
(415) 860-9905  
A Lafayette resident since 2002.

**Robbins, Joanne**

---

**From:** Synneva <dentistski@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2020 12:18 PM  
**To:** City Hall  
**Subject:** Public Comment Re Agenda#8A

I feel strongly that before removing any of the trees between Rohrer Dr. and Rheem Blvd, PG&E should be looking at and giving consideration to any options that would save all but diseased trees.

Thank you,  
K Synneve Skeie Alameddine  
Lafayette, CA

**Robbins, Joanne**

---

**From:** Mimi Bupp <mimibupp@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2020 12:30 PM  
**To:** City Hall  
**Subject:** PG&E Tree Removal

I urge you to prohibit PG&E from their planned tree removal in the St. Mary's corridor. Not only would our semi rural aesthetic (property values too!) be destroyed but it could also have the opposite effect on their goal of reducing wildfire potential. It's basic 4th grade science that trees are an important and integral factor in the water cycle. Without mature trees to uptake water into the atmosphere there will be no rain, therefore increasing the potential for more and devastating droughts. And as we've seen, drought enables wildfires.

Thank you for all you do to protect our city and to enhance our quality of life and reputation for education.

With gratitude,  
Mimi Bupp  
Los Palos Circle

Sent from my iPhone

**Robbins, Joanne**

---

**From:** Thomas K. Stierwalt <thomas.stierwalt@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2020 12:37 PM  
**To:** City Hall  
**Subject:** Public Comment - Agenda item #8A (PG&E tree removal project on St. Mary's Road)

Good afternoon,

I hope this finds you safe and well in the midst of this tragic pandemic we're facing.

I am writing to you today in regards to agenda item #8A. I love our town, Lafayette, that I was raised in and have returned to as an adult to raise my own three children.

One of the key aspects of our wonderful town is its beautiful foliage. I was very disappointed to learn that PG&E was proposing cutting down 79 trees along St. Mary's Road as part of an electrical upgrade project. Not only do these trees bring beauty to our town, they also provide a wind break in the summer and fall, which I understand may in fact help w reducing the potential for wildfires.

I'd like to implore you to consider alternatives to PG&E's current plans. PG&E should not be given a date for construction or an encroachment permit until they can reevaluate their plans and reevaluate the loss of these important trees.

Thanks for your time and consideration.

Thomas

**Robbins, Joanne**

---

**From:** MaryJo Cass <cass.maryjo@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2020 1:10 PM  
**To:** City Hall  
**Subject:** Public Comment - Agenda Item 8A

Dear Mayor Anderson and Members of the City Council,

I urge you to reject PG&E's request to cut down trees along St. Mary's Road. Tree removal would be a travesty, especially when our world is facing a climate crisis and a global pandemic.

PG&E puts profits before people and neighborhoods and has caused death and destruction in CA. How can we trust this company?

Perhaps you could create an advisory committee, which would include Michael and Gina Dawson, to propose a way forward.

Thank you,  
MaryJo Cass  
Lafayette resident

**Robbins, Joanne**

---

**From:** Kate Marten <skmarten@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2020 2:29 PM  
**To:** City Hall  
**Subject:** Public Comment on Agenda item #8A

To Whom it May Concern:

As a Lafayette resident, I am concerned about the the planned tree removal on St. Mary's Road by PG&E.

These trees should be protected based on a Riparian Habitat (natural trees to this area) that were left and cultivated as a natural barrier to protect the property from flooding, provide shade, and (later) noise pollution. These trees include great valley oak, madrone, buckeye, and black walnut trees.

It is my understanding from the municipal code that the City of Lafayette chose to preserve, protect and cultivate the trees natural to this area after Lafayette's housing developments of the 1950's and 1960's were built and too many natural trees were eliminated and replaced by other types of trees and landscaping not native to the area.

Sincerely,  
Susan Marten  
[skmarten@gmail.com](mailto:skmarten@gmail.com)  
#415-490-7554

**Robbins, Joanne**

---

**From:** Sherry Hoover <sth200@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2020 2:33 PM  
**To:** City Hall  
**Subject:** Public comment agenda item #8A

Dear Mayor Anderson and members of the Lafayette City Council,

I would like to voice my objection to proposed plans of PG&E to remove 79 trees along the St Mary's Road corridor between Rohrer Drive and Rheem Boulevard. Careful tree trimming should be sufficient to keep the electric lines clear of potential downed limbs. This maintenance should be reevaluated on an annual basis and the work should be done with skill so as to keep these protected trees healthy and looking attractive.

