

Community Workshop Meeting #1 Pacific Grove Community Center July 27, 2011 6 to 8 pm

Meeting Notes

As part of the first UFMP Community Workshop, community residents were asked to provide their comments and insights as each of seven topic stations. The topics included the following:

1. The Costs and Benefits of Trees
2. Tree Selection
3. Trees as Functional Structures for Stormwater Management
4. Risk Management
5. Management and Policy
6. Community Values and Stewardship
7. Issues Ranking Exercise

Comments were recorded on large poster-size writing pads and are transcribed below.

1. The Costs and Benefits of Trees

- CO₂ released from dead trees- concern
- Allergies to tree species – concern
- Efficient use of funds
- Hazards
- Concern about staffing cost estimates
- Encourage community involvement/donated services
- JPA shared services
- Ordinance restrictions currently cause issues with potential fire hazards, safety, and health issues
- Concern – citizen safety from falling trees
- Concern- Coercion of citizens a big negative (ration replacements deter planting)
- Accurate data specific to PG on energy issues
- Compliance – have budget for enforcement
- Property valuation studies

- Stormwater management
- Benefit – shade, prevents pollution and adds to valuation
- System to help with private tree maintenance cost, especially if trees are required by the City
- Alternatives when hazardous trees are expensive to remove
- Protection of listed and protected species and legality
- Consideration of long-term maintenance of trees (life cycle)
- Are all trees of equal value? Type – age – location, i.e. tiered value system
- Negotiating shared trees and maintenance/responsibilities
- Inverse benefit to property value impacts
- Program costs

2. Tree Selection

- Don't put cement over public areas where trees were removed
- Add bioswales and "bulb-outs". Could put in the center of Pine Street
- Trees start on one property and grow onto another and into the fence
- One for one replacement
- Trees should be far enough from house and fence – preparing for when they get bigger
- Spending money on other people's trees for trimming, cleaning, removal
- City should identify landmark trees and make a special effort to protect them and not remove them
- To restore canopy – City should have 4:1 ratio of restoration for the next 20 years on public lands.
- Never plant Monterey Cypress closer than 20' from a building, 6' from the sidewalk/fence. Never over water or sewer lines, or under overhead wires
- Restore canopy method – Do not let canopy lose any more
- Stop PGE from butchering trees
- Tree replacement needs follow-up enforcement. Must have a timeline
- Dangerous Eucalyptus grew next to a fence and now drops branches, and will keep growing
- R.T.R.P does not mean large canopy trees on small lots
- Proportionally appropriate
- People who advocate large canopy pines/large trees throughout residential neighborhoods should be willing to live under one (or more)
- Consider all perspectives – tree planter, owner, neighbors and future residents

- Never plant Monterey Pines closer than 15' from buildings, or 6' from sidewalk/fences. Never over water or sewer lines, or under overhead utility wires
- Never plant Coast Live Oaks 10' from buildings, 4' from sidewalks/fences, never over utility (water and sewer lines), or under utility wires
- Avoid catch phrases (eg "restore the canopy"). Look for a solution the majority will support without the need for constant enforcement. Ordinances need to be acceptable by the majority
- Have published tree guide with lots of options printed
- Have own choice(s) for trees, not arborist choice only
- Have less punitive system, and guidelines to remedy past planting mistakes, without fines for everyone
- Different areas of town can tolerate bigger trees. Hard to plant canopy trees (or multiple trees) in retreat area
- Retreat area can tolerate smaller trees and fruit trees
- Put PG&E lines underground. Good idea, but consider costs?
- Restore canopy
- Maintain tree assistance and expertise
- Buy trees in bulk. Cheaper for the residents
- Consider the right size trees for the lot
- Put inventory on website
- Ecological benefit – benefit to native wildlife
- Different lots have different soils and have different potential for growing trees
- Balancing canopy without the risk of large trees falling
- Distribute the need for the canopy throughout the City, not just in certain neighborhoods (e.g. Del Monte Park)
- "Forbidden" tree list (e.g. Eucalyptus)

3. Trees as Functional Structures for Stormwater Management

- Center of Pine Street (appropriate type and size of trees and location)
- Pine – Bioswales on side and in the middle
- Concern – Final plans for stormwater improvements are already determined (feedback here isn't taken)
- Need fuller canopied trees
- Permeable/porous pavers around the base of the trees and on City streets
- Planters around town on City property

- 6 inch diameter PVC pipe, to 3' down to rooms; watered by non-potable water to avoid cost of tree root uplift/cost
- Spacing of trees sufficient from structures/utilities. Driveways/French drains
- One for one replacement only
- Bulb-outs/curb-cuts to encourage flow into veg/treatment (middle crown on street)
- Bio-retention under sidewalks
- Plant a community garden – school location and school outreach
- Require S.W. capture from now forward for development projects
- No more pines within 70 feet of structures
- Forest succession: No further planting of Pines (nature will bring them back eventually through natural rotation of environment)
- Plant Oaks, stick to natives. Healthy diversity but without ornamentals or invasives
- Oaks health – No lawn and irrigation systems
- Education in schools about appropriate species and local systems
- Sidewalk issues and cost to homeowners
- Safety should be considered when planting trees
- Plants on City property – think about location and safety
- If planting trees, let homeowners decide what is best for the property (not City)
- Tree guide for various species with pros and cons of tree growth/care/like for property owners
- More trees along edges of course on public property where no issues for private property (could be safety issue here)
- Permeable paving in gutters and sidewalks
- Cost estimates – bioswales, sidewalk plantings and root upheaval costs
- Allow Oak leaves to accumulate on the ground (litter as fertilizer)
- Cost/benefit – PVC pipe option allows roots to go down with water instead of having sidewalk upheaval
- Permeable sidewalk ordinance requirement

4. Risk Management

- Who does the risk evaluation?
- Need for independent evaluation by a qualified professional
- Healthy looking trees can fall
- Extent of risk depends on size of the tree (the bigger it is the harder it falls)
- Don't make the tree assessment a major impediment to action
- If we know it is going to cause damage, take preventative action

- What is appropriate mitigation?
- Need to educate people on proper tree care to reduce hazards and illness (pine trees have a small root ball)
- Expensive to deal with root damage
- Dead trees should not require a professional arborist report – use common sense
- Spacing of the trees from buildings and driveways
- Distance from water connections, sewer lines and drain lines
- Common sense parameters for new tree plantings
- Need to be able to remove sick and old trees
- Hazards that cross property lines
- Insurance issues (very complicated)
- We have a right to be safe in our own yards. If we do not feel safe, we are not safe
- Need better understanding of the laws that apply
- Risk based on the scale for the property (too big for lot size can create hazards)
- Homeowner has the right to make decisions based on their own liability
- Imbalance in root system or tree weight distribution
- Need to pressure PG&E to underground utility lines. Power outages from trees downed in a storm. Would also create more room for the replanting in the public right-of-way
- Have arborist available to do evaluations prior to permitting
- Why don't people replant – Concern about creating hazards and liabilities, intrusion by City arborist into people's homes
- Consider the distance to neighbors, not just your own structure
- Some trees can look dead but may not be (e.g. Oak trees with worms)
- Working cooperatively with neighbors
- Replanting in the wrong places – more flexibility on species and location – hazards include allergies

5. Management and Policy

- Regulations vs. none – end result is compromise
- Ability to track in lieu fees (ROI)
- Enforcement – selective
- Inadequate staff
- Public and private do not have to be in lock-step
- Need for cooperation among neighbors (trees and roots that cross property lines)
- Reasonable ordinance = reasonable enforcement
- Equity (canopy coverage)

- Penalty equal to the value of the tree at the time it is damaged
- Flexibility – lot size
- Requirement to plant with 60 days, no water
- Where is the correct tree list?
- Deed restrictions re: open space area, trees, disclosure
- Greenbelt
- Spacing pines 20-25 feet from structures, 3' from water connections, driveways/sewer lines/French drains
- One to one replacement
- Standards for performance for tree trimmers in Pacific Grove – licensing requirements
- When can trees be trimmed?
- One gallon or five gallon instead of 15 (less water), better chance of survival
- New construction/remodel landscape plan to be presented for planning review
- Viewshed preservation
- Limit irrigation beneath oak trees
- Tree list – review, revise and expand to include smaller stature trees. Update periodically
- Property owners should be able to choose replacement tree species as long as they are not invasive
- Planting for new construction could take place off-site
- When new construction takes the whole lot, trees should be planted elsewhere in Pacific Grove
- City should be penalized when in violation
- There should be success criteria established and met to ensure mitigation tree plantings grow

