

Appendix D

Summary of Comments Received
on the Notice of Preparation

Table D-1 NOP Comment Summary

Committer/Date	Summary	EIR Section Where Considered
Received by Email/Comment Card/Voicemail		
<p>Steven Chainey January 17, 2020</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Fire Zone 3 - Panoramic Hill is not mentioned in the IS for the UC Berkeley Hill Campus WVFMP, although it shares a ¾-mile border with the UC Plan Area and includes the access entrance to the Upper Jordan Trail evacuation route. The densely vegetated WUI between UC's Sherwood Forest and private residences on Panoramic Hill should be addressed in the WVFMP, with measures added to reduce the risk of wildfire and airborne embers originating on UC's Plan Area. WVFMP projects and treatment areas described in the Initial Study document seem to overlook the importance of protecting Panoramic Hill and the wildfire egress route along Lower Jordan Fire Trail through Sherwood Forest. ▶ The following risk reduction measures are proposed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ IS Fig 2-2, Table 2-2, and Section 2.4.4: Extend the East-West Fuel Break (FB) Project along the border between Panoramic Hill neighborhood and UC's Sherwood Forest. The west end of the East-West FB should terminate at the densely forested east side of the UC softball stadium on Centennial Road. ▪ IS Fig 2-2, Table 2-2, and Section 2.4.4: Add a Sherwood Forest Fire Hazard Reduction (FHR) Project where it borders the Panoramic Hill neighborhood and UC sports facilities along the south side of Centennial Road. ▪ IS Fig 2-2, Table 2-2, and Section 2.4.4: Add a Lower Jordan Fire Trail Evacuation Route clearing project. Although the much longer Upper Jordan Trail is included in proposed Strawberry FHR and Frowning Ridge FHR projects, Lower Jordan Trail is much more heavily used and a more likely evacuation route connecting lower Centennial Road and the ridge tops of Panoramic Hill and Claremont Canyon. Lower Jordan Trail is also a likely access route for emergency vehicles and firefighting equipment if desperate evacuees in private vehicles are blocking upper Centennial Road and narrow Panoramic Way. ▪ IS Fig 2-2, and Section 2.4.1: Extend the proposed Centennial Evacuation Route clearing project downhill (west of) the UC Botanical Garden to UC Haas Clubhouse and pool facility. Both sides of lower Centennial Road are densely vegetated and would be a much safer evacuation route if a 100-foot buffer is created by limbing, thinning or removing tall trees and clearing brush ladder fuel. ▶ Evacuation support treatments include creation of up to 100-foot strips of vegetation clearing or thinning. However, many eucalyptus trees exceed 100 feet in height or grow on steep side slopes above roads and trails where they could fall, toppling roadside power lines and blocking critical evacuation routes and access for first responders (a common occurrence in the recent Australian wildfires). Trees taller than the width of roadside buffer zones should also be evaluated for evacuation support treatments. 	<p>2 Program Description, 3.11 Wildfire, Appendix A Wildland Vegetative Fuel Management Plan</p> <p>2 Program Description, 3.11 Wildfire, Appendix A Wildland Vegetative Fuel Management Plan</p> <p>2 Program Description, Appendix A Wildland Vegetative Fuel Management Plan</p>

Commenter/Date	Summary	EIR Section Where Considered
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The WVFMP should describe and spatially map an intended future condition for the near-term and long-term of the 800-acre Plan Area landscape resulting from the completion of this and future vegetation management projects. What is the overall goal and desired cumulative effect of proposed treatments and projects? ▶ I strongly urge UC to be resolute in defending the necessity of this plan if and when the Plan is opposed or misrepresented by some organizations or other members of the public. Make use of the UC Center for Fire Research and Outreach, Berkeley's Safe Passages Program, CalFire staff, and representatives of other local and state agencies with a depth of expertise in wildland vegetation management and their recent experience fighting wildfires and shepherding evacuees from harms way. ▶ The selective use of limited quantities of targeted herbicide to prevent stump sprouting of eucalyptus and acacia trees removed for wildfire risk reduction is an essential tool for vegetation managers. I support the University's recent and future fire hazard mitigation maintenance projects and the WVFMP on the Hill Campus, and look forward to an aggressive initiation of the approved WVFMP starting in 2021. 	<p>2 Program Description, Appendix A Wildland Vegetative Fuel Management Plan</p> <p>Not a CEQA issue</p> <p>2 Program Description, Appendix A Wildland Vegetative Fuel Management Plan</p>
<p>Stuart M. Flashman Esq. (on behalf of the Claremont Canyon Conservancy) December 20, 2019</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Mitigation to prevent wildfire during implementation of treatment should include use of weather forecasts to avoid work when fire risk is high due to heat or high winds ▶ Agrees with IS's conclusion that impacts to biological resources would be potentially significant and the Plan should identify measures to minimize such impacts ▶ Notes that protection of human health and safety should be the Plan's top priority, and some significant and unavoidable impacts to biological resources may occur, which would need to be justified by a statement of overriding considerations ▶ Recommends that the removal of vegetation should not be considered a significant impact and that the EIR needs to consider short-term, long-term, and temporary impacts of vegetation removal that considers the benefits of vegetation replacement, such as reduced fire risk and maintenance of wildlife habitat ▶ EIR must evaluate the two different treatment types proposed (non-native tree removal vs. thinning projects) under normal conditions and under Diablo wind conditions ▶ Under both conditions, EIR must consider speed of fire spread and fire fighter effectiveness, effectiveness of fuel breaks, likelihood of becoming a crown fire, likelihood of firebrands ▶ The Plan's short-term and long-term goals should be identified and discussed, including associated benefits, impacts, and a reasonable range of alternatives ▶ The EIR must include a stable and detailed project description explaining all of the treatments that would be used for different 	<p>3.11 Wildfire</p> <p>2 Program Description, 3.3 Biological Resources</p> <p>2 Program Description, 3.3 Biological Resources</p> <p>3.2 Aesthetics, 3.3 Biological Resources, 3.11 Wildfire</p> <p>2 Program Description, 3.11 Wildfire</p> <p>2 Program Description, 3.11 Wildfire</p> <p>1 Introduction, 2 Program Description, 3 Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures (all sections), 6 Alternatives</p> <p>2 Program Description, 6 Alternatives</p>