Please implore PG&E to look for sensible ways to manage the trees. Clear cutting our beautiful old oaks is not the answer and will only create more bad relations between Lafayette and PG&E.

My husband and I appreciate your careful consideration in yet another issue with PG&E.  
We are counting you.

Sincerely,  
Sherry Hoover  
3212 Sharon Ct  
Lafayette

## Robbins, Joanne

---

**From:** Charlie Montgomery <uskustoms@sbcglobal.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2020 2:40 PM  
**To:** City Hall  
**Subject:** "Public Comment – Agenda item #8A"

Please reconsider allowing PG & E to come in and cut down more trees in our area. It is my understanding that PG& E has already gone through our area and taken down trees. I grew up in Paradise, and my Mom still lives there. After the horrific fire, PG&E came through town and cut down hundreds of surviving trees. They're explanation was that they were cutting down any trees that were close to power lines. After taking down so many trees, PG&E put many of the power lines in underground.

Very few were living in Paradise when this happened, Paradise had no voice. But we do. Please do not kill our trees!

Sent from my iPhone

## Robbins, Joanne

---

**From:** susan spcallister.com <susan@spcallister.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2020 4:47 PM  
**To:** City Hall  
**Cc:** Srivatsa, Niroop  
**Subject:** Item 8-A City Council Agenda April 13, 2020 PG&E Tree Removal Project Along St.Marys Road

**Importance:** High

To: City of Lafayette  
Attention: Mayor Anderson and City Council  
Re: Agenda Item 8A PG&E Tree Removal

Dear Mayor Anderson and City Council Members,

Reference is made to this evening's Agenda Item #8A regarding P.G. & E's request to remove almost 80 trees along St. Marys Road between Rohrer Dr. and Rheem Blvd. It seems like, *"PG&E is at it again—just a different part of our town"*.

PG&E's request to remove so many trees—including heritage oaks—is for reasons that cannot be substantiated. The City should not provide any date certain to PG&E to proceed, if at all, until and unless removal of the trees is properly reevaluated.

PG&E has not done its homework. Sadly, this has happened before. No alternatives seem to have been considered. Actual location of many of the trees is further than 12' from PG&E's electrical line and the records show all their wildfire safety trimming was completed in 2019.

In closing, in lieu of repeating Save Lafayette Trees Michael Dawson's excellent letter regarding Item 8A, I would prefer to incorporate it by reference herein.

Thank you for your consideration of this most important and seemingly reoccurring matter.

Sincerely,

Susan Callister

P.O. Box 1694

Lafayette, CA 94549

## Robbins, Joanne

---

**From:** Lynn Hiden <dandlhidden@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2020 4:48 PM  
**To:** Candell, Susan; Bliss, Steven; Mike Anderson; Anderson, Mike; Teresa Gerringer; Cam Burks; Cameron Burks; Moran, Mike; Robbins, Joanne; Srivatsa, Niroop; Wolff, Greg; Horng, Justin  
**Subject:** FM NICK WARANOFF, PLEASE READ BEFORE PGE ITEM THIS EVENING /Fw: 4/13, 7 p.m. CITY COUNCIL MTG- Intent by PG&E for tree remvl proj 79 trees, many large and beautiful old trees on St. Mary's Road, betw Rohrer and Rheem

Dear Hardworking City Council and Staff,

Would you please try to get Nick's material, below, read, before hearing from the PGE group this evening?  
Best to read from the bottom up.

Many thanks,

Lynn

**From:** Nick Waranoff  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2020 12:57 PM  
**To:** 'Srivatsa, Niroop' ; 'Cameron Burks' ; 'Candell, Susan'  
**Cc:** 'Lynn Hiden' ; mdawson@gmail.com  
**Subject:** RE: 4/13, 7 p.m. CITY COUNCIL MTG- Intent by PG&E for tree remvl proj 79 trees, many large and beautiful old trees on St. Mary's Road, betw Rohrer and Rheem

I just remembered something else, although your situation may be different; you might want to inquire at the hearing about these points.

