

From: Liza [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, March 8, 2021 2:00 PM
To: Barry Miller <Barry.Miller@cityofsanrafael.org>
Cc: Lindsay Lara <Lindsay.Lara@cityofsanrafael.org>
Subject: Public Comment on General Plan EIR

Mr. Miller,

These comments concern Section 4.4 Biological Resources and are in addition to my February 19 comments concerning the omission of the 1929 Northwestern Pacific Railroad Depot building from our historical inventory.

Section 4.4 Table 4.4-1 contains numerous numerical errors in the percentage column; these should be corrected in the Final and/or explained in a footnote.

The description of CNDDDB as "monitoring" special-status wildlife is inaccurate. CNDDDB records observations submitted to it by field scientists; it does not survey or monitor at all. Occurrence records for CNDDDB species are submitted for areas under study; the absence of such records does not indicate that a species is absent, merely that it has not been observed and recorded in the database in that location. Please correct p.4.4-17.

Figure 4.4-3 omits the locations of Northern Spotted Owl nests. While the precise locations should not be disclosed in a public document, the approximate locations of owl activity centers should be included on the map or noted in the legend, lest it appear that no special-status species have been recorded in areas where they in fact have been recorded. For example, the Northern Spotted Owl activity center on Southern Heights ridge is within the EIR study area and its foraging habitat may include the Downtown Precise Plan area. Please update the figure.

Impact BIO-1 similarly omits any mention of the Northern Spotted Owl. Although this species would be covered under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act along with all other native migratory birds, a greater level of protection should be considered for a federally threatened species within our city. Any work conducted in the vicinity of Northern Spotted Owls should avoid the nest with a buffer of at least 1/4-mile, and include biological monitoring to ensure the nesting owls are not disturbed.

In Impact BIO-2, Policy C-1.12 only protects oak woodlands, and fails to provide any safeguard for Redwood forests, buckeye woodlands, native grasslands and other upland sensitive communities within the EIR study area. Mitigation Measure BIO-2 should be updated to require a survey by a qualified

biologist to ascertain presence of all these communities, *and* to avoid or mitigate impacts to any sensitive communities present, before approval of development permits. Simply identifying the presence of a sensitive community is not sufficient to mitigate impacts. The wording of Measure BIO-3 is similarly inconclusive, stating only that surveys shall be conducted for wetland and waters, where it should state that surveyed areas will be avoided or fully mitigated.

Thank you for your attention to my comments.

Sincerely,

Liza Wozniak

A solid black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

San Rafael, CA