

**From:** Lisa Rudnick [mailto:lisa\_rudnick@sbcglobal.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 06, 2007 7:06 AM  
**To:** Brandon Barchi  
**Subject:** letter for SLVWD board meeting of June 7, 2007

I am unable to attend the June 7th SLVWD board meeting. Please provide a copy of this letter to board members for the June 7, 2007 meeting so they will have the context of discussion which will likely take place during oral communications by other members of the community.

Thank you.

Lisa Rudnick  
Ben Lomond, CA

The following letter was submitted to the County Board of Supervisors at their May 22 hearing on timber. The final paragraphs address a serious issue which pertains to the SLVWD. The public deserves to know whether your Board has violated the Brown Act, or whether the Sierra Club letter, which was not endorsed by other water districts, did not have your prior approval.

Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors  
701 Ocean Street, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

May 22, 2007

RE: Item 54, TPZ acreage requirement

Local registered professional foresters have testified that parcels of 10 acres and smaller can indeed be productive for selective timber harvesting. During previous deliberations on the issue of TPZ acreage requirements, there has been no factual information presented which would suggest that your Board has a logical reason to set the acreage requirement for rezoning to TP any higher than 5 acres. You have heard from numerous potentially affected land owners, far more than people who are against selective harvesting.

Supervisor Beautz recently turned away more information from a local forester, reportedly stating that she didnt want any more information. This is a poor mindset for any decision-maker. Also, a recent statement by Supervisor Beautz that conflict always exists when there is timber harvesting is an incorrect assumption. Great controversy arises when the same non-profit groups, operating outside the legal mandate of avoiding propaganda and excessive lobbying, agitate excessive controversy.

Following the recent lawsuits, the County of Santa Cruz indeed won the right to use zoning authority to limit the location of selective harvesting, **but what the forest landowners won was the end of additional restrictions placed on rezoning to TP.**

Until the lawsuits were recently resolved, the County was placing all kinds of conditions upon rezoning to TP, such as the removal of structures. **The County can no longer place additional restrictions on rezoning to TP.** Therefore, the last minute suggestion of Supervisor Mark Stone, FOLLOWING the public input portion of the prior hearing on TPZ acreage, to set the acreage requirement high since flexibility remains for conditionally rezoning smaller parcels, is a foolhardy route. I believe that the suggestion was made, after Supervisor Stones obvious interactions with the Sierra Club and Earth First! representatives, in order to falsely lull your Board into setting the minimum parcel size higher. The County will be entering a slippery slope with this proposed conditional rezoning, based upon ANY additional criteria such as surrounding uses.

Remember that the forest and its management preceded any structures which have been plopped down in the midst of timberland. Government Code section 51102(b) states: ***The Legislature further declares that it is the policy of this state that timber operations conducted in a manner consistent with the forest practice rules...shall not be or become restricted due to any land use in or around the locality of those operations.***

County staff is correct in their analysis that setting the acreage requirement high will simply give the folks who oppose selective harvesting a constant venue to air the same old tall tales of havoc before your Board.

Also important to note is that at a prior Board of Supervisors public hearing on this subject, the County CAO incorrectly stated that very little of the timber yield tax comes back to the local community. This is false. According to the State Board of Equalization, roughly 90 percent of the money is returned to our county; some of the money goes directly to County coffers, and a large portion of the money goes to the SLV Unified School District, Felton Fire Department, and other local special districts. This was discussed by a group of foresters and forest landowners with Susan Mauriello prior to her making the statement that afternoon.

Another false representation is a letter before your board today on the letterhead of the San Lorenzo Valley Water District (SLVWD). I will submit as an attachment to my letter at todays public hearing, 17 pages of SLVWD agendas and minutes for the last few months. There is NO mention of this subject, and therefore either the author, Betsy Herbert, has falsely represented the SLVWD Board of Directors, or the SLVWD Board has violated the Brown Act. Additionally, the same letter in draft form was presented to at least one other local water district, the City of Santa Cruz Water Department by Jodi Frediani with the Sierra Club. Chris Berry with the City of Santa Cruz Water Department declined to endorse the letter, and was disappointed that the Watershed Sanitary Survey, cited heavily in the SLVWD letter, was being used in such a manner. It came as no surprise that Betsy Herbert contributed to the recent update of this Sanitary Survey which she repeatedly cites in the bogus SLVWD letter.

Furthermore, the report cited in Ms. Herberts letter deals with worst case scenarios, not normal situations. TMDLs are a poor measure of standard, since normal background rates of erosion are highly fluctuating, mainly dependant upon storm events, and are not indicative of poor selective timber harvesting practices.

I request that you leave the minimum acreage requirement for zoning to TP where it currently stands, at 5 acres.

Sincerely,

Lisa Rudnick

Ben Lomond, CA