

From: RNewman@ResolutionStrategiesInc.com
To: [Camille Leung](#)
Cc: [Amy Ow](#); [Jack Chamberlain \(jtuttlec@aol.com\)](#); [Jonathan Tang](#); [noel@nexgenbuilders.com](#); [robertpellegrine@yahoo.com](#); [Steve Monowitz](#); "[Larry Jacobson \(laj@cohenandjacobson.com\)](#)"; [Sherry Liu](#)
Subject: RE: Status of Project Geotechnical Consultant and Upcoming Grading Moratorium
Date: Friday, August 6, 2021 9:36:04 AM

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,

The honest answer to your question is that I don't know right at this moment, exactly what Jack's plans are. I have a call into him on this matter and to discuss the Cotton Shires letter (and get you an answer on the monitoring proposal as well).

As I am not a builder, can you enlighten me as to the moratorium period. Does the entire grading project need to be completed prior to October 1? If so, and if the 10 weeks is accurate, of course we don't have ten weeks if we started today. I am thinking perhaps Jack can get the grading done faster than that, so I am adding that to my list of matters to discuss with him. I am sure you would need confirmation of a faster schedule (from the grading contractor?).

Of course, this all turns on the decision of the County with respect to the minor change proposed and what response is being formulated to the neighbors counsel. If you could enlighten us to where you believe that is going, it would be helpful to allow us to move the project financing forward quickly enough to start (and finish I assume) the grading before we are stopped. Of course, an exception, if we could get one, would perhaps allow this project to get moving this year. I don't really want to think of what the impact of a delay until mid-2022 might be.

As soon as I can discuss these matters with Jack and Larry, I will be back in touch. Thanks for keeping me up to date.

Regards,
Rich

From: Camille Leung <cleung@smcgov.org>
Sent: Friday, August 6, 2021 9:18 AM
To: RNewman@Rochex.com
Cc: [Amy Ow](mailto:aow@smcgov.org) <aow@smcgov.org>; [Jack Chamberlain \(jtuttlec@aol.com\) <juttlec@aol.com>](mailto:Jack Chamberlain (jtuttlec@aol.com) <juttlec@aol.com>); Jonathan Tang <jtang@bkf.com>; noel@nexgenbuilders.com; robertpellegrine@yahoo.com; Steve Monowitz <smonowitz@smcgov.org>; '[Larry Jacobson \(laj@cohenandjacobson.com\) <laj@cohenandjacobson.com>](mailto:Larry Jacobson (laj@cohenandjacobson.com) <laj@cohenandjacobson.com>)'; [Sherry Liu <xliu@smcgov.org>](mailto:Sherry Liu <xliu@smcgov.org)
Subject: Status of Project Geotechnical Consultant and Upcoming Grading Moratorium
Importance: High

Hi Rich,

Please see message from the County's Geotechnical Section below.

Please note that the upcoming rainy season starts on October 1, with a Grading Moratorium in effect on that date. For an exception to the moratorium, you will need to apply with an accompanying Geo letter to support the grading work in the rainy season, subject to the Director's review (see attached application and application requirements).

Considering the current status of the Project Geotechnical consultant, the estimated 10 week grading schedule, and the current status of the building permits, do you plan to apply for this exception? Or do you plan to wait until after the wet season ends on May 1, 2022?

Thanks

From: Sherry Liu <xliu@smcgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, August 5, 2021 4:00 PM
To: Camille Leung <cleung@smcgov.org>
Cc: Melissa Andrikopoulos <mandrikopoulos@smcgov.org>; Steve Monowitz <smonowitz@smcgov.org>
Subject: Re: Invoice for CSA Response to Newmeyer Dillon Letters

Hi Camille,

Cornerstone declined to be the Project Geotechnical Consultant today, with their core staff passed or leaving.

Please ask the applicant to pick a new Project Geotechnical Consultant in order to continue this project.

Thank you!

All the best & Stay Safe,

Sherry

Geotechnical Section

Planning & Building Department

County of San Mateo

geo@smcgov.org

<https://planning.smcgov.org>

From: Camille Leung <cleung@smcgov.org>

Sent: Thursday, August 5, 2021 9:15 AM

To: Sherry Liu <xliu@smcgov.org>

Cc: Melissa Andrikopoulos <mandrikopoulos@smcgov.org>; Steve Monowitz <smonowitz@smcgov.org>

Subject: FW: Invoice for CSA Response to Newmeyer Dillon Letters

Hi Sherry,

I need your help with few things:

1. Please review the Response Letter from CSA and let us know if it adequately addresses the Newmeyer Dillon Letters (forwarded earlier). Please let us know by end of the week.
2. Also, I wanted to confirm full compliance with the GEO mitigation measures (pasted below) as they apply to Lots 5-8. For Lots 9-11, remember to require as-built plans per Geo-2b (I added to the Geo Final inspections).
3. Based on CSA recommendations (need update letter and update of 2015 report to current building code) and your requirement for a new Section 1, please issue a new email/letter with everything you need from the Applicant.

Thank you!

