Nov 25, 2023

Sonoma County Board of Supervisors

400 Administration Dr.

Santa Rosa, Ca. 95401

Dear Sonoma County Supervisors,

Congratulations on the efforts to protect trees in our county with a new Tree Protection ordinance.

Ordinances without enforcement by authorities, and punishments for violators, are often flimsy protections with hollow rhetoric often ignored by those who would do wrong.

Sonoma County needs a Tree Protection ordinance which can protect Heritage Valley Oak trees and Oak woodlands from those who would cut them down. Especially from

Therefore, Please make the Tree Protection ordinance strong with especially strong enforcement capabilities and stringent penalties applied on the first offense. Plus make sure there are progressively worse penalties for each and every offense.

Thank you for your implementation of this measure immediately,

Sincerely,

Duane De Witt

Box 3068

Santa Rosa, Ca. 95402

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I want to express my total support for the passage of the changes in the tree ordinances recommended by the Planning Commission that will come before you at tomorrow's board meeting.

It has been a great accomplishment on the part of many parties--staff at PRMD, the Planning Commission, and the many members of the public and conservation organizations. They have worked at least 18 months. Prior to that, there was a long period of advocacy for the changes. Now the changes should be approved.

These changes represent significant progress towards achieving priorities, including climate goals, protection of sensitive habitats, and connecting woodlands and savannas. The oaks of California are a keystone species when it comes to habitat conservation. The preservation of oak trees is the foundation for a healthy native ecosystem.

Very truly yours, Deborah Dobish 1495 Hurlbut Lane Sebastopol 707-823-8836

Re: File #ORD21-00 Please approve as proposed

Dear Supervisors,

Ever since your hearing in May of 2021 I have studied the condition of forests and woodlands in Sonoma County and worked with PRMD staff to draft improved protections for them. This issue is extremely important to me, and I believe to voters and business leaders in the county. The natural beauty of our hills and mountains are a major draw for residents and tourism, as well as important to habitats and oxygen production. Please approve the proposed ordinances as presented. While they are not perfect, they will be an improvement over the current language in effect.

Thank you, Wendy Smit Alexander Valley, CA

Honorable Members of the Board of Supervisors,

While I am an attorney, I am writing this letter today as a private citizen who has resided in Sonoma County at 1421 West Dry Creek Road in Healdsburg for over 30 years. I am also a forester.

My focus is on the proposed Tree Protection Ordinance (TPO) Amending Chapter 25 and 26 of the Sonoma County Code. In particular, I strongly object to Subsection 26-88-080 "(M) Subsection E" (option 1). That subsection condones the payment of cash as mitigation for cutting down the very trees that the TPO is supposed to protect. In other words, if someone wants to eliminate these trees, and they have plenty of money, they can merely put cash on the table and cut trees with abandon. Having that option available, in reality, makes the rest of the TPO irrelevant.

For that reason, I hereby respectfully request that the aforementioned Subsection E (Option 1) be deleted from the proposed ordinance.

Referring to Section II (1) of the proposed ordinance, I strongly disagree with the county's position that the proposed adoption of the TPO is exempt form CEQA. First of all, and with due respect, to suggest that the proposed adoption of this Ordinance is exempt to CEQA guidelines Section 15061 (b)(3) is an absurdity. It can absolutely be seen with certainty that there is a clear possibility that the adoption of the aforesaid mitigation clause will have an adverse effect on the environment.

Further, the reliance on CEQA Guidelines Section 15307 and Section 15308 is misplaced. First of all, the County of Sonoma is <u>not</u> a regulatory agency. Secondly, the adoption of the aforesaid mitigation section of the proposed Ordinance would tend to encourage the loss of trees, if you have enough money. This would <u>not</u> protect the environment.

Respectfully submitted,

Edwin W. Wilson, Esq.

From:	Yael Bernier
To:	Doug Bush
Cc:	<pre><dcva board@lists.sonic.net=""></dcva></pre>
Subject:	Woodland Ordinances
Date:	Tuesday, November 28, 2023 8:15:31 AM

To Sonoma County Supervisors James Gore, Lynda Hopkins, Susan Gorin, Chris Coursey, and David Rabbit: November 28,

2023

As residents of a very diverse region of agriculture, riparian habitat and woodland forest, we in Dry Creek Valley value the many native species that surround us. Our organization's mission is to protect and preserve our natural resources. Therefore we support the adoption of ORD21-0001 and ORD23-0004. We feel it encompasses a greater swathe of woodland habitat than the previous ordinance and support the theme of protection for the woodland's cultural beauty, diversity, ability to cool and moderate the climate, sequester carbon, prevent soil erosion and provide wildlife habitat for our native fauna as well. The importance of native habitat cannot be downplayed.

The Dry Creek Valley Association is concerned however that the fees to mitigate the cutting and clearing whether permitted or unpermitted are simply for some, the cost of doing business. That's a problem. Fines and Fees cannot mitigate the loss of these important trees that continue to be our greatest protection against drought and climate change.

Sincerely,

Yael Bernier, DCVA President