6. Community Values and Stewardship

- CALFIRE Tree USA “tree ordinance” is a guide for public parks and public places etc., good positive perspective in public NOT private spaces
- Balancing tree planting with preservation of ocean views
- Homeowner safety vs. preservation of older trees
- What is the baseline for restoration? (goal 2)
- Partnership with non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to foster community support for and standards of the urban forest (goal 5)
- More definition of what optimal means (goal 3) and what “expansion” is (goal 10)
- Fight to get people to plant trees

- Educate people to care for the trees, how to care for it so it does not provide damage
- Creation of a greenbelt around the edges of the City
- Would like to see more trees in the City (similar to Claremont)
- City needs to plant trees in all the public places
- Acknowledge that people live in Pacific Grove – it's not just for tourists
- Don't value other people's rights over the homeowner's rights
- Provide visual guide of how to trim trees for health and view
- Respect and protect right of Pacific Grove citizens
- #3 "optional" should take into consideration the lot size and housing stock/tree interaction. "Optimal" for the forest ecology is not optional for homeowners
- Sidewalks belong to the property owners. Hazards to residents, City should fix these areas
- How many trees on a lot?
- Spacing from buildings should be 20-25 feet from fencing, driveways, and water connections
- Designing around trees with minimal cut down
- More balance between the building and the land
- Create an ordinance people will support. You can't get people to plant trees if they don't want to
- City would facilitate getting trees for private owners to plant in public spaces
- Subsidize landowners who have large trees

7. Issues Ranking Exercise

Tree Resource

Increase and restore the tree canopy	High
Inventory trees in public spaces (streets, parks, etc.)	Medium
Increase the diversity of tree species throughout the City and add more tree species to the tree planting list	Low
Maximize the ecological and environmental benefits of the urban forest (e.g. stormwater management, air & water quality)	Low
Restore Pacific Grove's magnificent pine canopy	High
Plant more trees on public property	High
Right tree on the right lot (or area)	High
Balance preservation of native forest with private property rights	Medium
Encourage planting of trees by giving homeowners sole choice as to whether and with what to replace	Low
Allow for smaller trees to be planted on smaller lots	High
Allow fruit trees as replacement trees	High
Manage trees to maintain viewsheds	Medium
Trees should not be allowed to destroy foundations, walls, curbs, sidewalks, streets, etc.	High
Establish a tree nursery program to ensure a health stock of trees available for planting	Low
Clearly define hazardous trees	Medium
Encourage the planting of native, non-invasive tree species	High
Plant native pines only in public lands or on	High

oversized lots. Limit pine planting by X number of feet from structures	
Rule: Plant trees with six inch diameter PVC pipe for deep watering to assure roots go down	Low

Management Framework

Properly manage City-owned trees	High
Require 2 for 1 tree replacement to allow for mortality	Low
Require a 1 for 1 tree replacement policy	Low
Establish rules that guide, encourage, and enable, rather than oppress (e.g. incentives)	High
Increase maintenance of trees on public property	High
Create a short and concise tree ordinance	Medium
Improve the tree permitting process to be more clear and fair	Low
Better enforcement of the in-lieu tree replacement fee	High
All permits should be managed by an experienced arborist	Low
Improve the public noticing process for all tree cutting proposals	Low
Develop careful recommendation criteria regarding tree cutting moratorium during nesting season	Medium
Trees should not be allowed to cause falling hazards to people, cars and structures	High
Trees should be managed to minimize the risk of fire hazards	Medium
Pursue funding sources in support of tree preservation and management	Medium
Use in-lieu tree trees to plant trees	Medium
Experience arborist and City arborist have final say regarding tree removal	High
Fines for tree removal without permit	Medium

Community Framework

Establish an annual community tree-planting program	Medium
Involve the Arbor Society in continuous tree planting programs	Low
Support and encourage Arbor Day activities	Medium
Support and encourage voluntary tree planting programs	Low
Enhance public awareness of the urban forest as a community resource	High
Pursue partnership programs with local nurseries	Low
Expand the tree species list to include sample photos and more technical information (e.g. planting and maintenance requirements, ultimate size, life expectance, etc.)	Medium
Engage the community in active stewardship of the urban forest	High
Promote citizen-government business partnerships	Low
Utilize volunteers to help maintain trees on public land	High
Respect & protect the rights of Pacific Grove citizens	High
Acknowledge people live in Pacific Grove – it's not just a tourist destination	High

**Urban Forest Management Plan
Additional Comments Received
July 27, 2011 – August 18, 2011**

From: Bill Kampe [mailto:bkampe@mindspring.com]

Sent: Saturday, July 30, 2011 10:17 PM

To: Sarah Hardgrave

Subject: Thoughts on Tree Policies

Hello Sarah,

Enjoyed the tree meeting last week. It stirred some additional thoughts for me, in no particular order.

- Forbidden tree list – I like the idea. Perhaps there are some things that just shouldn't be planted in PG, e.g. black acacia. I would see it as part of the tree guide, along with the list of trees that count for any required plantings.
- Recommended supplemental list – there might also be a supplemental list of trees that are OK to plant, when a property owner is looking to fill out the landscaping.
- Are all trees equal? – The tree ordinance now treats every tree, regardless of species, age, location, as basically equal in terms of the obligation of the property owner. What if some trees are more worthy of protection than others? I think that's probably the case. We have pittosporum and holly trees that probably should come out, without penalty. Can we focus a tree ordinance on trees that are most significant, i.e.
 - Selected species, particularly Monterey Pine, Cypress, Live Oak
 - That are of some minimum size...more than the 4" DBH we have today
 - And in reasonably good long term locations
 - Plus street trees that conform to the street tree master plan
- Following the concept that some of our trees on private property are much less significant, let's allow property owners the discretion to, plant, prune or even remove some trees, such as
 - Those not on a core list of significant trees (the one's typically specified for replants)
 - Bad locations
 - Over mature
 - Just want to do something else in that spot
- Breaking a mindset - We have some things that are a big part of every PG discussion, yet I wonder if they should be at all:
 - 2 for 1; 1 for 1 – Instead, let's think about what makes sense to encourage the right kind of plantings in our city
 - For private property, how coercive do we want to be? Can encouragement work better?
 - For city property, it gets silly. We need to think on a much broader basis. For example, we might estimate that we will remove 173 trees and plant 286 in a year. If that's what keeps us moving toward our goal, that's what we should do. And it doesn't make sense to say that we planted exactly these 2 trees here to replace the 1 tree removed on the other side of town.
 - In lieu fee – This fee falls most heavily on those with the most trees. We should be giving bronze plaques of commendation, not levying in lieu fees. We need to think about other ways to feed the tree planting fund. And it shouldn't just be a way for people to buy out of tree responsibilities, either

- In lieu plantings – This concept strikes me as problematical. If I don't want to replant on my property, should I be able to meet the obligation by planting on city property or someone else's property? First, that looks like a real challenge to keep track of. And it would be a hodge-podge if private property owners could go onto city property and say "See, I planted a tree in the park". The city should do the planting on city property, unless it's a coordinated volunteer program, so that we get the right species, in the right places, properly executed. In this case I would actually support an in-lieu fee to make sure it's executed right.
- But my basic thought is that if we require replants on private property, we should expect the property owner to put the tree in the ground. And we shouldn't require a replant at all unless there is truly space and a satisfactory location, and a purpose that fits with a long term urban forest management plan.
- 80% restriction on development – this current restriction strikes me as very inequitable. It would be good to just drop that concept out of the next edition.
- There is punitive sentiment to force the city to follow its own ordinance. Certainly we should. But paying monetary penalties to ourselves would be crazy. We need an ordinance that works for the city, and can actually be followed. A coercive ordinance just won't hold up with the ups and downs of available funding.
- Landscaping plans for development – If we do require a tree planting plan along with a development project, let's keep the scope to only the significant trees. Let's not review whether petunia's or pansies are the right choice for the flower bed next to the front steps. And for stormwater management purposes, we might be looking for more than the trees, but still not every bush outside of the bioswale.
- View protection – good luck with this one. I do feel there's a point about property owners who create massive hedges that block views.