Committer/Date	Summary	EIR Section Where Considered
	<p>project alternatives and cannot be vague and just analyze the worst case scenario (multiple court cases cited)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The EIR needs to state clearly which parts of its analysis are project-level and programmatic, where each level of analysis would apply, and evaluate project and programmatic components accordingly ▶ A preferred alternative must be chosen and a eucalyptus-pine removal approach should be chosen as the preferred treatment alternative (Joe McBride Plan summarized) ▶ Impacts associated with each of the Alternatives must be compared, including feasibility and ability to avoid or substantially lessen potentially significant impacts ▶ The EIR needs to consider how the effects of future climate change will interact with the Plan and its implementation ▶ The EIR must consider the cumulative impact of the Project, in conjunction with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, including projects on adjoining and nearby vegetated or developed areas of the East Bay Hills ▶ The Plan should include coordination with surrounding land managers to jointly reduce wildfire risks, or evaluate the additional risk created by neighboring land management to minimize cumulative effects 	<p>2 Program Description, 3 Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures (all sections)</p> <p>6 Alternatives</p> <p>6 Alternatives</p> <p>2 Program Description, 3.6 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions</p> <p>4 Cumulative Impacts</p> <p>4 Cumulative Impacts</p>
<p>Melissa Mandel December 20, 2019</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ It's an environmentally destructive Plan that would lead to more fire, damage to the environment, wildlife deaths, and habitat destruction, and promotes nativism ▶ No amount of pesticides are safe – they cause illness, kill animals, and pollute the environment ▶ Primarily causes of wildfire ignition are humans and the Plan would open the forest and allow for more arsonists ▶ Forest should be left alone to allow overgrowth and maximum moisture retention to minimize fire risk ▶ Thinning will lead to increased wind in the Plan Area, which increases dryness and fire spread ▶ Muir Woods is an example of a healthy, natural forest with lots of forest litter present ▶ Another healthy forest example is on EBMUD's land in Moraga. Dead trees, poison oak, and Monterey Pines are allowed to remain and provide a wildlife sanctuary ▶ Broom should not be targeted due to low combustibility and coverage of highly flammable grasslands ▶ Plan is contradictory – healthy trees removed yet piles of dead branches often left onsite and use of heavy machinery also leaves extremely flammable shredded branches onsite ▶ California weather historically altered by European settlement through clearcutting and eliminating inland lakes. The Plan will do the same ▶ Concerned with potential for machinery to cause wildfires and result in pollution 	<p>2 Program Description, 3.3 Biological Resources, 3.11 Wildfire</p> <p>3.4 Hazardous Materials</p> <p>3.11 Wildfire</p> <p>6 Alternatives</p> <p>2 Program Description</p> <p>Not a CEQA issue</p> <p>Not a CEQA issue</p> <p>6 Alternatives</p> <p>2 Program Description</p> <p>Not a CEQA issue</p> <p>3.6 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions, 3.11 Wildfire</p>

Commenter/Date	Summary	EIR Section Where Considered
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Plan ignores that various tree species are dying, thinning will weaken trees and dry out soils as trees rely on each other for survival ▶ Promote forest diversity and plant more disease resistant, drought tolerant trees rather than removing trees to prevent fires ▶ Recommends reading Dave Maloney's report about fire prevention in the East Bay and David Theodoropoulos's report about the problems with nativist 'invasion biology' (links provided) ▶ Highly flammable vegetation takes over in cut/thinned areas, and thinned areas never return to a healthy state causing negative visual impacts 	<p>3.3 Biological Resources</p> <p>6 Alternatives</p> <p>Not a CEQA issue</p> <p>2 Program Description, 3.2 Aesthetics, 3.3 Biological Resources</p>
<p>Isis Feral December 20, 2019</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Opposes the Plan and contends that the proposed actions do not accomplish the purpose the Plan by increasing fire danger, threatening public safety, and causing ecological devastation ▶ The IS does not address health and environmental hazards of removing trees and using pesticides or related cumulative effects ▶ Would like to know precisely what pesticides are in use now and how the Plan would increase this use ▶ Grazing and herbicide use should not be combined to protect the grazing animals ▶ No discussion in IS of how herbicides affect flammability and how resulting fumes might endanger firefighter and the community when treated areas burn, as well as all modes of potential drift (air, water, soil) ▶ No discussion in IS of the effects of herbicides to top soil or watersheds and groundwater ▶ Pesticides are hazardous to human and ecological health (summaries are provided for several of the pesticides with associated links) ▶ Because chemical residues can persist in the environment for a long time, and herbicide products break down into various chemical components, subsequent applications of different herbicides can also combine into yet new, unintended mixtures. Synergism can exponentially increase chemical toxicity ▶ Environmental and health impacts are downplayed by claiming use of negligible quantities – endocrine disruption can occur at a nonmonotonic does ▶ Endocrine effects of pesticides in this program have not been adequately studied, and a large percentage of the ingredients are undisclosed ▶ Herbicide applications present severe health risks for certain people and consequently direct barriers to access. Obstacles to access to public spaces for people with disabilities are a violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) ▶ The IS concludes that public services, schools, parks, and public facilities would not be impacted, but pesticides are an access barrier for people with disabilities, and therefore there would be an impact. 	<p>1 Introduction, 2 Program Description</p> <p>3.4 Hazardous Materials, 4 Cumulative Impacts</p> <p>2 Program Description, 3.4 Hazardous Materials</p> <p>2 Program Description</p> <p>3.4 Hazardous Materials, 3.6 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions, 3.11 Wildfire</p> <p>3.5, Hydrology and Water Quality, 3.8 Geology and Soils</p> <p>3.3 Biological Resources, 3.4 Hazardous Materials</p> <p>3.4 Hazardous Materials, Appendix G Toxicity Evaluation</p> <p>3.4 Hazardous Materials, Appendix G Toxicity Evaluation</p> <p>3.4 Hazardous Materials, Appendix G Toxicity Evaluation</p> <p>3.4 Hazardous Materials, 3.10 Recreation</p> <p>3.10 Recreation</p>

