Brooke Larsen

From: Nash Gonzalez
Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2022 12:13 PM
To: Brooke Larsen; Matt Goines
Subject: Fw: public comment CDP_2021-0036, please postpone the meeting
Attachments: MUSD 2.pdf

FYI

From: Annemarie <aweibel@mcn.org>
Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2022 11:08 AM
To: Nash Gonzalez <gonzalezn@mendocinocounty.org>
Subject: Fwd: public comment CDP_2021-0036, please postpone the meeting

-------- Forwarded Message --------
Subject: public comment CDP_2021-0036, please postpone the meeting
Date: Thu, 14 Jul 2022 10:48:35 -0700
From: Annemarie <aweibel@mcn.org>
To: pbscommissions@mendocinocopunty.org, Julia Acker <ackerj@mendocinocounty.org>, Matt Goines <goinesm@mendocinocounty.org>

Hi,

To Coastal Permit Administrator,

Please postpone this project until MUSD can look into it further and also meet with PG&E as they asked in their letter to you!

Today you may vote in favor of Coastal Development Permit CDP_2021-0036 that PG&E is hoping to accomplish on MUSD property and close by.

The 65 pages vivible on your web page do not address the many unanswered questions:

Why was MUSD not contacted by PG&E initially? PG&E received this land (free) by the Sverko's, the former owners of the Wetzler/Motolinsky family. According to your records MUSD received information originally about this project. Please verify this. Why did they not know about today's meeting? I had to inform them. Where was the meeting advertised? In the Mendocino Beacon? Is there a sign on the road, or towards MUSD property about this project/meeting? To appeal a decision to go ahead with this project and have 10 days to do it and needing to pay $2,620 to appeal to the Board of Supervisors seems crazy when MUSD never heard anything about it. You read the comments by John Wetzler and Nan Motolinsky and I understand why they would like especially 1 tree removed for personal safety. They are asking you to look at their

situation separately.

PG&E wants to cut down 69 trees & remove low growing shrubs and bushes in an approximately 40,000 sq.ft. area from the PG&E substation parcel located next door to MUSD. When would that happen? While school is in progress? This would include these cuts on property owned by MUSD (52 trees, 1 Monterey pine, 1 Blue Gum Eucalyptus, 8 Redwood Sequoia, 4 Douglas fir, 3 Tanoak, 13 Willow, and 22 Pacific Wax Myrtle and low growing shrubs and bushes.)

These trees are growing along the eastern perimeter fence/wall that provides a visual landscape screening and probably also protects the school children (Kindergarten to 8th. grade) playing on the grounds & playgrounds, P.E. & sports areas and the school garden from electromagnetic radiation. Around 1995 members of the MUSD parent club measured the electromagnetic radiation from the PG&E site and interestingly an aquarium in a classroom was more worrysome, but since then is not the equipment stronger, the site bigger, technology changed? A new reding needs to be done before any trees get cut and a project approved. Little children are very sensitive, so are the pregnant moms that visit the school, as well as anyone else that visits and teaches there. With the current proliferation many more people suffer from radiation poisoning. With MUSD not knowing how can they discuss it at a board meeting? And now they are on vacation.

Apparently there does not need to be an environmental evaluation, and no biological survey as the trees removed from the Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA) will be replanted two-to-one on the parcel at Mickey Trust, an 84 acre parcel on the south side of Big River owned by the Save the Redwoods League. This is outrageous! This project needs at least an MND, if not an EIR.

The trees on MUSD property range from Diameter at Breast Height (DBS= 1.3 meters) 1 ft. to 80 ft. and their height between 10 ft. and 60 ft.

PG&E does not seem concerned that the birds, bats and special status amphibians (Ca. red-legged frogs, foothill yellow-legged frogs, tailed frogs, and southern torrent salamanders) and other animals that live in this area would loose their habitat.

As the name Little Lake Road implies there used to be a lake there, wetlands plans still indicate the wetlands. Would that not require a biological study? Normally regulations indicate that no projects can be approved within 100 ft. of any wetland. Why did the Department of Fish and Wildlife not respond? Why no comments by the Ca. Native Plant Society, and the Forest Advisor. Why was there no better information based on the letter by Sonoma State University about archaeological/cultural resources considering that non of the tribes responded.

Why would no one study what will happen to the area once these 52 trees and the additional low growing shrubs and bushes will be gone? How many

shrubs and bushes? What size are they?

PG&E indicates they will use Best Management Practices. Would they be aware of the wetlands? Would a biologist be on site the whole time? See electronic pages 54 about pesticides & herbicides. Do we want these applied on MUSD's school site? Why are there no comments by Environmental Health?

Please postpone this project until MUSD can look into it further and also meet with PG&E!

Sincerely, Annemarie Weibel