- a. There is no legal right to spray paint trees, either on public or private property.
- b. The paint – made by Arvoe [https://www.grainger.com/product/33MJ12?cm\\_mmc=PPC:+MSN+PPC&s\\_kwci\\_d=AL!2966!10!79439803637015!dat-2331239529068956:loc-190&ef\\_id=XpTB5AAAAQRofDlq:20200413194748:s](https://www.grainger.com/product/33MJ12?cm_mmc=PPC:+MSN+PPC&s_kwci_d=AL!2966!10!79439803637015!dat-2331239529068956:loc-190&ef_id=XpTB5AAAAQRofDlq:20200413194748:s) can only be removed, I was told, by scraping off the painted bark. They may also offer to apply brown paint over the paint used to place the X.
- c. They can, and sometimes do, use a ribbon instead, but that slows them down, and they don't make as much \$\$, although of course ribbons can be removed without harming the tree.
- d. The paint is applied by an independent contractor of PGandE – ACRT, an employee owned company based in Ohio whose regional management is based in Lodi (which explains their 209 area code).
- e. The ACRT folks make their assessments from ground level, which is often not reliable. Also, they generally identify themselves as being “from PGandE” even though they are independent contractors with ACRT. If truth matters. A true arborist would

have a small telescope like device to more accurately gauge the spacing. The most reliable method is to sit in a bucket and go tree by tree, which is what I have insisted upon on my property.

- f. California Civil Code section 3346 provides for double or treble damages for wrongfully inflicting harm to, or removing, trees. <https://codes.findlaw.com/ca/civil-code/civ-sect-3346.html>

**From:** Nick Waranoff <waranoff@comcast.net>

**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2020 11:27 AM

**To:** 'Srivatsa, Niroop' <NSrivatsa@ci.lafayette.ca.us>; 'Cameron Burks' <CBurks@ci.lafayette.ca.us>; 'Candell, Susan' <scandell@ci.lafayette.ca.us>

**Cc:** 'Lynn Hiden' <dandlhidden@comcast.net>; 'mdawson@gmail.com' <mdawson@gmail.com>

**Subject:** RE: 4/13, 7 p.m. CITY COUNCIL MTG- Intent by PG&E for tree remvl proj 79 trees, many large and beautiful old trees on St. Mary's Road, betw Rohrer and Rheem

What I meant to say is that trees fight climate change by absorbing carbon dioxide

**From:** Nick Waranoff <waranoff@comcast.net>

**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2020 11:26 AM

**To:** 'Srivatsa, Niroop' <NSrivatsa@ci.lafayette.ca.us>; 'Cameron Burks' <CBurks@ci.lafayette.ca.us>; 'Candell, Susan' <scandell@ci.lafayette.ca.us>

**Cc:** 'Lynn Hiden' <dandlhidden@comcast.net>; 'mdawson@gmail.com' <mdawson@gmail.com>

**Subject:** RE: 4/13, 7 p.m. CITY COUNCIL MTG- Intent by PG&E for tree remvl proj 79 trees, many large and beautiful old trees on St. Mary's Road, betw Rohrer and Rheem

Finally, trees fight carbon change.

**From:** Nick Waranoff <waranoff@comcast.net>

**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2020 11:21 AM

**To:** 'Srivatsa, Niroop' <NSrivatsa@ci.lafayette.ca.us>; 'Cameron Burks' <CBurks@ci.lafayette.ca.us>; 'Candell, Susan' <scandell@ci.lafayette.ca.us>

**Cc:** 'Lynn Hiden' <dandlhidden@comcast.net>; 'mdawson@gmail.com' <mdawson@gmail.com>

**Subject:** RE: 4/13, 7 p.m. CITY COUNCIL MTG- Intent by PG&E for tree remvl proj 79 trees, many large and beautiful old trees on St. Mary's Road, betw Rohrer and Rheem

One other thought: I am not familiar with the segment of road under discussion, but when I asked Tom Guarino, who is (or was) PG&E's government relations manager in the East Bay, whether there was any history or record of dangerous fires started in a suburban city like Orinda, by a tree contacting a powerline, his answer was "no." I think he said that in the suburbs, if a fire starts, it is quickly noticed and extinguished. The risk is when a fire starts in an isolated area and significantly expands before it is noticed.

**From:** Nick Waranoff <waranoff@comcast.net>

**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2020 9:45 AM

**To:** 'Srivatsa, Niroop' <NSrivatsa@ci.lafayette.ca.us>; 'Cameron Burks' <CBurks@ci.lafayette.ca.us>; 'Candell, Susan' <scandell@ci.lafayette.ca.us>

**Cc:** 'Lynn Hiden' <dandlhidden@comcast.net>; 'mdawson@gmail.com' <mdawson@gmail.com>

**Subject:** RE: 4/13, 7 p.m. CITY COUNCIL MTG- Intent by PG&E for tree remvl proj 79 trees, many large and beautiful old trees on St. Mary's Road, betw Rohrer and Rheem

Note this language from my item “3” below:

- A. Continue to meet state vegetation and fire safety standards through our routine vegetation management work, which require clearances of 4 feet around power lines in high fire-threat areas with recommended minimum clearances of 12 feet or more at time of prune to ensure compliance year-round. We will also remove hazardous vegetation such as dead or dying trees that pose a potential risk to the lines.