- m. **Mitigation Measure GEO-1:** A design-level geotechnical investigation of the site shall be performed prior to any project grading including static and seismic slope stability analysis of the areas of the project site to be graded and developed. The specific mitigation measures to be utilized in order to stabilize existing landslides and areas of potential seismically induced landslides shall be presented in the report. The specific mitigation measures shall include some of the following measures or measures comparable to these:
- Landslide debris on Lots 7 and 8 shall be excavated and replaced with a fully drained conventional buttress fill that is founded in the underlying Franciscan mélange, as recommended by the project geotechnical engineer. (Lots 7-8)
 - Retaining walls shall be designed to withstand high lateral earth pressure from adjoining natural materials and/or backfill shall be installed at the rear of Lots 5 through 8. In addition, retaining walls shall be built in the front of Lots 5 and 6 to aid in maintaining the slopes behind the lots and the more extensive cut required for Lots 5 and 6. (Lots 5-8)
 - A surface drainage system shall be installed for each lot to mitigate new landslides developing within the thin veneer of soil mantling the bedrock on the slope below Lots 1 through 4. (Lots 1-4)
 - Subsurface drainage galleries may be installed to control the flow of groundwater and reduce the potential for slope instabilities from occurring in

the future. (All lots)

- Over-steepening of slopes shall be avoided. Horizontal benches shall be constructed on all reconstructed slopes at an interval of 25 to 30 feet. New fill shall be compacted to at least 90 percent relative compaction (as determined by ASTM test method D1557). (All lots)
 - Drilled piers and grade-beam foundations shall be used to support foundations in accordance with recommendations of the project geotechnical engineer. (All lots)
- n. **Mitigation Measure GEO-2a:** Materials used to construct the buttress fill should have effective strength parameters equal to or better than the parameters used in the Treadwell and Rollo 2009 study. (Lots 7 and 8)
- o. **Mitigation Measure GEO-2b:** The following mitigation measures shall be implemented to ensure the stability of proposed structures that are located on deep fill soils:
- A site-specific, design-level geotechnical investigation shall be completed during the design phase of the proposed project, and prior to approval of new building construction within the site for specific foundation design, slope configuration, and drainage design. (All lots)
 - The geotechnical investigation shall provide recommendations to prevent water from ponding in pavement areas and adjacent to the foundation of the proposed residences, and to prevent collected water from being discharged freely onto the ground surface adjacent to the residences, site retaining walls, or artificial slopes. The project geotechnical engineer shall identify on site areas downslope of the homes where the collected water may be discharged utilizing properly designed energy dissipaters. (All lots)
 - Fills used at the project site shall be properly placed with keyways and subsurface drainage, and adequately compacted following the recommendations of the final geotechnical report and Geotechnical Engineer, in order to significantly reduce fill settlement. (All lots)
 - Underground utilities shall be designed and constructed using flexible connection points to allow for differential settlement. (All lots)
 - Foundation plans shall be submitted to the County for review prior to issuance of a building permit. All foundation excavations shall be observed during construction by the project Geotechnical Engineer to insure that subsurface conditions encountered are as anticipated. As-built documentation shall be submitted to the County. (All lots)
 - Drilled pier and grade-beam foundations or other appropriate foundations per the recommendations of the design-level geotechnical investigation shall be developed for lots that are determined to likely experience soil creep. (All lots)

All work shall be completed in accordance with requirements of the 2007 California Building Code and the San Mateo County Building Code. (All lots)

- p. **Improvement Measure GEO-3:** In compliance with the NPDES regulations, the Project Applicant shall file a Notice of Intent with the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) prior to the start of grading and prepare a SWPPP.

The SWPPP shall include specific best management practices to reduce soil erosion. The SWPPP shall include locations and specifications of recommended soil stabilization techniques, such as placement of straw wattles, silt fence, berms, and storm drain inlet protection. The SWPPP shall also depict staging and mobilization areas with access routes to and from the site for heavy equipment. The SWPPP shall include temporary measures to reduce erosion to be implemented during construction, as well as permanent measures.

County staff and/or representatives shall review the SWPPP to ensure adequate compliance with State and County standards.

County staff and/or representatives shall visit the site during grading and construction to ensure compliance with the SWPPP, as well as note any violations, which shall be corrected immediately. A final inspection shall be completed prior to occupancy.

- q. **Mitigation Measure GEO-4:** The Project Applicant shall be required to use the seismic design criteria listed below to design structures and foundations to withstand expected seismic sources in accordance with the California Building Code (2007) as adopted by the County of San Mateo.