That's what comes of mind for now.

All the best,
Bill Kampe

From: Thom Akeman [mailto:thomakeman@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, August 01, 2011 3:52 PM
To: Sarah Hardgrave
Subject: RE: Urban Forest Management Plan Update

Sarah --

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the tree planning process. I've attended two of the three public meetings to date and have some concerns I haven't expressed in the interest of not prolonging those events. I assumed a better opportunity would come some time. I'll make it now.

I'm concerned about three things I've heard to date.

1) **Natives:** The city consultants have pointed out that three species dominate trees in PG in tones that suggest that's a bad thing. That's basically a natural thing. Those are the trees that evolution established here because they thrive in local conditions, support the natural wildlife that depend on them, and don't require unseasonal irrigation. That's why natives are defined as the preferred trees in the city's master plan and the opening paragraphs of the city's tree preservation ordinance.

I believe the Audubon Society and California Native Plant Society sent the city council a letter last year explaining the decline in canopy to date has wiped out some native species of birds and diminished the numbers of others. The letter essentially outlined the importance of protecting natural habitat.

2) **Snags:** Some people snags are unsightly or dangerous, and generally useless. Approximately five years ago, when a city committee was reviewing the tree ordinance to see if it could be more enforceable, Public Works had an opinion that logs on the ground provide the same environmental value as standing snags. That didn't sound right, so the committee asked two PG residents who have written definitive books on local birds if they had any information on that. They both said that without snags, we will lose woodpeckers. They recommended that tree cutters leave snags standing at least 12 to 15 feet in places where that would be safe. That was written into the revisions at that time and are still part of the current ordinance. Many sizeable snags have been left since then -- at safe distances from streets, walkways and structures. To the best of my knowledge, none has caused any damage or injury while keeping woodpeckers from utilizing the eaves of our houses.

3) **CEQA:** The timeline confuses me. As I understand it, a proposed plan with ordinance revisions should be finished about the end of October. Then after a CEQA review, that should be ready for adoption by the end of the year.

I'm not a lawyer, but to me that sounds like a predisposition of a negative declaration. I don't understand that. The presentations to date have explained how we've lost more than 40% of our tree canopy in the past 25 years. Some of the concepts being discussed would cause a lot more lose in the years ahead.

I'm not a birder, but as I understand the experts among us that loss of canopy has and will have tremendous impacts on natural bird life here, as well as the ecosystems mentioned in our local coastal plan that depend on fog drip from the pines to survive. Those seem to me to be significant environmental impacts that should be seriously analyzed before the city acts.

To the best of my knowledge, the city has never done a full EIR on any tree issue except the management plan for George Washington Park, which I believe was adopted in 1999 (then generally ignored). We've looked at trees as individual issues in isolated circumstances. But it seems to me we now have convincing information that we have caused a cumulative impact that has had negative environmental effects. If we may be proposing to continue that -- or even expand or hasten that -- I don't see how we can not do some significant analyses of probable environmental impacts before proceeding.

I think that may have exceeded my three-minute time limit, so thanks for offering to accept comments this way.

--Thom

Thom Akeman
thomakeman@sbcglobal.net
Phone: 831-649-0187
Mobile: 831-601-9180
Mail: Box 22, Pacific Grove, CA 93950

-----Original Message-----

From: Linnet Harlan [mailto:linnetharlan@earthlink.net]

Sent: Tuesday, August 02, 2011 7:37 PM

To: Sarah Hardgrave

Cc: Linnet Harlan

Subject: Re: Urban Forest Management Plan Update

Hi Sarah,

Thanks for the update.

The more I think about the tree issue, the more important I think the idea of replacing trees that are cut down during the development process is. As you may remember, at the recent Council meeting at which the plan was discussed, Councilmember Fischer said the problem was there were now houses where there once had been trees.

We moved to PG in 1990 and it was fully built-up then. So the deforestation appears to be as a result of people replacing small houses with larger houses. I know of at least three houses in our neighborhood where at least one tree was cut down so a much larger houses (2 or 3 times as large) could be built on the property.

I'm not suggesting a solution here. In fact, I'd be loathe to suggest the Planning Commission and/or ARB start requiring tree planting. However, I think for us to craft a successful tree ordinance, we must understand what happened to the 40% of the canopy that disappeared in the last 25 years. Why did it disappear? Why were replacements not planted?

Right now my thought would be the above development of larger houses plus usual mortality without replanting. Let me know if there are other factors I should be aware of and thinking about.

Thanks,
Linnet

From: Jay Tulley [mailto:jay.tulley@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, August 02, 2011 9:29 PM

To: Sarah Hardgrave

Subject: urban forest map

Sarah,

Great work setting up the workshop. Here is a website that would be a great model for us. I realize it is tough to do something like this, but maybe we could just start small. Or maybe make this a high school project.

<http://urbanforestmap.org/>

Thanks,

Jay

-----Original Message-----

From: Bruce and Judy [<mailto:brucenjudy@mailbug.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, August 02, 2011 7:21 PM

To: Sarah Hardgrave; bwiseman@RBF.com; jpallen@cruzio.com

Subject: Urban Forest Management: Comments

(Published in Cedar Street Times, July 29, 2011--includes photos of damages from fallen trees)

URBAN FOREST MANAGEMENT: COMMENTS

By Bruce Cowan

Environmental Landscape Consultant--Retired

Pacific Grove has hired Bill Wiseman of RBF Consulting and James Allen, Consulting Arborist, to work with a selected Urban Forest Advisory Committee to attempt to resolve tree canopy removal/replacement and tree safety issues. A handout they provide has good diagrams, illustrations and tables relating to Pacific Grove. A preliminary meeting took place on July 14, followed by a public workshop July 27 on these issues. I include here my personal comments on the following:

1) Decline of the tree canopy. Coverage has decreased 42 percent since 1986.

Comments: Early in the 20th century some extensive fires on the Monterey Peninsula burned and renewed vast tracts of forest. Monterey pines rejuvenated quickly from seeds and grew fast. By mid century there was a healthy tree canopy. Monterey pines (*Pinus radiata*) are short-lived trees, generally about the life span of a human. Later in the 20th century the tree canopy was mostly overmature pines, which died, fell, or caused serious problems and concerns and had to be cut.

Even if many more Monterey pines were planted, the tree canopy would temporarily be less until the new pines grew. Most people like trees, but they hesitate to replant in their yards with a species that causes fear to live under, expense to maintain or remove, or subjects them to the negative aspects of a tree ordinance. No one should have to live under a LANDMARK TREE-- "A large TREE that will make its MARK when it LANDS".

Of the three native species--pine, cypress and oaks, coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*) is most compatible in residential yards, and it makes a nice but lower canopy than pines. Oak worms/moths are a pest causing cleanup problems, but are not a danger to humans. So far sudden oak death disease has not been much of a problem on the Monterey Peninsula.

Monterey cypress trees (*Cupressus macrocarpa*) get too large for small yards and require extensive maintenance and branch pruning to keep them safe. Notice the huge cypress uplifting the corner of Whalers Cabin at Point Lobos!

2) Trees are a Pacific Grove Brand. They are a key marketing vehicle and have community aesthetic value.

Comment: The "Piney Woods", is one reason tourists come, and one of the main features that attracted me to come live here--along with the wonderful shoreline.

3) Environmental Benefits include canopy interception of rain, infiltration into soils, consumption by vegetation, pollutant removal, soil stabilization, and streamside and coastal buffers to protect the Marine Sanctuary. Carbon sequestration helps reduce global warming.

Comment: In general, none of these can be disputed.

4) Economic benefits for Pacific Grove are calculated as follows: Amenity/Replacement Cost--\$209,000,000. Carbon Storage \$222,000. Annual Pollution Removal \$177,000. Annual Carbon Sequestration \$18,100. Energy Savings \$12,400.