I vaguely recall that the 12 foot standard is consistent with the CPUC ruling I cite in para 2 below, but I haven’t re-studied it and there may be newer or different rulings.

A few conclusions follow the paragraph A I quote above:

- A. Only “dead or dying trees that pose a potential risk to the lines” should be removed.
- B. The 12 foot standard is “recommended” as distinguished from the 4 foot standard which is the state standards “require.” There is discretion.
- C. The 12 foot standard is “to ensure compliance year-round.” Thus, it would only apply to situations where the tree’s rate of annual growth would be 8 feet. In other words, if the tree will grow one foot per year, the clearance should be 5 feet.
- D. Do not overlook removal of debris consisting of branches (or trees) that are cut. The PGandE vegetation page is a bit ambiguous but, in fact, PGandE contends that it has the right not to remove the branches and limbs it cuts. Any discretionary approval should impose an obligation on PGandE to remove anything it cuts.

Nick

**From:** Nick Waranoff <waranoff@comcast.net>

**Sent:** Sunday, April 12, 2020 7:41 PM

**To:** 'mdawson@gmail.com' <mdawson@gmail.com>

**Cc:** 'Lynn Hiden' <dandlhidden@comcast.net>; 'Srivatsa, Niroop' <NSrivatsa@ci.lafayette.ca.us>; 'Cameron Burks' <CBurks@ci.lafayette.ca.us>; 'Candell, Susan' <scandell@ci.lafayette.ca.us>

**Subject:** FW: 4/13, 7 p.m. CITY COUNCIL MTG- Intent by PG&E for tree remvl proj 79 trees, many large and beautiful old trees on St. Mary's Road, betw Rohrer and Rheem

Michael: Lynn Hiden forwarded your email to me. I live in Orinda so this isn’t my personal issue, but have spent a lot of time over the years on the issue of trees and power lines, and have learned a lot, because there is a PGandE power line easement over my property and I am a retired lawyer. It is a delicate balance. We all want to prevent fires. But we also want to preserve our trees to the extent we can.

Here are a few thoughts:

1. There is pressure from the judge overseeing the PGandE bankruptcy to prevent fires by removing or trimming trees.
2. There was a PUC decision in 2018 that established rules.  
<http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PublishedDocs/Published/G000/M200/K976/2009766667.PDF>
3. PGandE’s website has rules. [https://www.pge.com/en\\_US/safety/emergency-preparedness/natural-disaster/wildfires/vegetation-management.page](https://www.pge.com/en_US/safety/emergency-preparedness/natural-disaster/wildfires/vegetation-management.page)
4. There is a big difference between (a) trimming a tree to establish the necessary clearance and (b) removing the tree. The tension (no pun intended), of course, is between PGandE’s desire to do the work as rarely as possible (accomplished by removal or severe

trimming) and residents' desire to have the minimum pruning necessary and to prune rather than remove.

5. You and Lynn refer to a 12' clearance, but the presentation attached refers to only a 4' clearance. (Maybe I missed something.) Sometimes, a difference in clearance depends upon"
  - a. The nature of the tree and how fast it may grow
  - b. The frequency with which the trimming may occur. PGandE wants to trim more, less often, to save money. Residents may want less trimmed more often, to preserve the trees.
6. When I spoke to a PGandE arborist about the fact that residents in Orinda were being told that trees within a certain radius of a pole (maybe 12 feet) had to be removed, and asked her to provide me with a citation to or copy of the applicable law, rule, order or regulation, she was unable to do so and may have acknowledged that there was none, I don't exactly recall. But if that argument is made, ask for what I asked for.
7. If the trees are on private property, there may be relevant language in the easement document limiting PGandE's rights.

You probably know all of this. If not, I hope this helps.

Nick Waranoff

**From:** Lynn Hiden <dandlhidden@comcast.net>

**Sent:** Sunday, April 12, 2020 6:18 PM

**To:** Undisclosed-Recipient::

**Subject:** 4/13, 7 p.m. CITY COUNCIL MTG- Intent by PG&E for tree remvl proj 79 trees, many large and beautiful old trees on St. Mary's Road, betw Rohrer and Rheem

**LINK INCLUDED BELOW. PLEASE FEEL FREE TO FORWARD! CAN YOU GET COMMENTS IN, IN TIME? It appears that this decision will be made tomorrow evening!! This is heartbreaking....**

**From:** Michael Dawson <mdawson@gmail.com>

**Date:** April 11, 2020 at 3:13:47 PM PDT

**To:** Michael Dawson <mdawson@gmail.com>

**Subject:** Fwd: PG&E tree removal project on St. Mary's Road

Hi, Friends,

Unfortunately, at the next Lafayette City Council meeting (4/13/7 p.m.) PG&E will be proposing another new major tree removal project. *79 trees, many of the largest & oldest oaks (large and protected heritage oaks) in that area, will be removed this summer* on St. Mary's Road as part of an electrical upgrade program, and the project will devastate that area both visually and environmentally. I aim to get them to reconsider the alternatives.