Site Class: C

Soil Profile Name: Very Dense Soil and Soft Rock

Occupancy Category: II

Seismic Design Category: E

Mapped Spectral Response for Short Periods- 0.2 Sec (S_s): 2.226 g

Mapped Spectral Response for Long Periods- 1 Sec (S_1): 1.273 g

Site Coefficient - F_a , based on the mapped spectral response for short periods:

1.0

Site Coefficient - F_v , based on the mapped spectral response for long periods:

1.3

Adjusted Maximum Considered EQ Spectral Response for Short Periods (SMS):

2.226

Adjusted Maximum Considered EQ Spectral Response for Long Periods

(SM1): 1.655

Design (5-percent damped) Spectral Response Acceleration Parameters at short periods (SDS): 1.484

Design (5-percent damped) Spectral Response Acceleration Parameters at long periods (SD1): 1.103

- r. **Mitigation Measure GEO-5:** During site grading, soils in each lot shall be observed and tested by the project Geotechnical Engineer to determine if

expansive soils are exposed. Should expansive soils be encountered in planned building or pavement locations, the following measures shall be implemented under the direction of the Geotechnical Engineer in order to mitigate the impact of expansive soils:

- Expansive soils in foundation areas shall be excavated and replaced with non-expansive fill to the specifications of the geotechnical engineer.
- A layer of non-expansive fill soils 12 to 24 inches in thickness shall be placed over the expansive materials and prior to the placement of pavements or foundations.
- Moisture conditioning of expansive soil shall be applied to a degree that is several percent above the optimum moisture content or lime treating of the expansive soil.
- Foundations shall be constructed to be below the zone of seasonal moisture fluctuation or to be capable of withstanding the effects of seasonal moisture fluctuations.
- Specific control of surface drainage and subsurface drainage measures shall be provided.
- Low water demand landscaping shall be used.

From: Camille Leung

Sent: Thursday, August 5, 2021 8:37 AM

To: RNewman@ResolutionStrategiesInc.com; Jack Chamberlain (jtuttlec@aol.com)
<jtuttlec@aol.com>

Cc: noel@nexgenbuilders.com; Victoria Mejia <vmejia@smcgov.org>; David Byers <dbyers@landuselaw.net>; John Nibbelin <jnibbelin@smcgov.org>; 'Larry Jacobson (laj@cohenandjacobson.com)' <laj@cohenandjacobson.com>; robertpellegrine@yahoo.com; Steve Monowitz <smonowitz@smcgov.org>

Subject: RE: Invoice for CSA Response to Newmeyer Dillon Letters

Hi Rich,

Please see the attached response letter by CSA. Steve and Sherry have final review.

We plan to issue a letter to respond to comments, including this letter, and provide a decision as early as late next week.

Thanks

From: RNewman@ResolutionStrategiesInc.com <rnewman@resolutionstrategiesinc.com>

Sent: Wednesday, August 4, 2021 4:45 PM

To: Camille Leung <cleung@smcgov.org>; Jack Chamberlain (jtuttlec@aol.com) <jtuttlec@aol.com>; RNewman@ResolutionStrategiesInc.com

Cc: noel@nexgenbuilders.com; Amy Ow <aow@smcgov.org>; Victoria Mejia <vmejia@smcgov.org>; David Byers <dbyers@landuselaw.net>; John Nibbelin <jnibbelin@smcgov.org>; 'Larry Jacobson (laj@cohenandjacobson.com)' <laj@cohenandjacobson.com>; robertpellegrine@yahoo.com; Steve Monowitz <smonowitz@smcgov.org>

Subject: RE: Invoice for CSA Response to Newmeyer Dillon Letters

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,

I am sorry, I had not read the CS invoice until I printed the message I sent to you.

I thought we were waiting for a bid from them which you wanted Jack to approve before that proceeded. It appears that the work is done. Is this the final bill for this work?

Does this mean the County can now reply to the neighbors and their counsel, and if so, what is the timetable for that? Can you advise that nature of that response? Can you forward the CS reports?

Thanks,
Rich

From: Camille Leung <cleung@smcgov.org>

Sent: Wednesday, August 04, 2021 11:03 AM

To: RNewman@Rochex.com; Jack Chamberlain (jtuttlec@aol.com) <jtuttlec@aol.com>; RNewman@ResolutionStrategiesInc.com

Cc: noel@nexgenbuilders.com; Amy Ow <aow@smcgov.org>; Victoria Mejia <vmejia@smcgov.org>; David Byers <dbyers@landuselaw.net>; John Nibbelin <jnibbelin@smcgov.org>; 'Larry Jacobson (laj@cohenandjacobson.com)' <laj@cohenandjacobson.com>; robertpellegrine@yahoo.com

Subject: Invoice for CSA Response to Newmeyer Dillon Letters

Hi Rich and Jack,

Here's the invoice for Cotton Shires (CSA) work on responding to the Geo-related comments on Lots 5-8. Did you have comments on the Draft SWCA Change Order for Lots 5-8?

Just checking in to see when the County can anticipate payment for the outstanding mitigation monitoring fees for Lots 9-11? Here's a summary of what is due to date (inspections on Lots 9-11 are ongoing; full spreadsheet attached):

Lots 9-11 – Mitigation Monitoring

Paid by Chamberlain: \$31,083.44

Paid by the County: \$52,504.25

Balance Due: \$21,420.81

Lots 5-8

Recommended Deposit for Mitigation Monitoring per Change Order:

\$10,000 to \$20,000

CSA Fee for Review of Comments:

CSA Fee: \$3,637.50

Payment for EIR Addendum for Lots 5-8:

Paid by Chamberlain: \$23,321.55

Paid by the County: \$20,240.84 (remaining funds may have been spent, waiting on invoice for July)

Thanks