

Amy Ow

From: Camille Leung
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2020 1:50 PM
To: Peter Alexander Mye
Cc: Kristen Outten; Michele Rowe; Jennifer Torre; Megan Peterson; Amy Ow
Subject: RE: Proposed additional grading and truck trips for Lots 5-8 of Highlands Estates
Attachments: BOS Staff Report.pdf

Here you go

From: Camille Leung
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2020 1:47 PM
To: Peter Alexander Mye <Pmye@swca.com>
Cc: Kristen Outten <koutten@swca.com>; Michele Rowe <Michele.Rowe@swca.com>; Jennifer Torre <JTorre@swca.com>; Megan Peterson <MPeterson@swca.com>; Amy Ow <aow@smcgov.org>
Subject: RE: Proposed additional grading and truck trips for Lots 5-8 of Highlands Estates

Hi Peter,

Please see attached for Urbemis calcs. I will send the staff report in another email as it is a large file.

Thanks!

From: Peter Alexander Mye <Pmye@swca.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2020 1:17 PM
To: Camille Leung <cleung@smcgov.org>
Cc: Kristen Outten <koutten@swca.com>; Michele Rowe <Michele.Rowe@swca.com>; Jennifer Torre <JTorre@swca.com>; Megan Peterson <MPeterson@swca.com>
Subject: RE: Proposed additional grading and truck trips for Lots 5-8 of Highlands Estates

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Hi Camille,

Based on SWCA's information review there are a few outstanding questions that SWCA needs to confirm with the County.

SWCA can confirm that, as previously relayed to you by Erika, two CalEEMod runs (\$2,600) can be covered under the remaining budget.

However, before any emissions modeling using CalEEMod is initiated, please send over the following two items:

- BOS Staff Report for the Final EIR
- Emissions calculations (Appendix 4.4 of the Recirculated Draft EIR)

With this information SWCA will confirm the information provided to date, refine our list of questions, and set up a meeting to discuss timeline and budget.

Thanks,

**** Please note phone number change**

Peter A. Mye
Senior Planner

SWCA Environmental Consultants
330 Townsend Street, Suite 216
San Francisco, CA 94107
Direct 415.523.5516



The contents of this email and any associated emails, information, and attachments are CONFIDENTIAL. Use or disclosure without sender's authorization is prohibited. If you are not an authorized recipient, please notify the sender and then immediately delete the email and any attachments.

From: Peter Alexander Mye
Sent: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 12:36 PM
To: Camille Leung <cleung@smcgov.org>; Megan Peterson <MPeterson@swca.com>
Cc: Jennifer Torre <JTorre@swca.com>; Kristen Outten <koutten@swca.com>
Subject: RE: Proposed additional grading and truck trips for Lots 5-8 of Highlands Estates

Great. Thanks all for connecting us. Camille - I will reach out after my review of all the materials to clarify any questions.

Yours,

**** Please note phone number change**

Peter A. Mye
Senior Planner

SWCA Environmental Consultants
330 Townsend Street, Suite 216
San Francisco, CA 94107
Direct 415.523.5516



The contents of this email and any associated emails, information, and attachments are CONFIDENTIAL. Use or disclosure without sender's authorization is prohibited. If you are not an authorized recipient, please notify the sender and then immediately delete the email and any attachments.

From: Camille Leung <cleung@smcgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 12:30 PM
To: Megan Peterson <MPeterson@swca.com>; Peter Alexander Mye <Pmye@swca.com>
Cc: Jennifer Torre <JTorre@swca.com>; Kristen Outten <koutten@swca.com>
Subject: RE: Proposed additional grading and truck trips for Lots 5-8 of Highlands Estates

EXTERNAL: This email originated from outside SWCA. Please use caution when replying.

Wonderful thanks Megan and Kristen...Peter, please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or would like to discuss. Thanks!

Camille

From: Megan Peterson <MPeterson@swca.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 12:22 PM
To: Camille Leung <cleung@smcgov.org>
Cc: Jennifer Torre <JTorre@swca.com>; Kristen Outten <koutten@swca.com>
Subject: RE: Proposed additional grading and truck trips for Lots 5-8 of Highlands Estates

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Hi Camille, hope you had a nice 4th of July. In Erika's absence we have another senior planner, Peter Mye, available to assist with this request. He has a transportation background as well which will be helpful. Peter can be reached at pmye@swca.com /415.523.5516 and he will be getting up to speed on this request in the meantime so please feel free to reach out to him directly to discuss the current need.