Commenter/Date	Summary	EIR Section Where Considered
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Scoping Meeting was not accessible due to lack of transit ▶ Would like to see physicians involved to evaluate toxic effects of pesticide use and related potential medical costs for those affected ▶ The EIR should use a precautionary approach instead of a risk assessment approach for pesticides ▶ UCB pesticide use is in conflict with current cities of Oakland and Berkeley pesticide policies. Berkeley does not use herbicides, and Oakland is prohibited from using them in the hills ▶ Assertion that non-native vegetation is more fire prone than native vegetation is incorrect and not based in science. Dense forests keep winds from spreading fires, and the moisture from many inches of annual fog drip keep fires from starting in the first place. Trees do not catch fire easily, unlike grasslands (links to a few articles and one presentation are included) ▶ It's important to understand that wildfires are a necessary part of the ecology in wildfire zones, where species evolved to be fire-dependent (e.g., Alameda whipsnake, Alameda pallid manzanita) and herbicides threaten special-status wildlife ▶ Monterey pines, which are targeted by the Plan, originated 80 miles away and are listed as endangered and should be preserved ▶ Eucalyptus trees contribute to keeping endangered species alive and provide nectar for bees and overwintering for monarch butterflies ▶ Forest impacts are hidden due to nativist definition of forests ▶ Impacts related to land use and planning would occur because East Bay Hills Projects, and the LRDP, are about development and development would likely extend into the Plan Area ▶ Should be focusing on reducing development in wildfire zones and making existing structures fire resistant ▶ The Plan is likely to increase fire risk through clearcutting moisture-rich forests and turning them into dry, flammable grasslands more open to strong winds, leaving dead chipped vegetation onsite, and through the use of flammable herbicides ▶ Pesticides proposed for use are known to produce toxic fumes when they burn and make vegetation more flammable ▶ When you cut down a lot of trees you create a new source of substantially brighter light in formerly shaded area, which adversely affect daytime views of the area. Removing trees also lets the glare from city lights be seen more widely in the area at night. the sunlight that would now saturate the denuded area would increase fire danger by removing the source of shade and moisture that inhibits fires ▶ With increased fire risk under the Plan, firefighter lives are unnecessarily put in danger (another article is recommended about vegetation treatment to reduce wildfire) 	<p>Not a CEQA issue</p> <p>3.4 Hazardous Materials; medical costs are not a CEQA issue</p> <p>3.4 Hazardous Materials</p> <p>1 Introduction; 3.4 Hazardous Materials</p> <p>2 Program Description</p> <p>3.3 Biological Resources</p> <p>3.3 Biological Resources</p> <p>3.3 Biological Resources</p> <p>3.1 Approach to the Environmental Analysis</p> <p>3.1 Approach to the Environmental Analysis</p> <p>6 Alternatives</p> <p>2 Program Description, 3.11 Wildfire</p> <p>3.6 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions, 3.11 Wildfire</p> <p>2 Program Description, 3.2 Aesthetics and Visual Resources</p> <p>2 Program Description, 3.11 Wildfire</p>

Committer/Date	Summary	EIR Section Where Considered
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Supports the No Project option, and for diverting vegetation management funding earmarked for tree removal and pesticides to where it's most needed, for structurally securing homes and facilities, and for firefighting. 	6 Alternatives
Elizabeth Stage December 20, 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Concerns with lack of consideration for immediate neighbors of Plan Area (e.g., Berkeley lab, residents), lack of consideration of many people that visit the Plan area daily, and it's impossible to evaluate impacts when no Plan has been distributed to review ▶ Consideration of evacuation plans, landslides, and ongoing maintenance of treated areas must be part of the environmental impact analysis. Lack of specificity in IS. ▶ Recommends consideration of the recommendations of Joe McBride and indicates that "thinning" is a forest management strategy that does not apply to the wildland urban interface 	<p>2 Program Description, Appendix A Wildland Vegetative Fuel Management Plan</p> <p>2 Program Description, 3.8 Geology and Soils, 3.11 Wildfire</p> <p>6 Alternatives</p>
East Bay Pesticide Alert December 20, 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Scoping session held at the U.C. Botanical Gardens was at an inappropriate and obstructive location and kept concerned people from being able to attend (e-mail correspondence included) ▶ There is a history of tall, mature trees that contribute to the campus's historical, cultural, and visual resources (links to historic photos included) ▶ Eucalyptus trees provide many benefits, such as water and carbon storage, act as wind breaks, and provide beautification ▶ Contends that removing trees and deforestation leads to increased fire risk (several articles and presentations are cited) ▶ The university has ignored and continues to ignore expert information provided by EBPA ▶ Houses and other infrastructure start and spread fire, not trees and trees are often left in place and healthy ▶ Removing non-native trees for native plant restoration has negative impacts to wildlife through habitat removal ▶ Even with the best PPE, pesticides can still contact skin around the neck and wrists or mucus membranes ▶ There is no safe use of pesticides and agencies should review toxicology information for those proposed for use and review synergistic effects (information and links provided for pesticide compounds) ▶ Thinning 90 percent of tree cover and applying pesticides is deforestation may be to pave the way for new development and will harm the homeless ▶ Comments specific to UCB's LRDP are summarized intended to highlight conflicts between the Plan and the LRDP ▶ In the EIR, the EBPA would like to see: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Who is contracted by the university to conduct treatments ○ What has been spent on pesticides and what the university pays pesticide applicators 	<p>Not a CEQA issue</p> <p>3.2 Aesthetics and Visual Resources, 3.7 Archaeological, Historic, and Tribal Cultural Resources</p> <p>3.2 Aesthetics and Visual Resources, 3.5 Hydrology and Water Quality, 3.6 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions</p> <p>3.11 Wildfire</p> <p>3.4 Hazardous Materials</p> <p>2 Program Description</p> <p>3.3 Biological Resources</p> <p>3.4 Hazardous Materials</p> <p>3.4 Hazardous Materials, Appendix G Toxicity Evaluation</p> <p>2 Program Description</p> <p>1 Introduction</p> <p>Not a CEQA issue or beyond the scope of this EIR</p>

