

**From:** [Elaine de Man](#)  
**To:** [Fuller, Lashun](#)  
**Subject:** DRAFT WATER QUALITY AND TREE PROTECTION ORDINANCE  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 19, 2019 11:02:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [Comments on Draft Water Quality and Tree Protection Ordinance.pdf](#)

---

Good morning,

Please accept the attached comments concerning the Draft Water Quality and Tree Protection Ordinance and distribute it to the members of the Planning Commission.

Thank you,

Elaine de Man  
St. Helena, CA

## Concerning the Draft Water Quality and Tree Protection Ordinance

After listening to some six hours of heartfelt concern from members of the community and expert testimony from actual scientists, it was extremely discouraging to hear members of the Board of Supervisors say things like, “70% sounds good to me” or “70% is better than 60%, so we saved some trees here today.”

Comments like that fail to acknowledge the severity of the climate crisis and the contribution of deforestation to climate change, which is an actual national and global emergency. We have no time to lose. And we can’t afford to put all of our efforts into fixing “traffic” or “housing” because, as one supervisor has stated, that will “give us more bang for the buck.” Because, while we wait for *that* “bang” to start paying out, we continue to make the problem worse by destroying the one thing that is working in our favor right now. And it costs *no* bucks.

The following bullet points are from General Technical Report WO-59, “Carbon Storage and Accumulation in United States Forest Ecosystems,” prepared by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. ([https://www.nrs.fs.fed.us/pubs/gtr/gtr\\_wo059.pdf](https://www.nrs.fs.fed.us/pubs/gtr/gtr_wo059.pdf))

- The average forest in the United States contains 158 thousand pounds per acre (1 7.7 kg/m<sup>2</sup>) of organic carbon.
- The quantity of carbon varies considerably between regions, with Pacific Coast States containing 205 thousand pounds per acre (23.0 kg/m<sup>2</sup>)
- Pacific Coast States, including Alaska, contain the highest average carbon in forest soils, 64 percent of the total.
- There are significant differences in carbon storage among forest types. . . .Douglas - fir contains the highest average carbon because of the large quantity stored in the trees.
- On average, *live* trees are *accumulating* carbon at a rate of 1,252 pounds per acre per year (0.14 kg/m<sup>2</sup>/yr) ), a rate of increase of 2.7 percent of the amount stored in live trees
- Although oceans store a far greater amount of carbon than terrestrial ecosystems, our ability to manage terrestrial ecosystems is greater and likely to have a greater mitigation effect.

Let’s make it easy. Let’s say a property owner or developer wants to convert 100 acres of forest to vineyard. That forest is currently accumulating 1,252 pounds of atmospheric carbon per acre per year, or a total of 125,200 pounds of carbon *per year*.

While the ideal solution would be to not remove *any* living trees, if you were to take away 10% of the trees (assuming the 90% retention rate endorsed by the Watershed and Oak Woodland Protection Committee) that same forest could still accumulate 112,680 pounds of carbon per year.

But, if you were to take away 30%, the amount currently being considered in the draft ordinance, that same forest would now only be able to accumulate 87,640 pounds of carbon per year. That's a net loss of 37,560 pounds of carbon per year that could have been accumulated, but will instead be left in the atmosphere to contribute to climate change. Over ten years, the net cost of deforesting 30% rather than 10% will cost us 370,560 pounds of carbon that will be left in the atmosphere to contribute to global climate change. And that doesn't even take into account the impacts to the soil's ability to sequester carbon, which we are now learning has an even greater capacity.

With the current draft of the ordinance, at 70% canopy retention, at least 10,000 acres in Napa County can be deforested. Each one of those acres has the capacity to accumulate 1,252 pounds of atmospheric carbon per year, a total of 568 metric tons!

The weight of climate change does not rest on Napa County's shoulders alone. But given the current crisis, every person, every municipality, every county, state, and nation must do what they can. And here in Napa County, we can do this. To think that "saving some trees," by changing the canopy retention from 60% to 70% is enough, is to deny that there is a climate crisis. To think that focusing on traffic and housing, because it will give us the "biggest bang for the buck," is to kick the climate can down the road.

If the county wants to focus its efforts on traffic and housing, fine. But then it should call a moratorium on destroying *any* more forests and woodlands until those efforts show some positive results. At the very, very least, you should include the 90% canopy retention in the Watershed Protection Ordinance currently under consideration.

Elaine de Man  
St. Helena, CA  
Feb. 19, 2019

**From:** [Morrison, David](#)  
**To:** [Fuller, Lashun](#); [Bledsoe, Teresa](#); [Thepkaisone, Cesselea](#)  
**Cc:** [Anderson, Laura](#); [Bordona, Brian](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Napa watershed protection  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:14:20 AM

---

Sent with BlackBerry Work  
([www.blackberry.com](http://www.blackberry.com))

---

**From:** Val Wolf <[valjwolf@yahoo.com](mailto:valjwolf@yahoo.com)>  
**Date:** Tuesday, Feb 19, 2019, 8:44 PM  
**To:** Morrison, David <[David.Morrison@countyofnapa.org](mailto:David.Morrison@countyofnapa.org)>  
**Subject:** Napa watershed protection

Please do your utmost to protect our watershed from development that destroys any more of our precious carbon sequestering trees and our rural heritage. There is no more room for loss of our air filtering trees particularly after our massive losses from the horrific fires. We should be planting trees everywhere not killing any. The mono cropping and ground water poisoning by some of the industrial vineyards with bad ag practices is not conducive to the health of anything but the pocket books of the harm producers.

