

From: [Jacob Patterson](#)
To: [Perkins, Scott](#)
Date: Thursday, February 6, 2020 1:26:37 PM

Scott,

Your staff report provides a recommendation and two alternatives. There is a third option that makes more sense to me, which is to continue the public hearing to a date certain in March and direct staff to prepare an IS/MND and circulate it for the necessary 20 or 30 day public review and comment period. The permit could still be approved by the PC after that review period but will likely require a few additional mitigation measures and special conditions, including requiring species-appropriate replacement plantings of an adequate number of trees to replace the eliminated tree canopy and wildlife habitat due to the removal of the preparing a historic resources report evaluating the integrity of the cultural landscape. Tess has mentioned a forest management plan for this area, and the preparation of such a management plan might also be added as a project requirement and special condition. I think that might address some the the concerns expressed during prior public comments about evaluating this sensitive area as an ecological whole rather than just looking at individual tree removals (e.g., "death by a thousand cuts").

Even if the PC doesn't address the CEQA issue directly, they still have the option of adding additional special conditions and/or mitigation measures if they want to approve the CDP and I suspect that public comments will suggest some options they may want to consider.

Regards,

--Jacob