Committer/Date	Summary	EIR Section Where Considered
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Relationship between deforesting People’s Park and the Plan ○ Responses to all current and previous FEMA NOP comments ○ Economic Relationship between Oakland and the university ▶ Triclopyr should not be used in and around water because it contaminates waters and can seep into soil ▶ Do not like use of “limited” in the IS, it’s meaningless and meant to confuse ▶ Fuel breaks would increase fire danger and create wind tunnels ▶ What is called native is arbitrary and refuses to acknowledge species acclimation and the danger of destroying habitats formed over long time periods ▶ Determining conversion of forest land to non-forest uses as less than significant in the IS is dishonest ▶ The discussion of odor in the IS doesn’t take into consideration heightened sensitivity of people with Chemical Sensitivity ▶ The air quality section should discuss pesticide drift and translocation ▶ Evaluation of the Alameda pallid manzanita should be included ▶ Cultural evaluation needs to include evaluation of historic trees and vegetation ▶ Erosion has been caused by previous clearcutting by the UC which caused mudslides ▶ Suggests that past and proposed deforestation and pesticide use result in increased fire danger and subsequently, erosion and drainage issues ▶ The project has the potential to eliminate examples of CA history and cumulative effects to air quality, soil, water quality, specie habitats, and health ▶ Summarizes comments from David Maloney on the Plan, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Plan ignores USFS analysis that recommends against removing eucalyptus trees ▪ It violates recommendations made by the Oakland/Berkeley Task Force in 1991/1992 ▪ It has no basis in fire science ▪ It violates principles of wildland fire prevention ▪ It creates the conditions for a fire storm ▶ Recommend no deforestation, no pesticide use, and replanting of previously removed eucalyptus trees (comments on FEMA EIS from 2013 are attached) 	<p>3.4 Hazardous Materials, Appendix G</p> <p>Not a CEQA issue</p> <p>2 Program Description, 3.11 Wildfire</p> <p>2 Program Description</p> <p>Appendix A</p> <p>3.6 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions</p> <p>3.3 Biological Resources, 3.4 Hazardous Materials, 3.5 Hydrology and Water Quality</p> <p>3.3 Biological Resources</p> <p>3.7 Archaeological, Historic, and Tribal Cultural Resources</p> <p>3.8 Geology and Soils</p> <p>3.11 Wildfire</p> <p>3.7 Archaeological, Historic, and Tribal Cultural Resources, 4 Cumulative Impacts</p> <p>3.11 Wildfire (not all are CEQA issues)</p> <p>2 Program Description, 6 Alternatives</p>
<p>Anastasia Glikshtern December 20, 2019</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Opposes all use of herbicides due to health effects to humans, wildlife, and the environment and references the lawsuits related to glyphosate 	<p>3.4 Hazardous Materials, Appendix G Toxicity Evaluation</p>

Commenter/Date	Summary	EIR Section Where Considered
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Opposes replacing non-native vegetation with native vegetation due the terms being arbitrary and there being no indication that native vegetation is inherently less flammable ▶ Opposes the use of oak trees in tree replacement due to sudden oak death and believes it will lead to more dead trees and fuel in the area ▶ Supports protection of existing mature trees as opposed to removing trees to combat climate change and maintain carbon sequestration ▶ Fire danger will increase with tree removal by drying out the area and winds increasing, as well as leaving chips and logs onsite 	<p>2 Program Description, 3.11 Wildfire</p> <p>2 Program Description, 3.3 Biological Resources</p> <p>3.6 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions</p> <p>2 Program Description, 3.11 Wildfire</p>
<p>Hills Conservation Network (HCN) December 20, 2019</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ HCN believes that the new Plan is an improvement, but proposes an alternative plan to better reduce wildfire risk (and cite USFS AMSET report to support the alternative plan) and would like the identified treatment projects to be described in more detail, including specific locations, number of trees to be removed, where each treatment activity would be used, etc. to assess potential impacts ▶ The following alternative priorities are proposed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Highest priority should be to treat fine fuel, cured fuel, and areas near human activity ▪ 2nd priority should be fuel that spreads and increases intensity of fire ▪ 3rd should be creating/maintaining fire resistant environment through lowering temps, increasing moisture, reducing wind speed, discouraging succession of weeds, and avoiding creating of more fuel (chips, logs) ▶ Potentially ambiguous language needs to be removed. The term “prone to torching” can be interpreted in different ways by different people and should be removed. In its place the species that are intended to be removed should be listed. ▶ Specifics regarding vegetation treatments to achieve evacuation routes, fuel breaks, and fire hazard reduction zones are proposed ▶ There shall be no pesticide application to prevent regrowth of stumps. Regrowth shall be prevented using hand labor as has been effectively implemented by the East Bay Municipal Utilities District on adjacent properties ▶ Since a primary objective of this plan is to reduce fuels, there shall be no new vegetation planted. Instead, the plan must reduce fuel, reduce ignition risk, and ensure that the post-treatment environment is “naturally” more fire safe. This will be accomplished by removing ground fuels, fire ladder components, while ensuring that existing shade canopy is maintained ▶ The HCN alternative specifically calls for limiting vegetation removal activities to fuel breaks, evacuation routes, and adjacent to structures. As Jack Cohen has written extensively, removing vegetation more than several hundred feet from a roadway or structure is of negligible value in reducing fire risk (several links are included). 	<p>2 Program Description, 6 Alternatives</p> <p>2 Program Description, 6 Alternatives</p> <p>2 Program Description</p> <p>2 Program Description, 6 Alternatives</p> <p>6 Alternatives</p> <p>6 Alternatives</p> <p>6 Alternatives</p>

Commenter/Date	Summary	EIR Section Where Considered
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Fire modeling must analyze the current condition and the <i>new equilibrium</i> condition of the project areas post-treatment. ▶ The HCN alternative has many advantages over the initial study recommendation (several are listed, and AMSET comments on FEMA EIS are attached) 	<p>2 Program Description, 3.11 Wildfire</p> <p>6 Alternatives</p>
<p>San Francisco Forest Alliance December 19, 2020</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Express opposition to deforestation and pesticide applications ▶ Mature trees fight climate change and reduce fire danger (link to Guardian article is included) because they sequester carbon and are not easily ignitable. Native trees are vulnerable to disease, such as SOD ▶ Opposed to herbicide use due to negative affects to human health and the environment and reference the outcome of the Monsanto case as well as an article on the harmful effects of herbicides 	<p>2 Program Description</p> <p>2 Program Description</p> <p>3.4 Hazardous Materials, Appendix G Toxicity Evaluation</p>
<p>East Bay Regional Park District December 20, 2019</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Express support for the plan and find it to be well thought out and indicate that it accounts for biological resource protection and diversity ▶ The District believing addressing fuels is an urgent challenge and appreciates the need to proactively control wildland vegetation in fire-prone areas 	<p>Not a CEQA issue</p> <p>Not a CEQA issue</p>
<p>Bev Von Dohre December 19, 2019</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Exact same letter as Melissa Mandel included above 	<p>See above</p>
<p>Wende Micco December 18, 2019</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Applauds UCB's current efforts but encourages UCB to consider the details of the Claremont Canyon Conservancy's Fuel Management Proposal specific to Strawberry and Claremont Canyons and urges retention of healthy native oaks along Centennial Drive and oak-bay woodlands in the Plan Area. 	<p>2 Program Description, 6 Alternatives</p>
<p>Jerry Kent on behalf of Claremont Canyon Conservancy (Board Member) December 18, 2019</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Feels that UCB was able to achieve important fire mitigation work through projects between 2000 and 2007 with limited funds, staffing, and w/o public opposition and expresses discontent with FEMA process that stalled. The CCC generally supports what is proposed but urges UCB to move carefully and deliberately ▶ Policies from the 2020 LRDP that the commenter thinks should guide the plan and EIR process are quoted ▶ Believes the NOP to be inadequate because there is no plan, no alternatives, and no site specificity ▶ The final Hill Campus Wildland Vegetative Fuel Management Plan (Hill Campus FM Plan/EIR) must be based on verifiable wildland/urban fire mitigation science, natural resource management science, sustainable land management principles, and the requirements of law ▶ The Claremont Canyon Conservancy strongly recommends that UC planners base their Plan and EIR on the McBride Fuel Management and Wildfire Mitigation Proposal for the University of California Property in Strawberry and Claremont Canyons ▶ The Plan and EIR need to: 	<p>1 Introduction</p> <p>1 Introduction, 2 Program Description</p> <p>2 Program Description, 6 Alternatives</p> <p>2 Program Description</p> <p>2 Program Description, 6 Alternatives</p> <p>Executive Summary, 2 Program Description, 6 Alternatives</p>