Thank you  
Valerie Wolf  
389 Franklin St  
Napa CA 94559

**From:** [Morrison, David](#)  
**To:** [Fuller, Lashun](#); [Bledsoe, Teresa](#); [Thepkaisone, Cesselea](#)  
**Cc:** [Anderson, Laura](#); [Bordona, Brian](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Our climate and survival depend on trees  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 20, 2019 5:01:11 AM

---

Sent with BlackBerry Work  
(www.blackberry.com)

---

**From:** Nancy McCoy Blotzke <[nancymccoy@sonic.net](mailto:nancymccoy@sonic.net)>  
**Date:** Wednesday, Feb 20, 2019, 12:51 AM  
**To:** joellegPC@gmail.com <[joellegPC@gmail.com](mailto:joellegPC@gmail.com)>, Whitmer, David <[Dave.Whitmer@countyofnapa.org](mailto:Dave.Whitmer@countyofnapa.org)>, anne.cottrell@lucene.com <[anne.cottrell@lucene.com](mailto:anne.cottrell@lucene.com)>, Mazotti, Andrew <[Andrew.Mazotti@countyofnapa.org](mailto:Andrew.Mazotti@countyofnapa.org)>, JeriGillPC@outlook.com <[JeriGillPC@outlook.com](mailto:JeriGillPC@outlook.com)>, Morrison, David <[David.Morrison@countyofnapa.org](mailto:David.Morrison@countyofnapa.org)>  
**Subject:** Our climate and survival depend on trees

Dear Planning Commission Members,

At this time of climate crisis, there is a recommendation to allow 30% of Napa forests to be destroyed. How many 1000s of acres is that? Even more disappointing, is a “compromise” that would allow 15% of Napa woodlands and forests to be destroyed. How many 1000s of acres is that? Way more than the 795 acres proposed in Measure C. We need to preserve all the carbon sequestration we have. Nothing has yet been developed that can take the place of trees.

Measure C itself was a compromise that ended up killing it. As I canvassed I saw how false and misleading information had voters thinking that defeating C would save 795 acres of trees. Several such people wished they had talked to me before had they voted. I am quite sure that many more than 641 people voted no on C thinking they were saving trees.

Wasn't the Strategic Planning process supposed to heal the wound around Measure C? Why did the County spend so much time and money to hear from people in the Strategic Planning process, then ignore all the input and come up with a plan that comes nowhere close to the preservations in the initiative that was already a compromise? It appears that the comments and suggestions that were made the in SP process were ignore. In the case of the groups for whom Dave Morrison was the scribe, the comments were never accurately recorded. In one group, he ignored writing the word “climate” 2 times. Finally, I had to demanded that he write the word in order to get it on paper.

I honestly had hopes that the Strategic Planning process was sincere. It certainly seemed that way with the people who were facilitating it. Now it starts looking like a sham—as if those behind the scene were hoping that it would lull people into forgetting about the issue, the science, the climate impacts, the pollution of our water, the beauty and sacredness of our natural environment— so that wealthy interests can continue business as usual.

Now you have an opportunity, no matter your past views, to make take an ethical stand. Maybe you have had reservations thinking, “Oh, wouldn't it be a nice to have a my own

vineyard in Napa Valley. Think what my high school or college friends would say.” But on the other hand, wouldn’t you rather that your children and grandchildren knew that your life had a more lofty purpose-- that you did everything you could to avoid the climate catastrophe that awaited them? You can tell them that you were able to preserve for them the exquisite beauty and habitat that gives a sacredness to this place and uplifts the hearts and spirits of those who come here.

Sincerely,  
Nancy McCoy-Blotzke

**From:** [Dave Kearney-Brown](#)  
**To:** [Fuller, Lashun](#)  
**Subject:** Watershed and Oak Woodlands ordinance hearing  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 19, 2019 4:14:27 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

I want to add my voice to those of the majority of the citizens of city of Napa who support strong protections for our precious Napa County watershed and diminishing natural habitats.

We must provide frameworks to protect the environment, agriculture and our economy and to insure that these can all remain viable on a sustained basis. Neither wildlife nor the wine industry will thrive in an ecosystem whose most basic structure-the oak forests-have been stripped and plowed under. It is time to have a strong plan for saving as much as we can of our remaining natural watershed.

Specifically, any ordinance needs to include:

- A definition of "canopy" that includes any oak woodland with greater than ten percent canopy cover, aligned with the definition used by the state,
- three to one tree removal mitigation, without the inclusion of slopes that are greater than thirty percent,
- and, a tree retention requirement of ninety percent.

Thank you in advance for protecting our magnificent Napa Valley for all of us-businesses, agriculture, and future generations.

Sincerely,

David Kearney-Brown  
141 Dewitt Ave.,  
Napa