Thanks very much and please let us know if we can assist with anything else.

~Megan

Megan Peterson
Bay Area Director

SWCA Environmental Consultants
60 Stone Pine Road, Suite 100, Half Moon Bay, CA 94019
330 Townsend Street, Suite 216, San Francisco, CA 94107
P 650.459.1831 | C 650.438.1525



Visit Our Website: <http://www.swca.com/>  

From: Camille Leung <cleung@smcgov.org>
Sent: Monday, July 6, 2020 1:08 PM
To: Megan Peterson <MPeterson@swca.com>
Subject: FW: Proposed additional grading and truck trips for Lots 5-8 of Highlands Estates

EXTERNAL: This email originated from outside SWCA. Please use caution when replying.

Hi Megan,

As Erika is out on maternity leave, please advise as to which SWCA staff we should use as our contact for this portion of the contract.

Thanks!

From: Camille Leung

Sent: Monday, July 6, 2020 1:05 PM

To: Erika Carrillo <Erika.Carrillo@swca.com>

Cc: Steve Monowitz <smonowitz@smcgov.org>; Melissa Andrikopoulos <mandrikopoulos@smcgov.org>; Kristen Outten <koutten@swca.com>; Jessica Henderson-McBean <JHenderson-McBean@swca.com>; John Nibbelin <jnibbelin@smcgov.org>

Subject: Proposed additional grading and truck trips for Lots 5-8 of Highlands Estates

Hi Erika,

Hope this finds you very well!

Sorry for the delay in getting you this information relating to the proposed additional grading and truck trips for Lots 5-8 of the Highland Estates Project, that were not included in the previous EIR analysis. We wanted to collect all the information requested before initiating the additional environmental review. We believe the attached documents contain the information you need to run the analysis to advise the County as to which environmental impacts (Air Quality and any other potential impacts as identified by SWCA) may be exacerbated with this proposal, per Amendment #1 of the County's contract.

Potential impacts may be evaluated based on the scope of the proposal (see Total Grading and Truck Trips spreadsheet), Information provided by the applicant pertaining to # of workers onsite, miles travelled, construction and grading equipment to be used, and other information provided in response to information requested by SWCA to run the Air Quality analysis (see Draft Operations Schedule and BKF email 7/2/20), required mitigation measures and conditions (see certified EIR), as well as additional County requirements outlined in the Construction and Grading Requirements for Lots 9 and 10 document (These requirements were prepared for grading and construction activities on Lots 9 and 10, but will apply to Lots 5-8 as well). Please note that in addition to Air Quality concerns, Geological hazards, Noise, and Traffic are also areas of concerns to the neighbors.

Please let us know if you need any other information or have any questions. Also, please let us know your estimated time frame for SWCA to provide the County a draft memo on the potential exacerbated impacts, their significance, and any necessary additional CEQA analysis. From there, I will review the memo with the Director and County Counsel and we can discuss next steps.

Thank you!

Camille

From: Camille Leung <cleung@smcgov.org>

Sent: Tuesday, May 28, 2019 1:30 PM

To: Erika Carrillo <Erika.Carrillo@swca.com>

Cc: Steve Monowitz <smonowitz@smcgov.org>; Melissa Andrikopoulos <mandrikopoulos@smcgov.org>; Kristen Outten <koutten@swca.com>

Subject: Re: EXTERNAL:FW: Highland Estates Lot 11 Revised Storm Outlet

Thanks for the estimate... We will let you know soon how we want to proceed. Thank you

From: Erika Carrillo <Erika.Carrillo@swca.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 28, 2019 1:09:04 PM
To: Camille Leung
Cc: Steve Monowitz; Melissa Andrikopoulos; Kristen Outten
Subject: RE: EXTERNAL:FW: Highland Estates Lot 11 Revised Storm Outlet

Camille,

Assuming that we receive the information on the schedule and roster of equipment for the analysis, and there are no more than five phases and each phase has no more than 12 pieces of equipment, the cost to setup and run each model would be approximately \$1,500 (\$3,000 for two models). This would not include a technical memorandum or Air Quality Report.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,

Erika

From: Camille Leung <cleung@smcgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, May 28, 2019 11:56 AM
To: Erika Carrillo <Erika.Carrillo@swca.com>
Cc: Steve Monowitz <smonowitz@smcgov.org>; Melissa Andrikopoulos <mandrikopoulos@smcgov.org>; Kristen Outten <koutten@swca.com>
Subject: RE: EXTERNAL:FW: Highland Estates Lot 11 Revised Storm Outlet

Hi Erika,

While we are still working with the applicant to see if we can't agree on the grading amounts, we would like to know the cost of running 2 sets of grading figures for the CalEEMod Air Quality analysis. We would like to see if there is a significance difference in the amounts.

