

Public Comments for San Mateo County Forest Health and Fire Resilience Draft Public Works Plan

Date Submitted	Submitter	Comment Summary	Response
5/16/2021	Lisa Ketcham	Concerned about available vegetation maps do not depict or mention the Monterey pine woods at Pillar Point Bluff. "Under ESHA in the PWP, examples include Monterey Pine forest. How do we account for this being an invasive species that has transformed previous natural bluff habitats of coastal scrub and coastal prairie?" Included photo of vegetation.	Supportive. This additional requested info could be added in more detail in individual project PSAs if a future project occurs on the Pillar Point Bluff. Thank you for providing this information.
6/8/2021	Tim Hyland, State Parks	Submitted support letter	We appreciate the support.
6/11/2021	Anthony Castanos, Save the Redwoods	Submitted support letter	We appreciate the support.
6/14/2021	Steve Monowitz, County Planning and Building	Submitted support letter	We appreciate the support.
6/14/2021	Sup. Horsley, San Mateo County	Submitted support letter	We appreciate the support.
6/15/2021	Michael Rhoades, Santa Clara County Parks	Submitted support letter	We appreciate the support.
6/16/2021	Michelle McCormick, Girl Scouts of Northern California	Submitted support letter	We appreciate the support.
6/16/2021	Mike Duffy, Redwood Empire	Submitted support letter	We appreciate the support.
6/16/2021	Madeline Cavalieri, CA Coastal Commission	Submitted support letter	We appreciate the support.

Public Comments for San Mateo County Forest Health and Fire Resilience Draft Public Works Plan

6/16/2021	David LoCoco, PMAC	Submitted support letter	We appreciate the support.
6/16/2021	Gabriel Schultz, CAL FIRE	Thanks CCC for addressing concerns following RSDSCC public hearing for PWP. They support approach to streamline permitting and expedite projects. Also acknowledge this is not the only process and they are exploring other ways to	We appreciate the support.

Public Comments for San Mateo County Forest Health and Fire Resilience Draft Public Works Plan

6/16/2021	Dr. Keith Gillless, Board of Forestry and Fire Prevention	States the CalVTP is consistent with the Coastal Act, and PWP is not needed. Companion regulatory efforts could increase costs and delay projects. Multiple agency approvals of PWP process complicates regulations. Terminology is confusing with CVTS. No defined review period by CCC likely will result in projet delays. Standards, practices, data collection is different that that of CalVTP, which can cause confusion. CCC should recognize CalVTP as standalone program.	The RCD conducted extensive research on this topic with a wide variety of public agencies, regulatory experts, partners, etc. and the overwhelming preponderance of feedback received on this subject recommended that CDPs would be required for many of our forest health and fire resilience projects in the Coastal Zone. Moreover, the CalVTP PEIR notes in 3 locations that projects approved under the PEIR that take place within the Coastal Zone may need CDPs (e.g. PSA check Box 8, SPR AD-9 and BIO-8). The RCD is not in a position, as a local special district, to make a determination counter to the conclusion of our research. That said, we strongly support the Board of Forestry working at a statewide-level to resolve this question and make a final determination. The RCD is not invested in the PWP as the only solution for forest health and fire resilience project to complying with the Coastal Act. If the Board of Forestry and Coastal Commission make a determination that these types of projects are exempt from the Coastal Act and Local Coastal Programs, we will abandon our PWP and utilize exemptions as the most efficient pathway for implementation of these critical projects.
6/16/2021	Nicholas Calderon, San Mateo County Parks	Submitted support letter	We appreciate the support.
6/16/2021	Jeff Gaffney, County of Santa Cruz Parks	Submitted support letter	We appreciate the support.

Public Comments for San Mateo County Forest Health and Fire Resilience Draft Public Works Plan

6/17/2021	Jamie Tuitele-Lewis, RCD of Monterey	Asked how the 5 and 10 year review came about in the PWP development.	All partners felt it was very important to integrate into the plan a place to review and reflect on the progress. This would be a time we could sit down together and talk about the program. We can ask: What is working well or what is not? Do we need to course correct? If a change is required, we can then make an amendment, which is not a cumbersome process.
6/17/2021	Sarah Collamer, CAL FIRE	As a forester and in conversations with supervisor, Rich Sampson, and higher ups, CAL FIRE has discussed having some reservations about the PWP and not being fully invested in the process this past summer, although they were involved earlier in the process. Sarah helped to edit draft copy of the PWP with Angela Bernheisel of CAL FIRE.	We have heard and responded to the concerns of CAL FIRE about the additional requirements of the PWP. We also had discussions about CAL FIRE leading the PWP, but they are currently not eligible. We addressed the extensive comments and inputs CAL FIRE (Angela and Sarah) provided for the PWP. We also hear that this CAL FIRE agrees there needs to be a solution but this is not their preferred solution. We will continue our partnership with CAL FIRE and offer to be supportive as conversations develop at the state level and there is movement forward in developing a more permanent solution.