Comments: The monetary values of the benefits listed here were said to be based on data from the Pacific Northwest. Air quality, including carbon sequestration and air pollution removal, should be looked at specifically for Pacific Grove. Most of our air is fresh, clean and comes directly from over the ocean. The biggest benefit trees have here regarding air is to block the northwest ocean wind, which makes the outdoors more comfortable for people and for many garden plants.

Pacific Grove, a town of only a few square miles, is surrounded on at least two sides by rather dense pine and oak forest and has its own forests in Washington and Rip Van Winkle parks. The other boundaries are the Pacific Ocean and Monterey Bay. Trees occurring on residential lots would have a miniscule effect on air quality in California, even within Pacific Grove. Smog occasionally occurs when we get a northeast air mass moving in from the SF Bay Area. A southeast air movement from the Santa Lucia mountains during fire season may bring smoke.

On the whole, trees contribute monetarily to the City with increased tourism, and create a sense of well being and reduce stress--unless you happen to live under a Landmark Tree that causes you to lose sleep on windy nights, or you can't afford to remove the tree and pay permit fees and replacement costs. Potentially hazardous trees can greatly increase monetary and emotional stress to the owner and to nearby neighbors who are threatened if this tree falls. Even large branches can be scary; one falling branch killed a tourist visiting the Monarch Sanctuary a few years ago.

Del Monte Park neighborhood has many large-branched overmature trees which are getting older each year. These solitary trees towering over houses are often more massive than forest trees which compete for sunlight and shoot mainly upward with smaller, shorter branches and more slender trunks.

Regarding Energy Savings: Trees may keep the air a little warmer during winter nights, slightly reducing heating bills. On the other side of the coin, houses surrounded by trees are much slower to warm up during the day and may actually require more heating.

Energy savings can be achieved using solar panels on the roof. However, solar panels are uneconomical and useless if the house is shaded by trees a good part of the day.

In most cities and towns, trees provide energy savings because their shade reduces the need for air conditioning--the single greatest use of electricity during hot summer weather. In cool foggy Pacific Grove air conditioning is not needed. Most residents don't even have it. If it gets a little warm, open a window!

5) Risk Assessment--the likelihood that a tree or tree part will fall and cause injury or damage, and Hazard--the presence of a condition when the potential for injury or damage due to tree failure exceeds a threshold that is defined by the tree owner or managing agency.

Comments: Trees with wood rot, dangerous dead branches, or which are leaning heavily can be identified as hazardous trees. However, a windstorm can topple a tree of any size--even a perfectly healthy looking tree. Size is probably the most important criteria, especially with Monterey pine. A sapling, or a tree ten feet tall with a two or three inch diameter probably won't hurt anything if it falls; it could even be propped up. A 20 foot tree with a six inch diameter could do some damage to a roof or parked car, but probably wouldn't kill anyone.

Any one hundred foot Monterey pine with a three to four foot diameter trunk and huge spreading branches--many as big as medium sized trees--should be regarded as high risk no matter how healthy it looks. In Del Monte Park near the corner of Presidio and Lincoln, and further up Presidio, three or four such pines and one cypress fell over during the past decade, doing damage to at least three homes. One very large pine fell on a calm, windless September evening.

During the October 2009 windstorm, three large pines fell in Del Monte Park. Electricity was off for a couple of days. One tree on Buena Vista knocked down a power pole onto a vehicle. A tree on lower Lincoln fell

straight across the street; the only thing that saved a house it was aiming for was a very long setback from the street.

A very tall, perfectly healthy looking pine with no sign of heartrot fell diagonally across two houses on Presidio, smashing the corners of both. One resident's life was saved only because a neighbor had warned him the tree was leaning only a few minutes before it toppled.

Later a huge Monterey pine fell across the heavily traveled Holman Highway between Safeway and the Presidio Ave. exit; luckily not onto any vehicles.

My wife and I moved into our Del Monte Park house in 1971 because we loved the forest of pines, oaks and huckleberries that grew naturally on our property. However the pines were very tall, old and rather scary during windstorms whenever branches fell on our roof. Two pines were already dead. Over several years the old, dead and structurally hazardous pines were removed. We kept two healthy looking pines I thought would never fall. During one winter storm the taller "healthy" pine fell between two houses behind our property, smashing a shed; luckily no one was killed or injured. Later the shorter bushy pine broke and fell onto our next door neighbors' house, punching a hole in their roof.

Our oaks have grown very large since then to make their own canopy, giving us a wonderful shaded woodland garden that requires no irrigation. These are for the most part less threatening than the pines. However, a certified arborist who has just inspected our largest oak pointed out and described some major structural problems in the main trunk where it branches into two, and suggested I apply for a tree removal permit. Oak wood is much heavier than pine, and can do more damage to structures. It's not a matter of IF it will separate and crash down onto our neighbor's house, and maybe ours, it is a matter of WHEN, he said. So now, I learned, we are living under a LANDMARK TREE.

-----Original Message-----

From: Esther Trosow [<mailto:etrosow@93950.com>]

Sent: Thursday, August 04, 2011 11:11 AM

To: Jim Becklenberg

Cc: Bruce and Judy; Mike Zimmer; Sarah Hardgrave; cg54@comcast.net; danmiller39@comcast.net; rudyfischer@earthlink.net; bill@billkampe.org; alanpg@comcast.net; kencun17@sbcglobal.net; bwiseman@RBF.com; jpallen@cruzio.com; georgiabooth@att.net; Thomas Frutche; Francis X. Villablanca; blakematheson129@aol.com; alsaxepg@gmail.com; fishtaless@sbcglobal.net; david myers; huitt@comcast.net

Subject: Re: Blue gum eucalyptus

Another issue with the nectar sources is what sort of chemicals the plants brought into the sanctuary have been treated with. These plants must come from trusted sources that have not used dangerous chemicals on them. On blogs, Cherubini has spoken highly of Malathion on milkweed (not in PG, but the zeal is there and he was heavily involved in the nectar source conversation and may be fostering some plants for the sanctuary, or advising those who are).

Esther

On 8/4/2011 10:21 AM, Jim Becklenberg wrote:

> All:

> City staff will be meeting in the Sanctuary on August 15th with Dr. Stu Weiss, Dr. Monte Sanford, and Bob Pacelli to discuss and hear recommendations regarding optimal number and placement of potted Eucalyptus trees and nectar strategies for next fall. All actions will conform to the approved Sanctuary Management Plan, or be raised to the City Council for approval.

>

> We'll keep you posted.

>

> Jim Becklenberg

> Deputy City Manager

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Esther Trosow [<mailto:etrosow@93950.com>]

> Sent: Thursday, August 04, 2011 9:27 AM

> To: Bruce and Judy

> Cc: Mike Zimmer; Sarah Hardgrave; cg54@comcast.net; danmiller39@comcast.net; rudyfischer@earthlink.net; bill@billkampe.org; alanpg@comcast.net; huitt@redshift.com; kencun17@sbcglobal.net; bwiseman@RBF.com; jpallen@cruzio.com; georgiabooth@att.net; Thomas Frutche; Jim Becklenberg; Francis X. Villablanca

> Subject: Re: Blue gum eucalyptus

>

> Greetings Monarch enthusiasts:

>

> I went to the Sanctuary yesterday, and was really disappointed to see that the ridiculous and potentially dangerous (to wildlife as well as human sanity) string around the new potted eucs was still there.

>

> In addition (see photos attached), I see that at least one of the recently planted eucs is not thriving. The planted one in "8-3 006_deadeuc.jpg" shows that one right in the middle of the photo. Should

>

> that be replaced asap?

>

> The area where Brokaw Hall used to stand is now the path of least
> resistance for people traversing through the sanctuary. I saw two
> runners go through it, and many footprints indicate this is now a new
> path. The mayor stated that BH would be rebuilt (in her state of the
> city speech). I hope that will happen asap, and want to help get that
> going. In any event, please be aware that this new path is being
> created.

>
> I have attached two views of the sanctuary from the downhill side of the
>
> BH site. I am concerned about the hole that now exists. I will leave it
> to Stu whether that poses a threat to the habitat. It's just that all of
>
> the photos I've seen so far were taken from uphill (because the
> construction fence was there at the time). Eyeballing what is there now,
>
> I wonder if the trees downhill from the euc roosting site along the
> fence line are now more vulnerable to winds. Last year, I saw many
> monarchs on those trees directly in sight line from downhill, and hope
> this space will not affect them. If I remember correctly, the
> butterflies favored those trees a few months after their arrival.

