

Amy Ow

From: Camille Leung
Sent: Monday, September 16, 2019 5:36 PM
To: Taylor Peterson; robertpellegrine@yahoo.com; Noel Chamberlain
Cc: Amy Ow; Steve Monowitz; Kristen Outten; Jessica Henderson-McBean
Subject: RE: Lots 9 and 10 Site Visit_07/12/2019

Hi Tay,

Thanks. The County and SWCA agree that we will not need a follow-up nesting bird or roosting bat survey at this time.

Based on the recommendation of SWCA, please continue to try to make contact with CDFW. I recommend logging all your attempts by date and CDFW staff person's name, so that if you cannot reach them after several more attempts and if the County decides to allow the project to proceed forward, we can at least show them that several attempts were made to reach them.

Just to confirm, have any surveys been conducted so far for Lot 11? If not, please reach out to the applicants to see whether timing of the project would need such surveys to be done soon.

Thanks

From: Taylor Peterson [mailto:tpeterson@migcom.com]
Sent: Monday, September 16, 2019 4:08 PM
To: Camille Leung <cleung@smcgov.org>; robertpellegrine@yahoo.com; Noel Chamberlain <noel@nexgenbuilders.com>
Cc: Amy Ow <aow@smcgov.org>; Steve Monowitz <smonowitz@smcgov.org>; Kristen Outten <koutten@swca.com>; Jessica Henderson-McBean <JHenderson-McBean@swca.com>
Subject: RE: Lots 9 and 10 Site Visit_07/12/2019

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,

In my opinion the bird and bat seasons are over for the year for all of the lots. The last woodrat survey on Lots 9 and 10 was conducted on August 9, so an updated survey is required because more than 30 days have elapsed.

There is a requirement in the conditions of approval that states, "if active woodrat nests (stickhouses) with young are identified, a fence shall be erected around the nest site adequate to provide the woodrat sufficient foraging habitat at the discretion of a qualified biologist and based on consultation with the CDFG." I have asked two people at CDFW for guidance regarding the woodrat, as required in the conditions of approval, and have not gotten any replies. In my opinion the orange plastic fence that has been erected around the woodrat nest on Lot 9 is not preventing the rat(s) from foraging because they can climb under it, over it, and probably through it. We have consulted with CDFW and they have opted not to reply. I don't think additional consultation is necessary for this particular woodrat house and fencing.

Woodrat and frog surveys would be required for any work proposed for Lot 11 from now until February. Surveys for bats and nesting birds would be added to the list starting in April for bats and February for birds.

Tay

From: Camille Leung <cleung@smcgov.org>
Sent: Monday, September 16, 2019 3:28 PM
To: Taylor Peterson <tpeterson@migcom.com>; robertpellegrine@yahoo.com; Noel Chamberlain <noel@nexgenbuilders.com>
Cc: Amy Ow <aow@smcgov.org>; Steve Monowitz <smonowitz@smcgov.org>; Kristen Outten <koutten@swca.com>; Jessica Henderson-McBean <JHenderson-McBean@swca.com>
Subject: RE: Lots 9 and 10 Site Visit_07/12/2019

Hi Tay,

The biological mitigation measure for nesting/breeding birds says “typically February through August in the project region”.

The biological mitigation measure for native bats, the breeding season “generally occurs from April 1 through August 31”.

For the biological mitigation measure for woodrats, there doesn’t appear to be a “season” but “No earlier than 30 days prior to the commencement of construction activities, a survey shall be conducted”

For Lots 9 and 10, please advise as to whether the bird and bat seasons are over and advise as to the latest woodrat survey conducted.

What is the status of surveys (e.g., woodrat, CRLF) for Lot 11?

Thanks

From: Taylor Peterson [<mailto:tpeterson@migcom.com>]
Sent: Monday, September 16, 2019 3:04 PM
To: Camille Leung <cleung@smcgov.org>; robertpellegrine@yahoo.com; Noel Chamberlain <noel@nexgenbuilders.com>
Cc: Amy Ow <aow@smcgov.org>; Steve Monowitz <smonowitz@smcgov.org>; Kristen Outten <koutten@swca.com>; Jessica Henderson-McBean <JHenderson-McBean@swca.com>
Subject: RE: Lots 9 and 10 Site Visit_07/12/2019

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,

We are now outside of the nesting season identified in the EIR (February through August). Could you please confirm that additional nesting bird surveys are not required at this time?