Thank you!

From: Erika Carrillo [<mailto:Erika.Carrillo@swca.com>]
Sent: Friday, May 03, 2019 5:01 PM
To: Camille Leung <cleung@smcgov.org>
Cc: Steve Monowitz <smonowitz@smcgov.org>; Melissa Andrikopoulos <mandrikopoulos@smcgov.org>; Kristen Outten <koutten@swca.com>
Subject: RE: EXTERNAL:FW: Highland Estates Lot 11 Revised Storm Outlet

Camille,

Responses are provided below. Please feel free to give me a call next week if you would like to discuss.

Thanks,

Erika Carrillo
Senior Environmental Project Manager

SWCA Environmental Consultants
60 Stone Pine Road, Suite 100
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019
P 650.440.4160 x6403 | C 650.722.2735



The contents of this email and any associated emails, information, and attachments are CONFIDENTIAL. Use or disclosure without sender's authorization is prohibited. If you are not an authorized recipient, please notify the sender and then immediately delete the email and any attachments.

From: Erika Carrillo
Sent: Friday, May 3, 2019 1:14 PM
To: Camille Leung <cleung@smcgov.org>
Cc: Steve Monowitz <smonowitz@smcgov.org>; Melissa Andrikopoulos <mandrikopoulos@smcgov.org>; Kristen Outten <koutten@swca.com>
Subject: RE: EXTERNAL:FW: Highland Estates Lot 11 Revised Storm Outlet

Camille,

I will provide responses to your requests by the end of the day.

Thanks,

Erika

From: Camille Leung <cleung@smcgov.org>
Sent: Friday, May 3, 2019 12:41 PM
To: Erika Carrillo <Erika.Carrillo@swca.com>
Cc: Steve Monowitz <smonowitz@smcgov.org>; Melissa Andrikopoulos <mandrikopoulos@smcgov.org>; Kristen Outten <koutten@swca.com>
Subject: RE: EXTERNAL:FW: Highland Estates Lot 11 Revised Storm Outlet

Hi Erika,

Just checking for status. Applicant was initially going to grade/construct Lots 5-11 at the same time. Now they are planning to proceed with Lots 9-11 again before Lots 5-8. Due to this, we will await your recommendations on the changes to the grading amounts for Lots 9-11 and the "no-build area" for Lot 11, as well as other recommendations on Lots 5-8.

Thank you!

From: Erika Carrillo [<mailto:Erika.Carrillo@swca.com>]
Sent: Friday, April 26, 2019 3:08 PM
To: Camille Leung <cleung@smcgov.org>
Cc: Steve Monowitz <smonowitz@smcgov.org>; Melissa Andrikopoulos <mandrikopoulos@smcgov.org>; Kristen Outten <koutten@swca.com>; Sherry Liu <xliu@smcgov.org>
Subject: RE: EXTERNAL:FW: Highland Estates Lot 11 Revised Storm Outlet

Camille,

Thank you for your comments. We will review these and get back to you next week.

Have a good weekend!

Erika Carrillo

Senior Environmental Project Manager

SWCA Environmental Consultants

60 Stone Pine Road, Suite 100
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019
P 650.440.4160 x6403 | C 650.722.2735



Join us for a [Streamlined NEPA Process and Analysis Workshop](#) in Phoenix, May 7-9!



Visit Our Website: <http://www.swca.com/>

The contents of this email and any associated emails, information, and attachments are CONFIDENTIAL. Use or disclosure without sender's authorization is prohibited. If you are not an authorized recipient, please notify the sender and then immediately delete the email and any attachments.

From: Camille Leung <cleung@smcgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, April 25, 2019 4:47 PM
To: Erika Carrillo <Erika.Carrillo@swca.com>
Cc: Steve Monowitz <smonowitz@smcgov.org>; Melissa Andrikopoulos <mandrikopoulos@smcgov.org>; Kristen Outten <koutten@swca.com>; Sherry Liu <xliu@smcgov.org>
Subject: RE: EXTERNAL:FW: Highland Estates Lot 11 Revised Storm Outlet

Hi Erika,

Sorry for the delay. Please see the County's comments below on SWCA's Draft Memo.