>
> Also, I hope the plan is still to keep those nectar sources in boxes or
> planters, not directly in the ground. I have heard through the grapevine
>
> about some non-native ones that are in the works. Do we have an equal
> number of likely native ones? And how will the butterflies' preference
> to these sources be measured? Perhaps the team from SLO could set up a
> scientifically legitimate way of monitoring this, rather than relying on
>
> arbitrary observations?

>
> Cheers,
> Esther
>
>
> On 7/31/2011 12:58 PM, Esther Trosow wrote:
>> The point of the recent letters about eucs was the ones in pots are
>> overkill. The eucs that were trimmed are growing back. The ones that
>> were planted (from last year's potted trees are in the ground per
>> Stuart Weiss' plan (with a few extras that Bob insisted on).
>>
>> The question I have been raising is about the 35-40 extra ones that
>> have been "farmed" and brought into the sanctuary since Weiss okayed
>> the first lot.
>>
>> Perhaps they have been removed (despite Bob's "web" of string. I hope
>> so. If they are still there, they need to be removed. I'm hoping from
>> Bruce's comments they are already gone. They are superfluous to Stu's
>> plan and may cause harm massed where they were tied.
>>
>> Esther
>>
>> On 7/31/2011 9:44 AM, Bruce and Judy wrote:
>>> To City of Pacific Grove:
>>>
>>> Various e-mail messages I've seen had a lot of pros and cons
>>> regarding the planting of large numbers of new blue gum eucalyptus in

>>> the Monarch Sanctuary.
>>> As you may remember, I have maintained that I would refrain from
>>> getting involved--unless this invasive species were to be planted
>>> Washington Park, Rip Van Winkle and other open space areas where it
>>> doesn't already occur. I had mentioned that dozens or even hundreds
>>> of eucalyptus seedlings come up each year from the seeds of one large
>>> tree at the corner Congress and Forest Lodge; that a eucalyptus
>>> forest will occupy that area in a decade or so if I, or City staff,
>>> don't pull them every year.
>>>
>>> Anyway, I went to the Monarch Sanctuary to see for myself. It
>>> appears that the new ones are being planted along the south
>>> boundary, south of the pathway, where the tall eucalyptus have been
>>> for a long time. These would serve to add to the windbreak potential
>>> of the taller eucalyptus already in this grove. As long as new
>>> eucalyptus are restricted to this part of the sanctuary I can
>>> understand the benefit they may provide and have no objection.
>>>
>>> An article with photographs about eucalyptus in the Monarch
>>> Sanctuary appears on page 15 in the current issue of Cedar Street
>>> Times.
>>>
>>> (Also, on page 16, is an article I wrote pertaining to the Urban
>>> Forest Management workshops involving the benefits and risks of
>>> large canopy trees in residential neighborhoods.)
>>>
>>> Surprisingly eucalyptus seedlings don't sprout up in huge numbers in
>>> the Monarch Sanctuary as they do in some other areas.
>>>
>>> Bruce Cowan
>>> Environmental Landscape Consultant--Retired
>>>
>>> -----
>>> Sent without a computer! www.mailbug.com GetMailBugInfo@landel.com
>>> -----
>>>
>
>

From: Esther Trosow [mailto:etrosow@93950.com]
Sent: Friday, August 05, 2011 12:53 PM
To: Georgia Booth; bwiseman@RBF.com; JAMES P. ALLEN
Cc: 'Bruce and Judy'; cg54@comcast.net; 'Francis X. Villablanca'; Jim Becklenberg; Mike Zimmer; danmiller39@comcast.net; 'david myers'; huitt@comcast.net; 'ken cuneo'; rudyfischer@earthlink.net; Sarah Hardgrave; Stuart Weiss
Subject: Re: Blue gum eucalyptus

I totally agree about the need for collaboration. But what that shouldn't turn into is what has already been seen: acquiescing to the citizen who makes the most noise. We need to put Dr. Weiss back in the driver's seat on advising the city how to proceed with fixing the sanctuary. I'm sure he can handle a real conversation with other bone fide experts. He doesn't need heartache from one or two citizens--that's just not right. I hope the city staff will find a way to keep that scenario, which has already played out, from happening again.

I have been copying my monarch-related emails to the folks at RBF, but I've been getting some of the emails to Mr. Wiseman back as undeliverable.

Cheers,
Esther

On 8/5/2011 9:35 AM, Georgia Booth wrote:

I am grateful that Bruce Cowan is being included in this conversation. I appreciate this collaborative approach that includes the expert knowledge and recommendations of Dr. Villablanca, Dr. Weiss, and Mr. Cowan. I hope Mr. Wiseman and Mr. Allen are included as well.

Leave room for the butterflies,
Georgia Booth

From: Esther Trosow [<mailto:etrosow@93950.com>]

Sent: Friday, August 05, 2011 8:35 AM

To: 'Bruce and Judy'; cg54@comcast.net; Francis X. Villablanca; Jim Becklenberg; Mike Zimmer

Cc: danmiller39@comcast.net; david myers; huit@comcast.net; ken cuneo; rudyfischer@earthlink.net; Sarah Hardgrave

Subject: Fwd: Re: Blue gum eucalyptus

Here are some suggestions about native nectar sources from Bruce Cowan. There are already a lot of mature Pride of Madeira plants growing at the sanctuary, and I hope those will be left where they are (in the ground). They bloom too late to welcome the monarchs on arrival, but are good later in the season. Last year, the PoM weren't pruned, and their bloom was not as strong as it could have been. I saw lots of monarchs around the bottlebrush as well, so I hope those will be left in the ground.

It's the new buddlia, chaste tree, and other plants (maybe ivy?) that need to be in containers because of their potential to spread.

Is anyone obtaining the plants?

Esther

----- Original Message -----

Subject: Re: Blue gum eucalyptus

Date: Fri, 05 Aug 2011 08:08:19 -0700

From: Esther Trosow <etrosow@93950.com>

To: Bruce and Judy <brucenjudy@mailbug.com>

Yes, but the problem is that they need something in bloom when the butterflies are arriving in October, supposedly to encourage them to roost here & not move on.

Esther

On 8/4/2011 10:37 PM, Bruce and Judy wrote:

> On August 4, 2011 at 10:40am -0700, you wrote:

>

> On the question of native vs. non-native nectar sources for monarch butterflies:

>

> The food source they seem to prefer the most is a non-native shrub called Pride of Madiera (*Echium fastosum*). It is a large gray-green shrub with showy purple spikes of flowers usually in March, April or May. One or more are already in the Sanctuary. This needs to be planted in the ground, probably won't do well in a container. Needs sun.

>
> _____
>
> Native shrubs and plants:
>
> Chaparral currant (*Ribes malvaceum*). Blooms November through December,
maybe as early as October if there is rain.
>
> Pink flowering currant (*Ribes sanguineum glutinosum*). Blooms January
through February, maybe as early as December and into early March.
>
> Ceanothus 'Ray Hartman' A large ceanothus with abundant blooms and long
blooming season, perhaps February through April. Not sure if monarchs are
attracted much to ceanothus.
>
> Douglas iris (*Iris douglasiana*) blooms March and April. A few were planted
last year, does well in shade. I don't know if Monarchs feed on iris
blossoms.
>
> Notes: Pink flowering and chaparral currants are attractive to butterflies
and hummingbirds, and bloom at the proper time for overwintering monarchs.
Deer may feed on them, and especially on the Ray Hartman ceanothus, so they
would definitely all need deer fencing when small. Chaparral currant seems
less eaten by deer than the others. A ceanothus that can be tried is a
smaller shorter-lived one with tiny leaves that deer don't eat, with a short
blooming season in March, that is called Ceanothus 'Julia Phelps.'
>
>
> --Bruce Cowan
> Environmental Landscape Consultant--Retired
> _____>>
>>> Greetings Monarch enthusiasts:
>>>
>>> Also, I hope the plan is still to keep those nectar sources in boxes or
>>> planters, not directly in the ground. I have heard through the grapevine
>>>
>>> about some non-native ones that are in the works. Do we have an equal
>>> number of likely native ones? And how will the butterflies' preference
>>> to these sources be measured? Perhaps the team from SLO could set up a
>>> scientifically legitimate way of monitoring this, rather than relying on
>>>
>>> arbitrary observations?
>>>
>>> Cheers,
>>> Esther
>>>
>>>
> -----
> Sent without a computer! www.mailbug.com GetMailBugInfo@landel.com
> -----

