

From: [Camille Leung](#)
To: [Amy Ow](#)
Subject: FW: Voicemail from SAN MATEO CTY O (6503634000) to 6506158222
Date: Friday, August 20, 2021 12:08:39 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

From: RNewman@ResolutionStrategiesInc.com <rnewman@resolutionstrategiesinc.com>
Sent: Friday, August 20, 2021 8:29 AM
To: Steve Monowitz <smonowitz@smcgov.org>; RNewman@ResolutionStrategiesInc.com
Cc: Jack Chamberlain (jtuttlec@aol.com) <jtuttlec@aol.com>; 'Larry Jacobson (laj@cohenandjacobson.com)' <laj@cohenandjacobson.com>
Subject: RE: Voicemail from SAN MATEO CTY O (6503634000) to 6506158222

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.

Good morning Steve,

Thank you for your thoughtful reply.

Just a couple of points and I will leave the rest to our discussion at 11:00 (confirmed – which number is best for you at that time?):

1. I honestly do not know if the replacement engineering firm will be near the point where they can make the kind of assessment (having never visited the site to date). Jack advises that he has been providing them voluminous documentation of the history of the project, conditions of approval, etc.
2. It is my understanding that the project team certainly could have started grading months, if not years earlier, but the always uncertain position of the County (as driven by the circumstances) with regard to approvals makes standing-up that group and the expenses in doing so, imprudent. This is an important point: As of this moment, Jack has not been informed (to my knowledge) that the County will approve the minor modification, and, will not find the neighbor's complaints are sufficient to stop the project (or provide the never-ending delay they have sought and obtained for years on end). We understand that when this goes in print, it is evidence that a final determination has been made. We have not (again, to my understanding) had as much as a nod in this direction.

I think you can understand that when we are waiting for the very important developments to occur (letter and decision on modification), yet another step (with no small amount of work and expense necessary to provide) seems simply intolerable. The question is, “is this the last thing we will be asked for?” It is not an unreasonable

question, given that we are close to three decades of planning and permitting work.

It would be helpful that if such a request is brewing, that we learn about it in real time, so that we don't think the letter and decision we have discussed is on the brink of release, only to find it will likely be at least another month.

As always, I appreciate your cordial approach and assistance. I will call you at 11:00.

Regards,

Rich



RESOLUTION STRATEGIES
INCORPORATED

Richard M. Newman

President

1141 Capuchino Ave. #1934

Burlingame, CA 94011

(650) 259-9559 ph.

(650) 343-6111 fx.

From: Steve Monowitz <smonowitz@smcgov.org>

Sent: Friday, August 20, 2021 7:40 AM

To: RNewman@ResolutionStrategiesInc.com

Cc: Jack Chamberlain (jtuttlec@aol.com) <jtuttlec@aol.com>; 'Larry Jacobson (laj@cohenandjacobson.com)' <laj@cohenandjacobson.com>

Subject: RE: Voicemail from SAN MATEO CTY O (6503634000) to 6506158222

Hi Rich,

As you know, we received many objection letters covering a range of issue, so developing a summary response has been no easy task.

We have a final draft ready, and in the process of preparing it, had our Geotechnical consultant, Cotton Shires, peer review it to ensure accuracy. Camille's request is based on Cotton Shires feedback on our draft response – specifically, Cotton Shires has identified the need for the project geologist to confirm the following statement in the EIR addendum as being accurate: “although more soils would be removed to safely construct homes on Lots 5-8, the geologic hazards remain the same as those analyzed in the EIR”. Due to the age of the 2015 Cornerstone Report, Cotton Shires identified the need for the project geologist to confirm that the existing conditions of the site, as presented in the 2015 report,

remain unchanged, and the solutions to reduce those hazards, as presented in the mitigation measures, also remain the same.

As it relates to the timing of construction, while I could be wrong, my general observation has been that irrespective of the modification review, the construction Team has not been in a position to start and complete grading before the rainy season.

It is our position that the requested confirmation from the project geologist will be an important ingredient to our ability to defend the conclusions of our review, which we expect will be vigorously challenged. As a result, we believe that it is in the best interest of the project for us to have such a letter in hand before finalizing our determination.

I'm available at 11:00 if you'd like to talk about this.

Sincerely,

Steve

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

Sent: Thursday, August 19, 2021 6:05 PM

To: Steve Monowitz <smonowitz@smcgov.org>

Cc: Jack Chamberlain (jtuttlec@aol.com) <jtuttlec@aol.com>; 'Larry Jacobson (laj@cohenandjacobson.com)' <laj@cohenandjacobson.com>

Subject: FW: Voicemail from SAN MATEO CTY O (6503634000) to 6506158222

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.

Good evening Steve,

Hope all is well.

I received the attached message from Camille after hours today and I will call her back tomorrow, but I wanted to chat with you tomorrow if you are available.

To be perfectly honest, when I first listened to this message, I was quite surprised. We have been waiting months for the County to answer the letters of objection from counsel to the neighbors over lots 5-8 in the Highlands. We are now up against yet another grading moratorium with the current delay, and now comes a request for yet another action on Jack's part, before this letters (whose comment period closed July 2 as I recall) are answered.

It is true that Jack is in the process of engaging a new geotechnical engineering firm. However, absent a go-ahead from the County, it does not make much sense for him to spend much money on these new engineers, if he has no idea if the minor modification is or will be approved, or what the response will be to the neighbor's objections, for which yet another study was conducted on his dime. Honestly, this has gone too far.

I am going to ask you to intervene in the matter so we can have the letter sent to the lawyers and get an affirmative statement from the County that the minor modification has been approved, or whatever form that has to take.

Thanks Steve.

I will be in the office by 11:00 tomorrow. I will call you if you can give me a time that suits you.

Regards,

Rich Newman



RESOLUTION STRATEGIES
INCORPORATED

Richard M. Newman
President
1141 Capuchino Ave. #1934
Burlingame, CA 94011

(650) 259-9559 ph.

(650) 343-6111 fx.

From: tel: 6503634000 <unknown_caller11@um.att.com>

Sent: Thursday, August 19, 2021 4:59 PM

To: RICHARD NEWMAN <rnewman@um.att.com>

Subject: Fwd: Voicemail from SAN MATEO CTY O (6503634000) to 6506158222



The attached message was recently left in your AT&T Unified MessagingSM mailbox. We are sending you this email because you have asked for your messages to be forwarded to this address.

The original message is still in your account, and will be played or shown as usual the next time you sign in. If you prefer, you can use the link below to delete it. You can also mark messages as "read", which means they will be kept in your account, but will not be treated as new messages.

[Delete this message \(without further confirmation\)](#)

[Mark this message as read](#)

[Mark all messages as read](#)

[Sign in to your AT&T Unified MessagingSM account](#)

©2021 AT&T Intellectual Property. All rights reserved. AT&T and Globe logo are registered trademarks of AT&T Intellectual Property.