Commenter/Date	Summary	EIR Section Where Considered
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identify/implement methods to decrease short-term and long-term liability from wildfires and provide short-term and long-term goals ▪ Incorporate adaptive management and allow for future revisions based on changing conditions ▪ Identify and rank area by wildfire risk ▪ Prioritize treatment methods to protect human health and safety, prevent harm to homes and biological resources, and protect scenic values ▪ Identify and evaluate mitigation measures and alternatives that mitigate or avoid significant project impacts and substantial evidence must be provided for measures or alternatives that are dismissed as infeasible ▪ Take into account future climate change, particularly in cumulative ▪ Make recommendations to inform policy makers about controversial issues, such as fire and resource management science, eucalyptus and pine trees, herbicides, and public desire to save trees (examples are provided) <p>▶ Believe that flammable eucalyptus and pine trees that are identified in the final Hill Campus FM Plan/EIR should be removed, as proposed in the UC 2020 Long Range Development Plan, to release safer understory native vegetation to be managed appropriately</p> <p>▶ The final Hill Campus FM Plan/EIR must be separated from the Cal Fire award of a grant for partial work without a comprehensive plan. Care must be taken that a "cart before the horse" approach to justify the provisions in a grant does not interfere with a transparent and unbiased public process required by CEQA and NEPA laws</p> <p>▶ Suggests that the Plan and EIR should be developed recognizing that Diablo wind fires have proven unstoppable in unmanaged wildland vegetation and the Plan needs to be comprehensive and incorporate home hardening and defensible space provisions to be administered by local agencies</p> <p>▶ The final Hill Campus FM Plan/EIR should describe why East Bay Hill fires are different than the fires in Southern California, the fires in forested areas of the Sierra, and why fire mitigation efforts must be site and vegetation specific to address this area's development and vegetation history that has contributed to recognized fire hazards in the East Bay Hills wildlands and residential areas</p> <p>▶ The final Hill Campus FM Plan/EIR should describe how recommended fire projects in the Plan will address future fire risks associated with global warming, extreme weather, and the new normal for more fires often described by Cal Fire, in numerous scientific publications, and by the media.</p> <p>▶ The final Hill Campus FM Plan/EIR should include numbered polygons of project areas with cost projections for project work to facilitate grant requests and development of annual budget requirements</p>	<p>2 Program Description</p> <p>1 Introduction</p> <p>2 Program Description, 6 Alternatives, Appendix A Wildland Vegetative Fuel Management Plan</p> <p>1 Introduction, Appendix A Wildland Vegetative Fuel Management Plan</p> <p>2 Program Description, Appendix A Wildland Vegetative Fuel Management Plan</p> <p>2 Program Description; economic considerations that do not result in physical environmental effects are beyond the scope of CEQA</p>

Commenter/Date	Summary	EIR Section Where Considered
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The final Hill Campus FM Plan/EIR should expand on the description of fire behavior to address the fact that the four most damaging fires in California history have all occurred under similar circumstances (Berkeley 1923, Oakland 1991, Tubbs 2017, and Camp 2018), and that the State of California has a history of siege fires that can make quick and adequate response problematic ▶ The final Hill Campus FM Plan/EIR should describe the differences between forest fires and urban intermix fires. The UC Hills Plan and EIR must describe a viable model for fuel reduction that is understandable and based on native woodlands, shrubland, and grasslands that can be managed by University employees ▶ The final Hill Campus FM Plan/EIR should upgrade the wildland and residential area data set and analysis that was developed for the 1995 East Bay Hills Vegetation Management Program that was largely the work of the UC Fire Science Lab, Campus Professors, and project consultants. Further, the 1995 wildland and residential hazard analysis should be used as a baseline for measuring improvements in fire safety projects that are included in the eventual UC Hills Campus Vegetation Management Plan ▶ The final Hill Campus FM Plan/EIR should describe previous freeze events and their impact on high-ridge Campus, Tilden, and Claremont Canyon eucalyptus trees ▶ The final Hill Campus FM Plan/EIR should include a detailed discussion of topography with over 75% of the Hill Campus having a slope over 40%, and over 90% has a slope over 20%. In our opinion, current fire modeling does not fully address slopes of this degree when combined with extreme weather conditions that are typical during Diablo winds ▶ The UC Hill Campus Plan's vegetation fire hazard descriptions must be accurate and useful to a conflicted public and for university officials who must decide how to make the UC Hills reasonably fire safe ▶ The final Hill Campus FM Plan/EIR should address and deal with the two opposing "views" that have been stated by individuals and groups for the East Bay Hills with one view claiming that planted "exotic" vegetation, including eucalyptus and pine are the only fire safe vegetation because SOD will kill all oaks while shrubs and grasslands can produce uncontrollable flames above 40 feet. The second "view" claims that native vegetation, including oaks and bays are the only fire safe vegetation, and that UC should learn to manage native trees, shrubs, and grasslands in intermix areas especially when near homes ▶ The final Hill Campus FM Plan/EIR should address the fact that social media and blogging about vegetation fire hazards has created a political environment filled with strong views about native and exotic trees, clear-cuts, restoring natural landscapes, fake news about fire hazard myths, cherry picked facts, and media confusion about the role of vegetation fires at the urban/wildland interface and intermix as well as options for managing park and 	<p>1 Introduction, 2 Program Description, 3.11 Wildfire</p> <p>2 Program Description, Appendix A Wildland Vegetative Fuel Management Plan</p> <p>2 Program Description, Appendix A Wildland Vegetative Fuel Management Plan</p> <p>2 Program Description, Appendix A Wildland Vegetative Fuel Management Plan</p> <p>2 Program Description, 3.8 Geology and Soils, 3.11 Wildfire, Appendix A Wildland Vegetative Fuel Management Plan</p> <p>2 Program Description, Appendix A Wildland Vegetative Fuel Management Plan</p> <p>2 Program Description, 6 Alternatives, Appendix A Wildland Vegetative Fuel Management Plan</p> <p>Not a CEQA issue</p>