1. Please advise on the adequacy of the existing EIR and mitigation measures to address concerns regarding potential new dusky-woodrat nests/habitats (see attached email from Dave Michaels [neighbor]). We also attached other emails from neighbors which express environmental concerns for your reference as we want to ensure that we address the relevant environmental concerns in our CEQA analysis of the grading modification. Does SWCA identify any other areas where additional environmental analysis is needed?

The existing EIR and mitigation measure (BIO -2a) are adequate to address concerns regarding potential new dusky-footed woodrat nests/habitats; however, the trapping conducted under the CDFW study permit mentioned in the email from Dave Michaels does not comply with the mitigation measure and if additional trapping is proposed during the breeding season, this would be in direct conflict with the measure. The following

are the additional concerns identified by the neighbors. Based on my review of the information provided, no additional areas of environmental analysis are needed.

- White tailed kite
- Sinking of Ticonderoga Drive
- Floor area of the project
- Heritage trees to be removed
- Sea-level height of homes
- All grading
- Extreme weather events (e.g., atmospheric rivers)
- Geologic hazards
- Drainage
- Fire

2. Please provide further details regarding the need for additional noise and air quality impact analyses. For example, are there factors that offset the increased impacts caused by the longer duration of construction activities, such as the distance of residential receptors and the temporary nature of construction impacts, that can be relied on to conclude that the longer duration does not have the potential to result in new significant impacts? Does the fact that the additional grading is required to implement the mitigation measures regarding geotechnical hazards, and has therefore always been part of the project, factor into the need for additional review?

To determine the level of significance for air quality impacts, we would need information regarding the amount and extent of additional grading (import/export), haul truck capacity, trip length, approximate number of daily and total trips, schedule and phasing, on-road and off-road equipment list (including number of units, average hours per day, total hours per phase), average length of on-road vehicle trips for workers and vendors, average number of construction workers per day by phase, and estimated number of vendor trips per phase. In addition, we would need the modeling inputs used for the EIR. This information is needed to run the CalEEMod model and see if the impacts would exceed the new BAAQMD thresholds of significance shown in the table below, which are based on average daily construction and operation emissions, as well as average annual operation emissions. Since the significance criteria for construction is a daily value, we can evaluate the proposed grading plan and determine if there is a daily restriction that would keep the air quality emissions below the level of significance. The fact that the additional grading is required to implement the mitigation measure for geotechnical hazards does not mean that additional impacts associated with the mitigation measure were considered in the EIR, so additional review is needed to determine if impacts would remain less than significant with mitigation (see additional recommended mitigation measures below the table).

Table 3.3-4. BAAQMD CEQA Significance Thresholds for Criteria Pollutants

Pollutant	Average Daily Construction Emissions (pounds per day)	Average Daily Operation Emissions (pounds per day)	Average Annual Operation Emissions (tons per year)
Reactive organic gases (ROG)	54	54	10
Nitrogen oxides (NO _x)	54	54	10
Coarse Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀)	82	82	15
Fine Particulate Matter (PM _{2.5})	54	54	10

Carbon monoxide
(CO)

None

9.0 ppm (8-hour average), 20.0
ppm (1-hour average)

Source: BAAQMD. 2017. CEQA Air Quality Guidelines. Available online at http://www.baaqmd.gov/~media/files/planning-and-research/ceqa/ceqa_guidelines_may2017-pdf.pdf?la=en. Accessed March 18, 2019.

In addition, the BAAQMD recommends implementation of the following Basic Construction Mitigation Measures:

- a. *All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.*
- b. *All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off site shall be covered.*
- c. *All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.*
- d. *All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.*
- e. *All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.*
- f. *Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of the California Code of Regulations). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.*
- g. *All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.*
- h. *Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.*

For noise impacts, the analysis in the EIR was qualitative and did not quantify the noise or vibration levels associated with the construction activities. Construction noise is exempt from the County noise ordinance if the activities take place between 7 a.m. and 6 p.m. weekdays and 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. on Saturdays. Mitigation Measure NOI-1 states that construction activity would be kept to the hours of 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. on weekdays and 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. on Saturdays (inside work only). If construction activities can be limited to the hours allowed by the ordinance, impacts would be less than significant. If not, we would need to quantify the noise levels based on the proposed equipment types and hours of operation daily to determine if it exceeds the thresholds in the noise ordinance. Groundborne vibration can be determined based on the types of equipment and distance to the nearest sensitive receptor to determine potential structural damage and perceptibility at sensitive receptor locations.