**PG&E's presentation:**

[https://lafayette.granicus.com/MetaViewer.php?view\\_id=&event\\_id=818&meta\\_id=113624](https://lafayette.granicus.com/MetaViewer.php?view_id=&event_id=818&meta_id=113624)

To see the trees: Slowly drive along St. Mary's Road between Rohrer Drive and Rheem Boulevard and you will see X's on trunks of trees on both sides of the road all the way to Rheem Boulevard in Moraga. **Any tree**

between Rohrer Drive and Rheem Boulevard with an X on it is slated for removal. If you're interested in getting involved, please write a short email to Cityhall@Lovelafayette.org with subject line "Public Comment – Agenda item #8A". Tell City Council that PG&E shouldn't be given a date for construction or an encroachment permit until they can reevaluate the loss of these important trees. Your letter will be read as part of Public Comment. *My letter to our City Council is copied below.*

**Some things to consider:**

PG&E already did wildfire safety trimming in this area in 2019.

PG&E cites a need for 12' clearance on their electrical line, *but many of these trees are much further away.*

PG&E probably hasn't considered alternatives to tree cutting, including re-routing, burying, or evaluating installation.

PG&E looks at trees as merely dots on a map, as shown in their presentation.

Many of these trees are on private property.

It's not shown that removal of these trees will improve wildfire safety.

Watch the Lafayette City Council Meeting: Monday, April 13th, 7:00 pm:

[https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCBPuox8U4xResMPv4T\\_bSJw](https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCBPuox8U4xResMPv4T_bSJw)

Please let me know if you have any questions. Thank you for all that you do, and I hope everyone is healthy and safe!

Michael

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Michael Dawson <mdawson@gmail.com>

Date: Sat, Apr 11, 2020 at 2:44 PM

Subject: Public Comment – Agenda item #8A

To: cityhall cityhall@lovelafayette.org

Dear Lafayette Mayor and City Council,

I respectfully request that the City denies PG&E the necessary encroachment permit to close St. Mary's Road this summer until, and unless, PG&E resubmits a more acceptable electrical tree removal plan. PG&E does not adequately explain the reason or explore the alternatives of removing nearly 80 trees, *including many large and protected heritage oak trees valued by local residents.*

PG&E's rationale as shown on page 12 of their presentation is suspect. PG&E does not state that the Enhanced Vegetation Management project on their electrical lines was completed along St. Mary's Road in 2019. Trees that are currently marked for removal are already in compliance with PG&E's 12-foot wildfire safety distances, and many are well beyond. Is PG&E conducting a discretionary wildfire program outside of the 12-foot limit, an action not endorsed by the CPUC? Is PG&E merely making their construction project more convenient? And since these are mostly privately-owned trees, will PG&E honor residents' wishes to not sign tree-cutting agreements?

Moreover, why is there yet again a lack of transparency with City Council and residents?

Updating our utility infrastructure is a positive step toward better safety. Yet, we are all aware that PG&E plans their projects from afar, completes them in a rush, and operates without oversight or accountability. It does not appear that PG&E has explored alternatives to permanently removing Lafayette's oldest residents including rerouting electrical lines, undergrounding, trimming, and exploring alternative construction techniques.

Please remember that PG&E started two fires in Lafayette last year with a newly-installed electrical pole. We require a more thorough reexamination than what PG&E has proposed today. I ask the City Council to hold PG&E accountable to their impact, demand they work smarter, and require that they remove far fewer trees. Please deny their encroachment request until they do so.

With sincerest regards,

Michael Dawson  
711 Los Palos Drive  
Lafayette, CA

**Robbins, Joanne**

---

**From:** Mara Zhelutka <marazhelutka@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2020 4:55 PM  
**To:** City Hall  
**Subject:** Comment on Agenda Items #8A

PG&E Tree Removal Project on St. Mary's Road

I am a resident of Lafayette and I oppose the removal of almost 80 trees by PG&E as part of their electrical upgrade program. I believe this will effect a drastic change to the proposed area, both visually and ecologically.  
PLEASE STOP PG&E FROM TAKING OUR HERITAGE OAKS!