Commenter/Date	Summary	EIR Section Where Considered
	<p>residential vegetation in Very High Severity Fire Hazard Zones in the Oakland hills</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The final Hill Campus FM Plan/EIR should describe how the University will work with PG&E to coordinate and update standards for tree separation and limb clearance near powerlines in high-ridge locations with trees above flammable wildland vegetation that can be impacted by Diablo winds ▶ The final Hill Campus FM Plan/EIR should include an area map showing the Cal Fire Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone including and surrounding the Campus Hills between Tunnel Canyon in the South and the city of Berkeley in the North. Followed by an analysis of current, future, and cumulative impacts of fire hazard mitigation projects and responsibilities for agency wildland vegetation management. ▶ The final Hill Campus FM Plan/EIR should address the fact that fire behavior in the past has been based on standard modeling that assumes relative differences in vegetation with flame lengths at the fire front of 0-4', 4-8', 8-11', and above 20'. However, these flame lengths and descriptions do not correspond to what urban residents see on TV during every fire season ▶ The final Hill Campus FM Plan/EIR should note that a comprehensive Environmental Impact Statement was prepared by FEMA also covered Strawberry Canyon, Chaparral Hill, and Claremont Canyon areas. It also should describe how the University proposes to deal with the FEMA/EIS and its USFWS Biological Opinion for these three project areas, and for obtaining required permits. The Plan should also state how long it will take the University to complete a Title 10 Habitat Conservation Plan with the USFWS and other resource agencies if required, to obtain permits ▶ The final Hill Campus FM Plan/EIR should either use or explain why it does not agree with the general concepts of the 3Rs advocated by the Sierra Club and other environmental groups (that seems to me to be consistent with UCs 2020 LRPD Plan policies) about the removal of high fire risk eucalyptus and pine trees, replacement naturally by lower growing and safer natives, and for required restoration of habitat for local native species, including listed species ▶ The final Hill Campus FM Plan/EIR should propose the use of prescribed fire by Cal Fire at some future point in the Hill Campus while recognizing that current use is questionable given concerns about the possibility of losing control of a managed fire and given the operational difficulties of using prescribed fire within urban areas of the Bay Area's challenged air quality system ▶ The final Hill Campus FM Plan/EIR should include in its fire mitigation program and suppression planning a request for the location of an East Bay Hills Cal Fire Unit near the Campus ▶ The final Hill Campus FM Plan/EIR should recommend the adoption of specific updated IPM policies and updated University policies that will allow appropriate and safe use of herbicides by 	<p>2 Program Description, Appendix A Wildland Vegetative Fuel Management Plan</p> <p>3.11 Wildfire, 4 Cumulative Impacts, Appendix A Wildland Vegetative Fuel Management Plan</p> <p>2 Program Description, Appendix A Wildland Vegetative Fuel Management Plan</p> <p>2 Program Description, 3.3 Biological Resources</p> <p>6 Alternatives</p> <p>2 Program Description, 3.6 Air Quality, 3.11 Wildfire</p> <p>Outside of the scope of this EIR</p> <p>2 Program Description, 3.4 Hazardous Materials</p>

Committer/Date	Summary	EIR Section Where Considered
	<p>trained and licensed employees and by reliable and licensed contractors working on Hill Campus vegetation management projects to implement the final Plan/EIR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Removal of highest-fire-risk trees in the Hills to reduce excessive vegetation fuel followed by treating eucalyptus stumps with an IPM approved herbicide is the only currently available economic and effective strategy in UC's Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones ▶ The final Hill Campus FM Plan/EIR should recommend removal of all second-growth eucalyptus trees, coppice suckers and seedlings for both fire hazard reduction and economic reasons to allow for the restoration of areas that were logged following the freeze of 1972 ▶ The final Hill Campus FM Plan/EIR should also document and include a discussion about the continued risks of retaining large blue gum eucalyptus trees on both the Campus Park area and the Hill Campus ▶ The final Plan/EIR should include a case study that will clarify the facts surrounding the recent UC Grizzly Peak Fire of August 2, 2017. And then provide appropriate science-based policies to address recommendations for vegetation management ▶ The University is clearly not a self-contained vegetation island. Its immediate neighbors, EBRPD and EBMUD, contain extensive wildlands with very substantial fuel loads of highly flammable and invasive vegetation. The EIR will need to address the "cumulative impacts" of fire safety for the campus and the major land ownerships of wildlands in the East Bay Hills. Diablo Winds come from the North East and LBL has modeled the potential for a 60 ft high wall of wildfire coming from Tilden blowing into the Hill Campus. The EIR will need to address how the University's fuel management plans interact with and have been coordinated among the major wildland ownerships in the East Bay Hills. The wildlands wildfire threats in the East Bay Hills are present at an areawide scale, and they must be addressed at this large scale ▶ Additional information on previous fires in the area and wildfire risk is provided in links, figures, summaries, quotes, and a paper the author wrote in 2017 is provided 	<p>2 Program Description, 6 Alternatives</p> <p>2 Program Description, 6 Alternatives, Appendix A Wildland Vegetative Fuel Management Plan</p> <p>2 Program Description, Appendix A Wildland Vegetative Fuel Management Plan</p> <p>2 Program Description</p> <p>1 Introduction, 4 Cumulative Impacts, Appendix A Wildland Vegetative Fuel Management Plan</p> <p>2 Program Description, 3.11 Wildfire</p>
<p>BAAQMD December 17, 2019</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Please be aware that any prescribed burning projects shall comply with the requirements of Regulation 5: Open Burning, and receive written approval of a smoke management plan by the APCO prior to any burn and comply with the smoke management plan during the burn 	<p>2 Program Description, 3.6 Air Quality, 3.11 Wildfire</p>
<p>Claremont Canyon Conservancy December 14, 2019</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ As was noted at the scoping meeting, the study is too vague and nonspecific ▶ As UC and its consultant develop the full plan, we urge that the following points be given careful consideration. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The plan prepared and submitted by Forestry Professor Emeritus Joe McBride should be the basis of the UC Plan. It is 	<p>2 Program Description</p> <p>2 Program Description, 3.3 Biological Resources, 3.4 Hazards Materials, 6 Alternatives</p>