3. Please provide input on the process and methods that should be used to conducting the additional air quality and noise analyses, if still recommended. Please also explain why this would necessitate the use of the new CEQA checklist, and why using the new checklist would automatically be considered a major change that necessitates a subsequent EIR.

See above for description of information needed to conduct the additional air quality and noise analyses, which are still recommended. The current CEQA guidelines update applies to steps in the CEQA process not yet undertaken (<http://opr.ca.gov/ceqa/updates/guidelines/>); therefore, any additional CEQA analysis would need to follow the new checklist. A supplemental EIR can only be used if only minor changes would be necessary to make the previous EIR adequately apply to the project in the changed situation, and revisions to the EIR to address the updated checklist would be considered more than minor. If there are no new environmental effects or substantial increases in the severity of previously identified significant effects, an addendum could be prepared.

4. Refinement of Grading Numbers and Truck Trips:

- a. County’s grading estimates for Lots 5-8 (sent to SWCA) are different than the applicant’s estimates. Grading estimates for Lots 5-8 vary by about 3,000 cy (County: 8,000; Applicant: 5,230). Also, total truck trips vary by about 600 trips (County’s estimate: 1300; Applicant: 719). Before we can move forward on the analysis, we will be working with BKF to see if we can agree on these numbers. We also need to reach agreement on the number of truck trips per day that should be assumed, which BKF estimates to be 10-12 trucks per day per their 3/7/19 letter.
- b. Please confirm that the grading proposed for Lots 9-11 conforms to the approved grading volumes contained in the EIR, and that if a subsequent or supplemental EIR is required, the additional analysis will be limited to Lots 5-8, and that construction of lots 9-11 could proceed while these analyses are conducted. The approved and current proposed grading amounts for Lots 9-11 are shown in the attached table.

The Recirculated Draft EIR included 2,200 cubic yards (cy) of cut and 4,200 cy of fill for Lots 9-11 (see table below). In the Excel spreadsheet provided, the approved quantities of cut and fill cited from the BOS Staff Report are less than what was included in the EIR. The proposed 2,180 cy of cut and 3,105 cy of fill would conform to the approved grading volumes for these lots. If there is independent utility for building on Lots 9-11 than presumably construction could proceed as the impacts associated with these lots is covered under the EIR.

Table 3.0-2-3
Proposed Earthwork

Area	Cut (cy)
Lots 1-4	500
Lots 5-8	1,000
Lots 9 and 10	900
Lot 11	1,300

- 5. Lot 11: What is your view on the need for the subdivision to be re-recorded in order to expand the “No-Build” area so to correspond to the current extent of the riparian habitat? Would confirmation that construction plans will not intrude into the existing riparian area provide evidence of compliance with the required mitigation measures?

Mitigation Measure BIO-5a states that “Prior to the commencement of construction activities on lot 11, the outer edge of the willow scrub habitat (facing lot 11) shall be delineated by a qualified biologist. Temporary fencing shall be installed that clearly identifies the outer edge of the willow habitat and that identifies the willow scrub as an ‘Environmentally Sensitive Area.’ Signs shall be installed indicating that the fenced area is ‘restricted’ and that all construction activities, personnel, and **operational disturbances** are prohibited.” This does not require recording the “No-Build” area, but that may be beneficial to ensure that operational disturbances are avoided. Installation of the temporary fencing with signage would provide evidence of compliance with the mitigation measure.

Thank you

Camille Leung, Senior Planner
San Mateo County
Planning and Building Department
455 County Center, 2nd Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063
650-363-1826

From: Erika Carrillo [<mailto:Erika.Carrillo@swca.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, April 17, 2019 2:59 PM
To: Camille Leung <cleung@smcgov.org>; Kristen Outten <koutten@swca.com>
Cc: Steve Monowitz <smonowitz@smcgov.org>; Melissa Andrikopoulos <mandrikopoulos@smcgov.org>
Subject: RE: EXTERNAL:FW: Highland Estates Lot 11 Revised Storm Outlet

Camille,

If they can avoid the riparian area, shifting of the house on Lot 11 would not result in a new significant impact or increase the severity of previously identified significant effects. No additional mitigation measures would be required.

If the impacts to the riparian area result in new significant impact or substantial increase in the severity of the previously identified significant effect and additional mitigation would be required to minimize the impacts to the extent feasible, we would recommend that a subsequent EIR be prepared.