-----Original Message-----

From: Bruce and Judy [<mailto:brucenjudy@mailbug.com>]

Sent: Saturday, August 06, 2011 3:33 PM

To: cg54@comcast.net; Mike Zimmer; Roque Pinheiro; PG Volunteers; mannel@pgmuseum.org; holdren@pgmuseum.org; volunteer@pgmuseum.org; Thomas Frutche; eleanorathens@netscape.net; Sarah Hardgrave; bwiseman@RBF.com; jpallen@cruzio.com; cg54@comcast.net; danmiller39@comcast.net; rudyfischer@earthlink.net; bill@billkampe.org; alanpg@comcast.net; huitt@redshift.com; kencun17@sbcglobal.net

Subject: Ehrharta Erecta--invasive weed

Panic veldt grass (*Ehrharta erecta*) is the weedy perennial grass from a few inches to 4 feet tall with long stems and thousands of tiny seeds which grow and ripen continually. It is an invasive grass of natural areas as well as an extreme garden weed. Allegedly it was introduced from South Africa by a well known botanist, Ledyard Stebbins, to "improve the pastures". The USDA sponsored the introduction of new grasses to the US in the 1950's.

I think this "Stebbins' grass" could be the biggest threat to the natural habitats in Rip Van Winkle Open Space as well as Del Monte Forest. I've been pulling it out at Rip Van Winkle near the parking area, but recently found a couple of patches too large to pull. It comes up through any groundcover or shrub, has replaced seaside daisies and woodmint under cypress at Point Lobos, and it sets seeds continually. It could certainly crowd out and prevent new pine or oak seedlings from growing. It is the hardest weed to control in my Pacific Grove volunteer projects, where I spent 31 hours in July and 70 hours in June, mostly weeding. It can grow right in those African irises at the Civic Center and is almost impossible to locate and pull out.

Fortunately I've only found a couple of fairly big ones among the irises in the Museum back garden and removed them before the seeds were mature. If it took over the Museum gardens it could ruin them forever because it can't even be sprayed when mixed in with the other plants. These invasive weeds are all over our Del Monte Park neighborhood and could take over and ruin my own yard landscape quickly if I didn't keep an eye out for it and remove each one that appears before it sets seed. As it is, I only find maybe one or two per year, and get them as soon as I see them.

Ehrharta can't be controlled effectively unless the seed sources are completely eliminated for several years. When I first saw a small patch getting started in my yard probably 30 years ago I didn't know what it was and I let it grow. By the next year it was already becoming extremely invasive, so I got rid of it and have not let any grow since. Also I help keep it out of our next door neighbors' yards.

Ehrharta grass is much harder to control than pampas grass and most other weeds. It has already taken over many gardens in Pacific Grove. In time I'm afraid it will fill in and become the dominant groundcover everywhere in the forest, displacing creeping snowberry, woodmint, ferns etc.. A nightmare.

--Bruce Cowan
Landscape Volunteer

>

>

-----Original Message-----

From: Bruce and Judy [<mailto:brucenjudy@mailbug.com>]

Sent: Monday, August 08, 2011 8:35 PM

To: Sarah Hardgrave; bwiseman@RBF.com; jpallen@cruzio.com; tmoss@parks.ca.gov; r wells@vlastudio.com; kamatra@comcast.net; cg54@comcast.net; Mike Zimmer; Roque Pinheiro; PG Volunteers; danmiller39@comcast.net; rudyfischer@earthlink.net; bill@billkampe.org; alanpg@comcast.net; huitt@redshift.com; kencun17@sbcglobal.net; brucenjudy@mailbug.com; georgiabooth@att.net; pgfog@sbcglobal.net
Subject: Preserving our Natural Forests

To: Urban Forest Advisory Committee and Consultants:

PRESERVING OUR NATURAL FORESTS

Most of the discussions with UFAC so far have been about tree ordinances, tree safety issues on private properties, and the effects of reduced tree canopy throughout residential areas.

I would like to propose some discussion about trees that still exist in PG's natural forests, particularly Washington Park and Rip Van Winkle Open Space.

BACKGROUND:

Both of these areas have natural forests of Monterey pine and coast live oak. Major differences include the understory vegetation, which in turn influences forest health. Aside from plentiful poison oak, blackberry and woodmint--mostly in the northern section, the understory of Washington park (and the Monarch Sanctuary) is almost entirely made up of non-native weeds--ripgut grass, foxtail grass, wild oats, rattlesnake grass, ryegrass, and in winter the invasive yellow oxalis which produces by bulbs and can't be eliminated by any means other than spraying. A few patches of heavy turf- forming Kikuyu grass are spreading. Much of the native understory remaining in Washington Park is rapidly being covered with very invasive South African cape ivy (*Delairea odorata*), a fast growing herbaceous vine that smothers native shrubs, groundcovers and even small trees.

Rip Van Winkle still has extended areas of largely weed-free native understory vegetation in addition to poison oak and wild blackberry, including wood mint, creeping snowberry, with some wild strawberry, yerba buena, sticky monkey flower, native Douglas iris and native grasses. It is also possible habitat for Yadon's rein orchid (*Piperia yadonii*), an endangered species. However non-native weeds are encroaching, including most of the above, plus panic veldt grass (*Ehrharta erecta*) purposely introduced to California from South Africa. This perennial grass, which seeds itself prolifically throughout the year with thousands of tiny seeds on long narrow stems protruding in every direction, can come up through any groundcover and substantially change the habitat.

This weed is also beginning to become established in Washington Park--so far mostly in small areas in the southwest portion of the section north of Pine Ave.

Poison hemlock (*Conium maculatum*), a serious invasive plant which is taking over much of Point Lobos and other areas, is poised to invade Rip Van Winkle. It is now being removed from upper Congress greenbelts.

Genista (French broom) is a big problem in many of our natural forest areas, crowding out native understory and increasing fire hazard. It has largely been removed from Rip Van Winkle, but since the thousands of seeds each shrub produces can come up every year for many decades control of seedlings must continue indefinitely. Genista still grows in a steep ravine behind the laundry and in adjacent Pebble Beach property. There are scattered genista in Washington Park, mostly just north of the ball field.

Pampas grass, one of the worst threats to our forests, has been eliminated from Rip Van Winkle and adjacent Del Monte Forest open space, and from PG High School property. However much pampas grass

remains near Arnett Park mostly on steep slopes and on private properties along Sunset Drive, which are seed sources for reinfesting all open space areas.

Kikuyu grass doesn't seed itself often, but wherever established spreads by rhizomes and makes thick turf in which no tree seedlings or other native plants can establish and grow. It is virtually impossible to eliminate by pulling.

Rip Van Winkle is also subject to invasions of eucalyptus and acacias from Australia and myoporum from New Zealand which have been planted on nearby properties. Seedlings of eucalyptus and myoporum are removed each year from within and adjacent to Rip Van Winkle, and a black acacia--a very invasive species that spreads by suckers as well as seeds--was killed by girdling several years ago.

Hottentot fig ice plant from South Africa is a major impediment to all native vegetation in coastal areas, such as the Lighthouse grounds, and at Asilomar State Park, where control and eradication efforts have been ongoing for decades.

All of the above weedy plants can greatly reduce ability for pines and oaks to replenish themselves because they prevent seedling establishment and out compete the tree seedlings that do sprout. Annual grasses present a fire hazard when they dry up, and mowing may be necessary--which scatters the seeds even more. Native understory disappears, and the result is groves of mature trees with a weedy understory, not a true forest. An example is the Country Club Gate Shopping Center, where the native monkeyflowers and other native vegetation (except poison oak) soon disappeared completely after the shopping center was built and were replaced by weeds, genista and ice plant. Some new pines, oaks and Monterey cypress have been planted, however, and where weeds have been sprayed some new pine seedlings are volunteering.