Thanks,

Tay

From: Camille Leung <cleung@smcgov.org>
Sent: Monday, September 16, 2019 2:58 PM
To: robertpellegrine@yahoo.com; Noel Chamberlain <noel@nexgenbuilders.com>
Cc: Amy Ow <aow@smcgov.org>; Steve Monowitz <smonowitz@smcgov.org>; Kristen Outten <koutten@swca.com>;

Jessica Henderson-McBean <JHenderson-McBean@swca.com>; Taylor Peterson <tpeterson@migcom.com>

Subject: FW: Lots 9 and 10 Site Visit_07/12/2019

Hi Robert and Noel,

See email below for what SWCA will be looking for in the follow-up inspection. Please do not dig the construction entrance until Tay Peterson (Biologist) and County's mitigation monitor have confirmed that Bio Surveys are up to date. I believe the last nesting bird survey for Lots 9 and 10 was dated 8/9/19 and has expired.

Also, in talking to Noel, he said he will only need to dig down 3" for the aggregate entrance in order to stabilize the 1 foot thick rock bed made up of 4"-6" rock for use by trucks to enter and exit the site. Please do not grade any more than 3" below the grade for the entrance.

Also, bio surveys were submitted only for Lots 9 and 10, so please do not do any work on Lot 11.

Also, thanks for the \$5,000 payment for Mitigation Monitoring. Current balance is \$6,083.44. I asked for Noel to provide \$5,000 of additional funds to cover future construction monitoring services, but the current balance still needs to be paid.

Also, due to the error in the Grading schedule, Noel was going to send a revised Grading Schedule.

Remaining Items are:

1. Please do not dig the construction entrance until Tay Peterson (Biologist) and County's mitigation monitor have confirmed that Bio Surveys are up to date. I believe the last nesting bird survey for Lots 9 and 10 was dated 8/9/19 and has expired.
2. Revised Grading Schedule
3. Payment for Mitigation Monitoring. Current balance is \$6,083.44. Please pay current balance.
4. Provide additional info requested by Planning for sign-off of Lot 11.
 - a. Please see attached map for Planning comments on the 5/22/19 resubmittal for Lot 11. We reviewed the plans with SWCA (mitigation monitor) and the County Arborist. Please provide information as requested on the map attached.
 - b. Please check the location of the evacuation easement and other easements that may have changed with the changes to house and driveway on Lot 11.
 - c. Need Bio-surveys per Bio Mitigation Measures for Lot 11
5. Install all Erosion Control and Tree Protection Measures, as required by the submitted plans and comments from SWCA
6. Schedule and complete Erosion Control and Tree Protection Pre-site inspection with Planning Staff and SWCA (follow-up inspection required)

Thanks

From: Camille Leung

Sent: Wednesday, September 04, 2019 1:24 PM

To: Noel Chamberlain <noel@nexgenbuilders.com>

Cc: Amy Ow <aow@smcgov.org>

Subject: FW: Lots 9 and 10 Site Visit_07/12/2019

Hi Noel,

SWCA Email re-sent per your request...

From: Camille Leung
Sent: Tuesday, July 16, 2019 12:44 PM
To: Noel Chamberlain <noel@nexgenbuilders.com>
Cc: Steve Monowitz <smonowitz@smcgov.org>; Amy Ow <aow@smcgov.org>; Taylor Peterson <tpeterson@migcom.com>; Kristen Outten <koutten@swca.com>
Subject: FW: Lots 9 and 10 Site Visit_07/12/2019

Hi Noel and Tay,

Please see SWCA recommendations from our site visit on 7/12/19, below. Please make the recommended corrections and arrange with Kristen as to whether a follow up inspection or just photos are needed.

Tay, please send the updated nesting bird survey when you get a chance.