Thanks,

Erika

From: Camille Leung <cleung@smcgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, April 17, 2019 9:57 AM
To: Erika Carrillo <Erika.Carrillo@swca.com>; Kristen Outten <koutten@swca.com>
Cc: Steve Monowitz <smonowitz@smcgov.org>; Melissa Andrikopoulos <mandrikopoulos@smcgov.org>
Subject: EXTERNAL:FW: Highland Estates Lot 11 Revised Storm Outlet

Hi Erika and Kristen,

If the applicant revises their proposal to expand the No-Build Area to include the whole riparian area, how does this affect the significance of project changes? Essentially, the applicant is self-mitigating so its not as if additional mitigations need to be proposed, right?

If applicant does not agree to re-record the Subdivision Map to include a larger No-Build Area, the County will need to add additional mitigation to minimize the “operational” impacts of the project (future homeowner use of the No-Build Area), resulting in a Subsequent EIR, right?

Thanks

From: Camille Leung

Sent: Wednesday, April 17, 2019 9:48 AM

To: Taylor Peterson <tpeterson@migcom.com>; Jack Chamberlain <jtuttlec@aol.com>; Roland Haga <RHAGA@bkf.com>

Cc: Noel Chamberlain <noel@nexgenbuilders.com>; Steve Monowitz <smonowitz@smcgov.org>; Sherry Liu <xliu@smcgov.org>; Amy Ow <aow@smcgov.org>; Kristen Outten <koutten@swca.com>; Erika Carrillo <Erika.Carrillo@swca.com>

Subject: RE: Highland Estates Lot 11 Revised Storm Outlet

Hi Jack, Roland, and Tay,

The County has reviewed the Memo from MIG dated 3/25/19 and building plans submitted on 4/11/19. Please revise project documents to reflect the following comments:

1. For the MIG Memo, please use the most current site plan for Lot 11 (attached). The riparian delineation provided by Tay shows grading within the riparian zone and improvements for the house on Lot 11 immediately adjacent to the riparian zone, such as the front right corner of the house, a corner of the driveway and utility improvements. The plans submitted to the Building Department on 4/11/19 show a revised site plan with grading and improvements outside the riparian area. The County recommends that the applicant look at the full footprint of the project (access, storage, future use of property by owners) to analyze whether the house should be shifted away further from the riparian zone.
2. For the MIG Memo, please indicate the location and type of fencing in compliance with Mitigation Measure BIO-5a, for County and SWCA review. Due to the very close proximity of construction to the riparian zone, the County recommends use of more structural fencing, such as chain link fencing, to prevent movement of the fence during construction.
3. For the MIG Memo, Building Plans and the recorded Subdivision Map, the County recommends that the applicant expand the No-Build Zone on Lot 11 to include the full riparian area. The County recommends that the applicant look at the full footprint of the project (access, storage, future use of property by owners) to analyze whether the house should be shifted away further from the riparian zone.

Mitigation Measure BIO-5a: Prior to the commencement of construction activities on Lot 11, the outer edge of the willow scrub habitat (facing Lot 11) shall be delineated by a qualified biologist. Temporary fencing shall be installed that clearly identifies the outer edge of the willow habitat and that identifies the willow scrub as an "Environmentally Sensitive Area." Signs shall be installed indicating that the fenced area is "restricted" and that all construction activities, personnel, and operational disturbances are prohibited.

Thanks

From: Taylor Peterson [<mailto:tpeterson@migcom.com>]

Sent: Monday, March 25, 2019 4:30 PM

To: Sherry Liu <xliu@smcgov.org>

Cc: Jack Chamberlain <jtuttlec@aol.com>; Roland Haga <RHAGA@bkf.com>; Noel Chamberlain <noel@nexgenbuilders.com>; Steve Monowitz <smonowitz@smcgov.org>; Camille Leung <cleung@smcgov.org>

Subject: Highland Estates Lot 11 Revised Storm Outlet

Hi Sherry,

Jack asked that I respond to a question you had in a March 19 email regarding biological issues on Lot 11 of the Highland Estates subdivision. I have attached the requested letter response. Please do not hesitate to call or email me if there are any further questions.

Thanks,

Tay

Taylor Peterson
Director of Biological Analysis
MIG, Inc.
2635 North First Street, Suite 149
San Jose, California 95134
Cell: (650) 400-5767