Commenter/Date	Summary	EIR Section Where Considered
	<p>comprehensive, it takes into account conditions created by global warming and it has the specifics necessary to make the Hill Campus as firesafe as possible while respecting the natural environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UC's plan should not be limited to the five projects noted in the Initial Study. Other areas of the Hills Campus require attention as well. If other areas are covered under separate approved plans, then those areas should be noted in this plan ▪ UC's vegetation management plan must respect science and correctly apply it. It must avoid programs that respond to popular opinion but are not based on sound science. One such program is thinning. Thinning is a tool that foresters use in rural areas to ensure that trees grown for timber are given the room they require to grow straight and tall to maximize the harvest. The safest and most financially viable option is to completely remove the dense eucalyptus groves ▪ UC has successful experience with complete removal rather than thinning in the Hills Campus in the area southeast of Claremont Avenue at Signpost 29 ▪ Maintenance is critical. Once an initial treatment has been completed, ongoing work is necessary to prevent the land from returning to a state where fire-prone vegetation is again difficult to manage. A correctly designed treatment program, such as elimination and not mere thinning of eucalyptus, will enable a cost-effective and time-limited maintenance program ▪ Vegetation management along evacuation routes must be completed over a wide enough area to keep the routes safe in emergency situations. A hundred feet may be insufficient if trees beyond a 100-foot perimeter are tall enough to fall across a route ▪ The UC plan must include habitat for the threatened and likely to become endangered Alameda Whipsnake ▪ The Initial Study outlines the correct use of the herbicide triclopyr. However, the study also mentions but does not discuss using glyphosate. If this latter chemical is not going to be applied, then that should either be so stated or preferably no mention of it should be made 	
William Boyd December 13, 2019	<p>▶ The following are eucalyptus along the south side of South Park Drive, across from the golf course, that are capable of throwing embers to another big stand of eucalyptus on the ridge above the golf course. This latter stand extends from north of South Park Drive on a ridge that runs parallel to Grizzly Peak Rd that threatens the South side of the UC lands and Strawberry Canyon. As noted in my earlier materials in response to the UC Wildland land Fuel Management Plan, the huge areas of eucalyptus in Tilden are a clear and present threat to UC, already highlighted by LBL, and must be examined in the EIR Project Objectives, Existing Conditions and Cumulative Impacts section of the EIR</p>	1 Introduction, 2 Program Description, 4 Cumulative Impacts
Maria Kiernik December 11, 2019	<p>▶ I, along with my family and friends, STRONGLY OPPOSE any further clearcutting and ESPECIALLY OPPOSE ANY KIND OF HERBICIDE / PESTICIDE USE applications by the university. We do not need to add more chemicals (some of which have been</p>	3.4 Hazardous Materials, Appendix G Toxicity Evaluation

Commenter/Date	Summary	EIR Section Where Considered
	declared as probable carcinogens by the World Health Organization) into our environment, especially one where young children play. Our dog recently died of lymphoma - we hiked with him almost daily in the hills.	
Blanche Sack (voicemail) December 11, 2019	▶ Supports UCB's Plan and appreciates the outreach that UCB has conducted (could not attend the meeting due to inability to drive at night)	Not a CEQA issue
Alex Jackson December 11, 2019	▶ I am writing in opposition to the use of pesticides (and herbicides) in the eradication effort for non-native trees in our local parks and open spaces. I hike daily in these areas, and I am concerned for the health of myself and all of the other users of our parks, and for the environmental impact that these chemicals WILL have on our lands. The rules in place about use of these chemicals are there for a reason, not to be set aside for expediency. it is absurd to think that we can actually eradicate these trees (eucalyptus, etc.) no matter what we do. Not realistic. Don't ruin our watershed, and parklands in the process. Building a wall against plants that have been here for over a hundred years is surely a losing proposition. We need to manage, of course, and adapt to our current ecosystem	2 Program Description, 3.4 Hazardous Materials
William Boyd December 3, 2019	▶ Provides photo essay and lessons learned from the Sonoma Valley wildfires	3.11 Wildfire
William Boyd December 3, 2019	▶ AB 38 sets forth Legislative Findings, in Section 1, regarding the need for wildfire mitigation programs and defines key State policies applicable to vegetation fuel management for wildfire protection purposes. As such, the Plan and associated EIR need to address the policies and fuel management standards set forth in the Findings provisions. ▶ Sections from AB 38 as well as legislative findings are provided	3.11 Wildfire
William Boyd December 3, 2019	▶ Provides an overview of their experience with CEQA, resource protection, and resource management ▶ Forwards an email between Claremont Canyon Conservancy members providing information regarding Joe McBride's alternative plan and recommendations, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The significance of UC Berkeley, along with its huge daytime population, warrant taking the most extensive wildfire fuel load reductions feasible, as specified pursuant to the recently enacted AB32. This goal should be incorporated into the Project Objectives for the EIR and then analyzed in the EIR. ▪ The University must address wildfire spread issues in the EIR. The issues associated with "wildfire movement" should be stated in the Project Objectives and examined in depth in the EIR. ▪ The "mitigation" and "alternatives" analyses of the EIR must be measured in relation to the likelihood of success of "reducing flammable wildfire fuel loads to the maximum extent feasible" ▪ Professor McBride recommends replacing eucalyptus with a restored, wildfire resistant landscape comprised of coast live oak and grasslands. His recommendations have been validated by the experience of the Sonoma Valley in 2017 	Not a CEQA issue 1 Introduction, 2 Program Description, 3.11 Wildfire