Early in the 20th Century fires burned a lot of the existing natural forest. Pines, which sprout up from seed quickly after fires, grew old and are now mostly in a state of decline. Many have died or fallen. Oaks grew too, largely from acorns planted by scrub jays and squirrels. Oaks are longer lived and slower growing. Oaks can grow well in the shade of pines (if the small ones survive the deer), but pines are not very shade tolerant and do not do well under oaks. Many areas of Washington Park and most of Rip Van Winkle are undergoing natural tree succession, changing from mature pine forest to mature oaks. This is called Climax Forest.

FOR DISCUSSION

1. Should oaks be removed from certain areas to replenish Monterey pines?
Or should natural plant succession of pine to oak be allowed to continue?
2. Should reforestation be mostly by planting, watering and taking care of young trees as in a landscape?
Or by removing weedy understory and/or spreading pine wood chips, in which case pine and oak seedlings come up abundantly on their own and require no irrigation? Some areas along upper Congress Ave. below David are examples that are succeeding. The area at the south end of Washington Park where chips were spread to cover the ground will be a good area to monitor for pine seedlings likely sprouting up next winter.
3. Should genista, pampas grass, panic veldt grass, Kikuyu grass, weedy annual grasses, cape ivy and other weeds only be removed manually? If so, who is going to do it? Or should they be sprayed with a relatively safe product like Glyphosate (Roundup), taking care to avoid spraying native vegetation? Or should the forest be left to its own devices, to eventually become within a century or two a thicket of invasive non-native weeds, genista, pampas grass, cape ivy, acacias, myoporum and probably eucalyptus--with scattered aging oak trees, willows along the creeks of Rip Van Winkle, and poison oak and wild blackberry being probably the only native survivors?

Submitted by Bruce Cowan

Environmental Landscape Consultant and volunteer weed puller for City.

Environmental Horticulturist, Asilomar State Park 1968-1974.

Member of Committee with Vern Williams to purchase Rip Van Winkle Open Space.

Del Monte Forest Open Space Advisory Committee (OSAC) member over 30 years.

Registered Invasive Plant Control Volunteer at Point Lobos.
Member & past Monterey Chapter President, California Native Plant Society
Member of California Invasive Plant Council (Cal-IPC)

-----Original Message-----

From: Bruce and Judy [<mailto:brucenjudy@mailbug.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, August 09, 2011 8:09 AM

To: Sarah Hardgrave; bwiseman@RBF.com; jpallen@cruzio.com; cg54@comcast.net; Mike Zimmer; Roque Pinheiro; PG Volunteers; danmiller39@comcast.net; rudyfischer@earthlink.net; bill@billkampe.org; alanpg@comcast.net; huitt@redshift.com; kencun17@sbcglobal.net; Thomas Frutchey; georgiabooth@att.net; pgfog@sbcglobal.net
Subject: Preserving our Natural Forests--addition

To: Urban Forest Advisory Committee and Consultants:

(Additional item to discuss--see #4)

PRESERVING OUR NATURAL FORESTS

FOR DISCUSSION

1. Should oaks be removed from certain areas to replenish Monterey pines?
Or should natural plant succession of pine to oak be allowed to continue?
2. Should reforestation be mostly by planting, watering and taking care of young trees as in a landscape?
Or by removing weedy understory and/or spreading pine wood chips, in which case pine and oak seedlings come up abundantly on their own and require no irrigation? Some areas along upper Congress Ave. below David are examples that are succeeding. The area at the south end of Washington Park where chips were spread to cover the ground will be a good area to monitor for pine seedlings likely sprouting up next winter.
3. Should genista, pampas grass, panic veldt grass, Kikuyu grass, weedy annual grasses, cape ivy and other weeds only be removed manually? If so, who is going to do it? Or should they be sprayed with a relatively safe product like Glyphosate (Roundup), taking care to avoid spraying native vegetation? Or should the forest be left to its own devices, to eventually become within a century or two a thicket of invasive non-native weeds, genista, pampas grass, cape ivy, acacias, myoporum and probably eucalyptus--with scattered aging oak trees, willows along the creeks of Rip Van Winkle, and poison oak and wild blackberry being probably the only native survivors?
4. Dead and dying trees can pose a hazard even in a forest where they are near trails, streets, nearby homes, picnic areas etc. There are many such trees in Washington Park. A pine fell across a picnic table in Washington Park recently. On the other hand, dead standing trees provide habitat for woodpeckers and other fauna. To what extent should dead tree removal be part of a natural forest management plan for Pacific Grove?
Grove open space?

Submitted by Bruce Cowan

Environmental Landscape Consultant and volunteer weed puller for City.

Environmental Horticulturist, Asilomar State Park 1968-1974.

Member of Committee with Vern Williams to purchase Rip Van Winkle Open Space.

Del Monte Forest Open Space Advisory Committee (OSAC) member over 30 years.

Registered Invasive Plant Control Volunteer at Point Lobos.

Member & past Monterey Chapter President, California Native Plant Society

Member of California Invasive Plant Council (Cal-IPC)

Sent without a computer! www.mailbug.com GetMailBugInfo@landel.com

-----Original Message-----

From: Sarah Hardgrave

Sent: Tuesday, August 09, 2011 2:06 PM

To: Bruce and Judy; bwiseman@RBF.com; jpallen@cruzio.com; cg54@comcast.net; Mike Zimmer; Roque Pinheiro; PG Volunteers; danmiller39@comcast.net; rudyfischer@earthlink.net; bill@billkampe.org; alanpg@comcast.net; huitt@redshift.com; kencun17@sbcglobal.net; Thomas Frutche; georgiabooth@att.net; pgfog@sbcglobal.net; David; setwave@msn.com; fishtaless@sbcglobal.net; jbileci@lawmonterey.com; etrosow@93950.com; Jim Becklenberg

Subject: RE: Preserving our Natural Forests--addition

Hi Bruce and all,

Thank you for your continued input and involvement in the UFMP process. We are continuing to get good input from folks via e-mail since the community workshop.

Our consultant contract does not provide time for Bill Wiseman and James Allen to be responding to all of this correspondence. Nor is it within their scope to be involved with Monarch Sanctuary issues. As the lead staff person on the UFMP, I'm responsible for ensuring our consultant team's time is spent on the specific tasks we have hired them to do. Unfortunately, processing all of the e-mail takes away from that time and comes at an expense of other tasks.

Therefore, please make City staff, me and Mike Zimmer, your main points of contact on the UFMP, and we will provide all comments to our consulting team. We will make sure that all of this very good input is added to and included with the full range of comments we are getting at the UFMP meetings and beyond.

Best regards, Sarah

Sarah Hardgrave
Environmental Programs Manager
City of Pacific Grove
(831) 648-3189 or
(831) 648-5722 Ext. 202

Bringing you HOPE -
Helping Our Peninsula's Environment
Box 1495, Carmel, CA 93921 Info7 at 1hope.org
831/ 624-6500 www.1hope.org

Trustees 2011
Dena Ibrahim
Holly Kiefer
Vienna Merritt-Moore
Terrence Zito

Founding Trustees
Terrence Zito
Darby Worth
Ed Leeper
Robert W. Campbell
David Dilworth

Science Advisors
Herman Medwin, Ph.D.
(deceased) - ***Acoustics***

Susan Kegley, Ph.D.
- ***Hazardous Materials & Pesticides***
Arthur Partridge, Ph.D.
Forest Ecology

Sarah Hardgrave
Pacific Grove City

August 5, 2011

Pacific Grove Urban Tree Protection Requests

Dear Ms. Hardgrave,

For your thoughtful consideration here are HOPE's requests to add to the Urban Forest Management Plan.

Policy:

Pacific Grove has lost more than 80 percent of its forest canopy¹ in the last 100 years, some 15 percent in just the past 25 years. At this rate Pacific Grove neighborhoods will have nearly Zero canopy trees in about 20 years.

(Other than the obvious aesthetic and ecological consequences, state law prohibits using a fraudulent name for a city, so we would have to change our town's name to "Pacific Stump.")