Yours

Mara Zhelutka  
979 Hawthorne Dr.  
Lafayette, CA 94549

**Robbins, Joanne**

---

**From:** Elizabeth Henry <henrylibby@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2020 5:08 PM  
**To:** City Hall  
**Subject:** Public Comment - Agenda item #8A

City Council,

PG&E should not be given a date for construction or an encroachment permit until they can reevaluate the loss of these important trees between Rheem Boulevard and Rohrer Drive in Lafayette.

They have already done their "wildfire safety" trimming in this area.

There has been no alternatives considered, rather than taking down 79 trees???

PG&E needs to worry about how they are going to service communities and pay for all the wildfires in the last couple of years, before they decide to cause another environmental disaster by taking down trees.

Perhaps PG&E is not educated on the benefits of having trees in our community??? There are many people who could educate them.

What exactly is their justification for this in the first place? It certainly cannot be an environmentally sound or safe one.

Many of these trees are on private property!!! Residents have RIGHTS!

Thank you,

Libby Henry  
3812C Happy Valley Road

## Robbins, Joanne

---

**From:** Llsa Warren <warren.l@sbcglobal.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2020 5:10 PM  
**To:** City Hall  
**Subject:** Public comment on agenda item #8a

I am writing to express my deep disappointment with the plans to cut 79 trees between Rohrer Drive and Raheem Blvd. How hard could it possibly be for P,G&E to be more thoughtful in their planning so that they could do selective cutting? They've already cut down many trees unnecessarily at the corner of Olympic and Reliez Station Rd. Why are we letting them do the same on St. Mary's?

Sincerely, Lisa and Lyell Warren  
3284 Walnut Lane, Lafayette

Sent from my iPad

**Robbins, Joanne**

---

**From:** VONIS MOORE <vonis@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2020 5:11 PM  
**To:** City Hall  
**Subject:** Public Comment on Agenda item #8A.

Please do NOT approve PG&E approval of trees on St. Mary's Road. This will not help to alleviate fires and in fact could exacerbate fire risk by removing wind breaks. Additionally, do NOT remove protected trees and heritage oaks.

We have had enough of poor judgement from PG&E.

Vonis Moore  
3231 Withers Avenue  
Lafayette, CA 94549

**Robbins, Joanne**

---

**From:** Kymberly Speer <kymspeer@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2020 5:19 PM  
**To:** City Hall  
**Subject:** Public comment on Agenda item 8A

Please don't let PG&E cut down our trees!! And in any event, PG&E shouldn't be given a date for construction or an encroachment permit until they can reevaluate the loss of these important trees.

Thank you,

Kym Speer  
994 Carol Lane  
Lafayette

## Robbins, Joanne

---

**From:** Bill Bucher <bill.bucher@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2020 6:54 PM  
**To:** City Hall  
**Subject:** PGE ITEM THIS EVENING - 4/13, 7 p.m. CITY COUNCIL MTG-

Dear Lafayette City Council

Regarding the agenda item on tonight's CC meeting related the PGE's proposed removal of trees along St. Mary's road.

The LHC as concerns related to the need to remove so many trees in the interest of safety. Selective pruning or other clearing methods may be more prudent. I believe the CC has received several emails and letters that raise questions regarding the 12' space requirement, live trees vs. dead or diseased trees, and the general disregard by PGE of protecting these important assets of the city. We urge the City Council to not approve PGE's plan until more questions are answered and less drastic alternatives are explored.