Commenter/Date	Summary	EIR Section Where Considered
<p>Joe McBride December 3, 2019</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Submits his comments from the scoping meeting and his entire alternative fuel management plan. Comments are summarized below: ▶ There is a lack of specificity in the plan, which makes it hard to evaluate impacts ▶ No map of existing vegetation is presented in the plan. This is crucial information both as to the selection of the vegetation management activities and the evaluation of potential environmental impacts ▶ The Fuel break (Figure 2-2) does not extend along the University property and the housing area off of Panoramic Way. This is a crucial omission because of the potential for fire driven by a north wind to race up the north facing slope of strawberry Canyon and into the residential area ▶ It is unclear if any vegetation type conversion (for example conversion of Monterey pine plantations to annual grasslands or oak-bay woodland). If so, such conversions should be spelled out in the plan. I believe it is crucial to convert existing eucalyptus plantations to either oak-bay woodland or annual grassland and to convert all conifer plantations along the ridges to annual grassland ▶ Table 2-2 identifies 155 acres for treatment in the plan. I think the plan should be expanded to a larger area. In particular, I am concerned about expanding treatments to the north facing slope of Strawberry canyon west of the Frowning FHR project. ▶ The "Evacuation support treatment" proposes the treatment of a strip of land 100' from either side of major evacuation roads (page 2, paragraph 5). This strip should be widened to include any trees that could potentially fall onto the evacuation routes because of their height and lean ▶ Treatment Maintenance (page 2-10). The objectives and "vegetation management activities" should be spelled out for each vegetation type in each of the Fire hazard reduction projects. This information is necessary to evaluate the long-term effectiveness of the plan and the environmental impacts of the maintenance program 	<p>Addressed below</p> <p>2 Program Description</p> <p>3.3 Biological Resources</p> <p>2 Program Description, 6 Alternatives</p> <p>2 Program Description, 3.3 Biological Resources</p> <p>2 Program Description, 6 Alternatives</p> <p>2 Program Description, 6 Alternatives</p> <p>2 Program Description</p>
<p>Marilyn Goldhaber December 2, 2019</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Include a summary of vegetation management already approved in the 2020 LRDP 	<p>1 Introduction, 2 Program Description, 4 Cumulative Impacts</p>
<p>Katherine Bond December 2, 2019</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ What are herbicides? 	<p>2 Program Description, 3.4 Hazardous Materials</p>
<p>Jerry Kent December 2, 2019</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Follow policies for fuel management from the LRDP and LRDP EIR ▶ High fire risk vegetation (e.g., eucalyptus, Monterey pine) should be removed in VHFHSZs and replaced with less flammable native flora ▶ Thinning of second-growth eucalyptus is not safe or sustainable without regular use of prescribed fire every 5 years ▶ The Plan and EIR must be separated from the grant to ensure a transparent and unbiased public process 	<p>2 Program Description</p> <p>2 Program Description</p> <p>2 Program Description, 6 Alternatives</p> <p>Not a CEQA issue</p>

Commenter/Date	Summary	EIR Section Where Considered
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Vegetation management and home hardening with defensible space are needed to adequately reduce fire risk 	3.11 Wildfire, 6 Alternatives
Robert Bahme November 27, 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Endorses the plan and would like to see a specific fire break and tree removal zone added. Indicates that the pine trees are not native and create a large fire liability 	2 Program Description, 6 Alternatives
SPRAWLDEF November 24, 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Supports comments made by the Sierra Club 	See Sierra Club comments below
Sierra Club November 24, 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Plan is inadequate because it does not include an alternative for the removal of blue gum eucalyptus. Instead, the plan reports that eucalyptus will be thinned. This is insufficient and inadequate for dealing the fire danger from the blue gum eucalyptus ▶ UC should put into its plan an alternative that the Sierra Club advocates which is the 3Rs. This plan calls for removal of blue gum eucalyptus and other fire dangerous trees which will allow for the restoration and recovery of native vegetation that is less fire dangerous and the reestablishment of the biodiversity that existed with the native habitat and also recovery of endangered or threatened species (2015 3 R's paper is attached) 	6 Alternatives 6 Alternatives
Ian Monroe November 22, 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Supports aggressive removal of eucalyptus trees 	2 Program Description, 6 Alternatives
State Clearinghouse November 20, 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Copy of NOP submitted to reviewing agencies 	Outside of the scope of this EIR
NAHC November 20, 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ CEQA regulations related to cultural resources are summarized, including AB 52 and SB 18, and NAHC recommendations for cultural resource assessments are provided 	3.7 Archaeological, Historic, and Tribal Cultural Resources
Max Ventura November 20, 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Objects to the scoping meeting location and late noticing of the meeting ▶ Believes the plan is a nativist attack and will convert the area to grasslands, which is more dangerous for fire risk 	Outside of the scope of this EIR 2 Program Description
Alfred Twu November 20, 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Please get rid of all the eucalyptus trees and other flammable plants. The hills will still be beautiful without them and we'll all be much safer 	2 Program Description, 6 Alternatives
Verbal Comments Received at Public Scoping Meeting on December 2, 2019		
Joe McBride December 2, 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Plan is lacking specificity and no vegetation map is provided, environmental impacts will not be able to be evaluated ▶ The Plan fails to use appropriate techniques for assessing landsliding ▶ Concerned with only treating 100 feet on each side of evacuation routes ▶ Concerned with the schedule and that treatments are already underway without the EIR being approved 	2 Program Description, 3.3 Biological Resources, 3.8 Geology and Soils, 3.11 Wildfire, 4 Cumulative Impacts, 6 Alternatives,
Dan Grasseti December 2, 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Concerned with the schedule and that treatments are already underway without the EIR being approved ▶ Concerned with lack of specificity in the Plan ▶ Interested in the process and when the Plan will be released to the public 	2 Program Description, 4 Cumulative Impacts

Committer/Date	Summary	EIR Section Where Considered
Stuart Flashman Attorney for the CCC December 2, 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ It should be clear that the primary purpose of the project is to identify and implement methods of vegetation management to decrease the short-term and long-term risk of damage to people, property, and/or the environment ▶ The EIR needs to distinguish between short-term and long-term goals for the project; address the priority of different tasks; identify areas of highest wildfire risk; analyze the effectiveness of the methods of vegetation removal; assess all feasible mitigation measures and alternatives; consider the effects of future climate change on the effectiveness of the Plan and address cumulative affects; and should not assume native species are preferable ▶ Prioritization should be 1) protecting human health and safety, 2) protection structures and biological resources 	1 Introduction, 2 Program Description, 4 Cumulative Impacts, 6 Alternatives
Elizabeth Starge December 2, 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Upset with UCB for how the FEMA grant process and litigation went ▶ Believes the UC is prioritizing the safety and welfare of research labs on campus as opposed to other disciplines and Berkeley neighbors 	Not a CEQA issue
Jerry Kent December 2, 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Believes the UC should use the McBride Plan (submits written comments which are included above) 	6 Alternatives
Jon Kaufman December 2, 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Believes the UC should use the McBride Plan ▶ Believes thinning trees is not appropriate in the WUI and the UC should instead focus on removing trees that are a potential cause of wildfire 	6 Alternatives
Michael Graf Attorney for CCC December 2, 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The project description is too vague and general ▶ The EIR must consider how different treatment options exacerbate or reduce wildfire risk ▶ The EIR must go into greater detail on how each of the different treatments will affect biological resources and compare between alternatives 	2 Program Description, 3.3 Biological Resources, 3.11 Wildfire, 6 Alternatives
Katherine Bond December 2, 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The project description is too vague and does not provide information about the herbicides proposed for use ▶ The term thinning needs to be clearly defined 	2 Program Description, 3.4 Hazardous Materials, Appendix G Toxicity Evaluation
Janice Thomas December 2, 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Plan is too vague and the figures were not helpful ▶ Concerned with removal of coastal live oaks that occur within EST and FB areas, as well as disturbance to native vegetation and wildlife 	2 Program Description, 3.3 Biological Resources