Thanks

From: Kristen Outten [<mailto:koutten@swca.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, July 16, 2019 10:42 AM
To: Camille Leung <cleung@smcgov.org>
Cc: Jessica Henderson-McBean <JHenderson-McBean@swca.com>
Subject: Lots 9 and 10 Site Visit_07/12/2019

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.

Hello Camille,

I am sending this email to summarize what we reviewed and discussed at last Friday's site visit at Lots 9 and 10. Please let me know if you have any questions or would like to discuss further.

LOT 9:

- There are two trees on the Civil Plan that were slated for protection. There seemed to be some confusion amongst the team as to specifically which two trees those were, as well as confusion regarding the extent of grading/disturbance within proximity of the trees. Several trees (+/-5?) were included in the tree protection zones on Lot 9. According to COA 21, "Tree protection zones shall be delineated using 4-foot tall orange plastic fencing supported by poles pounded into the ground, located as close to the driplines as possible while still allowing room for construction/grading to safely continue". Tree protection fencing was installed near the trunk of the trees and did not extend to the outer extent of the dripline. To ensure grading activities do not result in adverse impacts to the oak trees slated for protection, I recommend the contractor more accurately determines the extent of grading/disturbance and that the tree protection fencing is extended to the outer extent of the dripline of the trees that are slated for protection. If the tree protection buffers cannot be expanded due to the limits of grading, then I recommend that a certified arborist or registered forester inspect the trees/roots before any roots or root masses need to be cut, per COA 21.
- The silt fence was installed on Lot 9 in an area slightly beyond the limits of grading shown on the Erosion Control Plan. The silt fence was installed along the western edge of the property whereas the Erosion Control Plan shows it will be installed on the inside (east side) of the trees slated for protection. Similar to the comment above, I recommend the contractor more accurately determines the extent of grading/disturbance and that the silt fence is installed in accordance with the Erosion Control Plan. This will ensure compliance with COA 7 and ensure actual impacts are consistent with those that were used in the CEQA analysis.

- Woodrat middens were included within the tree protection zone to ensure they are not impacted by grading activities. It was assumed that the woodrat nests are active with young present, until proven otherwise. In accordance with Mitigation Measure BIO-2, it is recommended that the biologist consult with CDFW to determine an appropriate buffer that will provide sufficient foraging habitat.

LOT 10:

- There are eight trees on the Civil Plan that were slated for protection, all of which were fenced off during the site visit. Please note that the two trees along the northwest end of the lot that are slated for protection are included in the tree protection zone and are well outside the limits of grading; however, they did not have 4-foot tall orange plastic fencing as required by COA 21. This is because these trees are within the fence line of the adjacent landowner. Similar to what was discussed above for Lot 9, tree protection fencing was installed near the trunk of the trees and did not extend to the outer extent of the dripline. To ensure grading activities do not result in adverse impacts to the trees slated for protection, I recommend the contractor more accurately determines the extent of grading/disturbance and that the tree protection fencing is extended to the outer extent of the dripline of the trees that are slated for protection. If the tree protection buffers cannot be expanded due to the limits of grading, then I recommend that a certified arborist or registered forester inspect the trees/roots before any roots or root masses need to be cut, per COA 21.
- The silt fence installed on Lot 10 appeared to be installed in an area larger than what is shown on the Erosion Control Plan. I recommend the silt fence is installed in accordance with the Erosion Control Plan. This will ensure compliance with COA 7 and ensure actual impacts are consistent with those that were used in the CEQA analysis.

BOTH LOTS:

- The disturbance coordinator contact sign was posted on site with the appropriate contact info.
- The construction entrance/exit was not yet installed, but according to Noel will be installed prior to any grading activities.
- The contractor will provide their own QSP; SWCA will provide 3rd party compliance inspection on behalf of the County.

Please let me know if you have any questions or would like to discuss this in more detail. Also, I will upload the photos to the project SharePoint site later today. Let me know if you need me to resend you the link to that site.

Thanks,
Kristen

Kristen Outten
Project Manager / Senior Biologist

SWCA Environmental Consultants
60 Stone Pine Road, Suite 100
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019
P 650.440.4160 x 6404 | C 831.331.5264 | F 650.440.4165



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.