Regards,

Bill Bucher  
President, Lafayette Homeowners Council

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** "Lynn Hiden" <[dandlhidden@comcast.net](mailto:dandlhidden@comcast.net)>  
**Subject:** Fw: FM NICK WARANOFF, PLEASE READ BEFORE PGE ITEM THIS EVENING /Fw: 4/13, 7 p.m. CITY COUNCIL MTG- Intent by PG&E for tree remvl proj 79 trees, many large and beautiful old trees on St. Mary's Road, betw Rohrer and Rheem  
**Date:** April 13, 2020 at 5:02:33 PM PDT  
**To:** "Joan Bruzzone" <[joanbruzzone@comcast.net](mailto:joanbruzzone@comcast.net)>, "'Dave' Bruzzone" <[dbruzz@comcast.net](mailto:dbruzz@comcast.net)>, "Aron Rosenberg" <[aronrosenberg@gmail.com](mailto:aronrosenberg@gmail.com)>, "Betty La Porte" <[bblaporte@gmail.com](mailto:bblaporte@gmail.com)>, "Bill Bucher" <[bill.bucher@comcast.net](mailto:bill.bucher@comcast.net)>, "brian baker and linda murphy" <[bakemurph@yahoo.com](mailto:bakemurph@yahoo.com)>, "Cam Burks" <[camburks@yahoo.com](mailto:camburks@yahoo.com)>, "Candace J. Kay Andersen" <[candace.kay.andersen@gmail.com](mailto:candace.kay.andersen@gmail.com)>, "CARL ANDURI" <[carl.anduri@gmail.com](mailto:carl.anduri@gmail.com)>, "Carol Federighi" <[Carolfeds@comcast.net](mailto:Carolfeds@comcast.net)>, "CW Chung" <[cwchung@comcast.net](mailto:cwchung@comcast.net)>, "Danielle Gallagher" <[danielle.gallagher@gmail.com](mailto:danielle.gallagher@gmail.com)>, "Donn Walklet" <[donnwalklet@comcast.net](mailto:donnwalklet@comcast.net)>, "Dorothy Paige" <[paigedorothy@gmail.com](mailto:paigedorothy@gmail.com)>, "Ed Spivey, Pine Lane Assoc." <[espivey1@gmail.com](mailto:espivey1@gmail.com)>, "Eliot Hudson" <[elhudbox@sbcglobal.net](mailto:elhudbox@sbcglobal.net)>, "Ellen Breslin" <[ellbres@comcast.net](mailto:ellbres@comcast.net)>, "Erling Horn" <[eandphorn@comcast.net](mailto:eandphorn@comcast.net)>, "Forrest Arakawa" <[forrestarakawa@yahoo.com](mailto:forrestarakawa@yahoo.com)>, <[ggholit@comcast.net](mailto:ggholit@comcast.net)>, "GEORGE BURTT" <[grant\\_burt@earthlink.net](mailto:grant_burt@earthlink.net)>, "Gina Dawson" <[gdawson@gmail.com](mailto:gdawson@gmail.com)>, "Girard Pessis" <[girard@pessis.com](mailto:girard@pessis.com)>, "Glenn Breslin" <[glennbreslin@gmail.com](mailto:glennbreslin@gmail.com)>, <[ivorsamson@comcast.net](mailto:ivorsamson@comcast.net)>, "Jean Follmer" <[jeanfollmer@yahoo.com](mailto:jeanfollmer@yahoo.com)>, "Jeanne Ateljevich" <[jateljevich@comcast.net](mailto:jateljevich@comcast.net)>, "Jim Todhunter" <[hjtodhunter@comcast.net](mailto:hjtodhunter@comcast.net)>, "John Kiefer" <[jhkiefer@comcast.net](mailto:jhkiefer@comcast.net)>, "Karen J. Maggio" <[KJMaggio@gmail.com](mailto:KJMaggio@gmail.com)>, "Kathy Sunnybrook HOA \(\pref'd\) Marshall" <[kwisemarshall@aol.com](mailto:kwisemarshall@aol.com)>, "Kathy Merchant" <[merchant70@aol.com](mailto:merchant70@aol.com)>

**Robbins, Joanne**

---

**From:** Nick <waranoff@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2020 7:26 PM  
**To:** City Hall  
**Subject:** Public Comment agenda 8A

What specific CPUC ruling is he relying on?

Nick Waranoff  
510-334-0729

## Robbins, Joanne

---

**From:** Nick <waranoff@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2020 7:27 PM  
**To:** City Hall  
**Subject:** Re: Public Comment agenda 8A

And does it say that your program overrides all other issues

Nick Waranoff  
510-334-0729

> On Apr 13, 2020, at 7:25 PM, Nick <[waranoff@comcast.net](mailto:waranoff@comcast.net)> wrote:  
>  
>  
> What specific CPUC ruling is he relying on?  
> Nick Waranoff  
> 510-334-0729

## Robbins, Joanne

---

**From:** Nick <waranoff@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2020 7:57 PM  
**To:** City Hall  
**Subject:** Re: Public Comment agenda 8A

Can city hire its own arborist to review findings of the program?