- Pacific Grove needs "canopy restoration" and protection as a goal and as "highest priority." HOPE supports restoring the Monterey pine forest/Coast Live Oak canopy along with Monterey Cypress.
- To achieve any significant "canopy restoration," city policy must protect trees on private property - because the city does not own more than about 15 percent of the city land area. This means that even if the city fully planted trees on all of its lands - Pacific Grove would have no more than 15 percent canopy cover.
- Property owners with Canopy Trees should be rewarded with at least a \$100 per Canopy Tree as a Property tax reduction every year.
- The City should negotiate and pass along tree buying cost discounts to Pacific Grove homeowners and residents.

¹ Outside the Del Monte Park area

Founded in 1998, and known for helping with hundreds of environmental and democracy successes including stopping both "Dirty Harry" and "The Terminator," ***H.O.P.E.*** is a non-profit, tax deductible, public interest group protecting our Monterey Peninsula's natural land, air, and water ecosystems and public participation in government, using science, law, education, news alerts and advocacy.

- Individual house owners desire for ocean views should never override the Canopy protection and restoration goals.
- HOPE also supports expanding the list of trees used for replacements to those which are NOT invasive.
- Neighborhood Tree Improvement Program modeled on Monterey's highly successful Neighborhood Improvement Program (NIP). City Neighborhoods would decide where and which trees to plant.
- City should replant on-site all canopy trees removed from city lands in past 15 years.
- Tree removal or major trimming decisions should be made SOLELY by a city official. Because of the conflict of financial interest / conflict of loyalty, prohibit tree removal or major trimming decisions by "experts" (Arborist, Forester, Landscaper) paid by property owner.
- Similar to Carmel, add a section to the Building Code prohibiting non-porous concrete or asphalt and instead requiring "pavers" or "grasscrete" to all new or modified sidewalks, driveways, patios, etc.

Ordinance:

- If the 2-1 mitigation is reduced to 1-1 -- then there must be a painlessly easy (for staff) method to do follow-up. City can not afford staff time to monitor, so the burden must be on the homeowner to comply and provide evidence of compliance. Of course this means there must be serious penalties for lying about compliance.

A method successfully used by some federal agencies is a letter sent once a year that must be returned signed (and in our case by the homeowner certifying that the planted tree is still alive.)

- Need criminal Misdemeanor penalties or the wealthy will pay even a huge (such as \$20,000 - \$50,000) fine to thwart city law and destroy trees that took decades or centuries to grow. This means only the non-wealthy can afford to destroy trees.
- To protect new homes from a falling tall canopy tree add a section to the Building Code requiring necessary steel bracing at roof lines.

Permits:

- One-stop shopping - one central place for tree removal and major cutting: Need one city desk for all tree removal permits. This means - individual tree removal permits, development permits and city tree removal permits.

Founded in 1998, and known for helping with hundreds of environmental and democracy successes including stopping both "Dirty Harry" and "The Terminator," H.O.P.E. is a non-profit, tax deductible, public interest group protecting our Monterey Peninsula's natural land, air, and water ecosystems and public participation in government, using science, law, education, news alerts and advocacy.

- One person responsible for permits,
 - One form for all permit applications, and
 - One city web page listing all proposed tree removals.
- The one responsible person for permits should be a trained Forest Ecologist (See article "Ecologist vs Arborist vs Forester vs Landscaper vs Biologist").
 - They must be specifically trained to reject CEQA Exemptions and Negative Declarations when they are not appropriate.
 - Permits must avoid wherever possible "opinion based" decisions.
 - Permits should require "evidence based" data including: a photograph of the entire tree, a detailed photograph of the problem area, GPS coordinates (especially for city owned trees) and street address.
 - CEQA compliance must be on the form for tree and significant (like PG&E's) trimming.
 - Any new Monterey pine canopy loss or habitat loss (the trees on Pico) is a cumulative significant impact because of native Monterey Pines imperiled circumstances.
 - If tree is a public nuisance - don't give a blank check - limit removal to the branches that are a nuisance.
 - Cabling to hold trunks and branches is a feasible mitigation measure to reduce nuisance trees and branches.
 - Bird Nests Need Protection
 - Require PG&E to apply for tree trimming and removal permits
This would give 30 days notice of their activities.

Notice

- 30 day orange-net and posted notice before tree application is heard. This give neighbors time to learn about the proposal and discuss it.

Appeal

- 30 day Appeal to give neighbors who are out of town to learn of proposal.

Enforcement:

Founded in 1998, and known for helping with hundreds of environmental and democracy successes including stopping both "Dirty Harry" and "The Terminator," H.O.P.E. is a non-profit, tax deductible, public interest group protecting our Monterey Peninsula's natural land, air, and water ecosystems and public participation in government, using science, law, education, news alerts and advocacy.

- **Enforcement should run like Historic Building: Progressive fines, increasing in steps to a Misdemeanor when all else fails.**
- **Need citizen enforcement provision especially for when the city refuses to comply with its own ordinances.** (Sample language is below)

"Enforcement

Violations of this ordinance shall be assessed by weight of living material - biomass. The fine shall be \$1 per pound of Monterey Pine Forest ecosystem biomass harmed. Each violation exceeding 10,000 pounds of biomass removal shall be a misdemeanor. The fines shall be used only for enforcement of this ordinance or purchase of native Monterey pine forest land.

"Intervenor Compensation

This ordinance provides for enforcement by private Attorney General. When successful enforcement of this ordinance is brought and accomplished by any person or entity other than the City or the District Attorney the successful plaintiff is to be awarded \$5,000 civil penalty from defendant and any other fees and costs deemed appropriate by the court including those awarded pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 1021.5

If you need any clarification or references - please let us know ASAP.

Thank you,

**David Dilworth,
for the Board of Trustees**

Founded in 1998, and known for helping with hundreds of environmental and democracy successes including stopping both "Dirty Harry" and "The Terminator," H.O.P.E. is a non-profit, tax deductible, public interest group protecting our Monterey Peninsula's natural land, air, and water ecosystems and public participation in government, using science, law, education, news alerts and advocacy.

What's the difference between an Ecologist, a Biologist, a Forester, an Arborist, and a Horticulturist ?

Copyright 2003-2011 David Dilworth

- ***(Physician)*** An **Ecologist** is explicitly trained in the **health of interdependence of all the biota in an ecosystem**. A forest ecologist is trained in the **health of interdependence of forest biota**.
- ***(Medical Specialist)*** A **Biologist** only studies **one species at a time**. Biologists are rarely trained in or understand ecological interdependence. The word "**interdependence**" **does not even appear in most Biology textbooks**. (In years of research, I have yet to find a single one.)
- ***(Prosecutor)*** A **Forester** is paid to **find trees which can be cut down or to find reasons to cut specific trees down**.
A **Forester** is only trained to, acts to, and is rewarded by **maximizing removal of trees and biomass from a forest** for the production of sawtimber, pulpwood or seeds. Foresters are **only interested in the health of the specific trees they can remove or use** - at the expense of all other forest health including other trees, animals, insects, plants, flowers and soils. **Foresters are only trained to see trees as an agricultural product** - not as part of a multifaceted interdependent ecosystem. A monoculture tree farm is generally their ideal "forest."
- ***(Beautician)*** An **Arborist** is only interested in the **appearance and form of individual trees regardless of the suitability of soils or other environmental conditions**. They are typically hired for **safety**: to protect human health and property from damage - not to protect the tree's health. **Arborist certification does not require understanding ecosystem health**.
- ***(Farmer)*** A Horticulturist's goal is the maximum **production of fruit**.

When hiring an "expert" to assist with health of a forest, whether a wildland forest or an "urban forest" **it is a serious mistake to use any expert except an ecologist**. **Arborists, foresters and even "one species at a time biologists" regularly and systematically make decisions harming the health of a forest ecosystem for decades – or longer.**

When an already imperiled forest is involved, their uninformed harmful decisions can put an ecosystem on a path to extinction – irreversibly.

Trying to give them the utmost benefit of the doubt, many -- government agencies in charge of forests, planning departments and environmental consulting firms, "mistakenly believe" an arborist or a forester is expert in understanding the health of a tree or the ecosystem it lives in. In reality the only genuine expert in forest ecosystem health is (not surprisingly) a Forest Ecologist. While in the long run it is **always less expensive to protect an ecosystem's health by hiring a Forest Ecologist**, surprisingly few agencies understand that it is typically also **less expensive to hire a forest ecologist in the short term**.