Nick Waranoff  
510-334-0729

> On Apr 13, 2020, at 7:27 PM, Nick <[waranoff@comcast.net](mailto:waranoff@comcast.net)> wrote:  
>  
> And does it say that your program overrides all other issues  
>  
> Nick Waranoff  
> 510-334-0729  
>  
>> On Apr 13, 2020, at 7:25 PM, Nick <[waranoff@comcast.net](mailto:waranoff@comcast.net)> wrote:  
>>  
>>  
>> What specific CPUC ruling is he relying on?  
>> Nick Waranoff  
>> 510-334-0729

## Robbins, Joanne

---

**From:** Nick <waranoff@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2020 8:05 PM  
**To:** City Hall  
**Subject:** Re: Public Comment agenda 8A

Montes didn't directly answer mayor's request for the report not just a list

Nick Waranoff  
510-334-0729

> On Apr 13, 2020, at 7:56 PM, Nick <[waranoff@comcast.net](mailto:waranoff@comcast.net)> wrote:

>

> Can city hire its own arborist to review findings of the program?

>

> Nick Waranoff

> 510-334-0729

>

>> On Apr 13, 2020, at 7:27 PM, Nick <[waranoff@comcast.net](mailto:waranoff@comcast.net)> wrote:

>>

>> And does it say that your program overrides all other issues

>>

>> Nick Waranoff

>> 510-334-0729

>>

>>> On Apr 13, 2020, at 7:25 PM, Nick <[waranoff@comcast.net](mailto:waranoff@comcast.net)> wrote:

>>>

>>>

>>> What specific CPUC ruling is he relying on?

>>> Nick Waranoff

>>> 510-334-0729

## Robbins, Joanne

---

**From:** Nick <waranoff@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2020 8:11 PM  
**To:** City Hall  
**Subject:** Re: Public Comment agenda 8A

Report would have tree by tree analysis not just conclusion

Nick Waranoff  
510-334-0729

> On Apr 13, 2020, at 8:05 PM, Nick <[waranoff@comcast.net](mailto:waranoff@comcast.net)> wrote:  
>  
> Montes didn't directly answer mayor's request for the report not just a list  
>  
> Nick Waranoff  
> 510-334-0729  
>  
>> On Apr 13, 2020, at 7:56 PM, Nick <[waranoff@comcast.net](mailto:waranoff@comcast.net)> wrote:  
>>  
>> Can city hire its own arborist to review findings of the program?  
>>  
>> Nick Waranoff  
>> 510-334-0729  
>>  
>>> On Apr 13, 2020, at 7:27 PM, Nick <[waranoff@comcast.net](mailto:waranoff@comcast.net)> wrote:  
>>>  
>>> And does it say that your program overrides all other issues  
>>>  
>>> Nick Waranoff  
>>> 510-334-0729  
>>>  
>>>> On Apr 13, 2020, at 7:25 PM, Nick <[waranoff@comcast.net](mailto:waranoff@comcast.net)> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> What specific CPUC ruling is he relying on?  
>>>> Nick Waranoff  
>>>> 510-334-0729

**Robbins, Joanne**

---

**From:** Dawn Eames <leosunshine21@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2020 9:08 PM  
**To:** City Hall  
**Cc:** Michael/Gina Dawson; Cheryl MacDonald; Hendrik/Lori Kirleis; Laura LaMotte; Tom Camp; Bobbie Freitas; Gerald Macpherson; twldee@comcast.net  
**Subject:** Public Comment on Agenda Item #8A - City Council Meeting 4/13/2020

**I hope this is not too late to weigh in on the proposed cutting of trees on St. Mary's Rd.**

**It is important that PG&E be required to evaluate the environmental impact, safety issues, aesthetic and historical significance of the trees that are slated to be removed, prior to approval of an encroachment permit for removal or construction.**

**Thank you for your consideration.**

**Dawn Eames**

**Robbins, Joanne**

---

**From:** Tyler Durden <guenley@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 14, 2020 12:16 AM  
**To:** City Hall  
**Subject:** "Public Comment – Agenda item #8A"

PG&E shouldn't be given a date for construction or an encroachment permit until they can reevaluate the loss of these important trees.

This tree removal plan seems ridiculous. The risk of wildfires does not come from trees. The real risk comes from incompetence, mismanagement, and greed on PG&E's part. As I see it PG&E has two jobs; keep the power on and don't kill anybody. They are completely incompetent at both. I propose we (the city of Lafayette) join the city of San Jose in a hostile take over of PG&E. They have a plan in the works to do so. Let's rally the troops to fight the tree removal and at the same time join the take over to make it a true public utility. PG&E is a disaster. They are mass murderers and have been repeatedly for decades. It's time for fresh leadership, a new company. Don't accept their proposal. Let's not remove trees and destroy this beautiful city of ours, let's remove PG&E and create a better energy system! A system that keeps the power on and does not kill people or trees.

Sincerely,  
Michael Guenley