

Amy Ow

From: Camille Leung
Sent: Tuesday, July 16, 2019 12:44 PM
To: Noel Chamberlain
Cc: Steve Monowitz; Amy Ow; Taylor Peterson; Kristen Outten
Subject: FW: Lots 9 and 10 Site Visit_07/12/2019

Hi Noel and Tay,

Please see SWCA recommendations from our site visit on 7/12/19, below. Please make the recommended corrections and arrange with Kristen as to whether a follow up inspection or just photos are needed.

Tay, please send the updated nesting bird survey when you get a chance.

Thanks

From: Kristen Outten [mailto:koutten@swca.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 16, 2019 10:42 AM
To: Camille Leung <cleung@smcgov.org>
Cc: Jessica Henderson-McBean <JHenderson-McBean@swca.com>
Subject: Lots 9 and 10 Site Visit_07/12/2019

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.

Hello Camille,

I am sending this email to summarize what we reviewed and discussed at last Friday's site visit at Lots 9 and 10. Please let me know if you have any questions or would like to discuss further.

LOT 9:

- There are two trees on the Civil Plan that were slated for protection. There seemed to be some confusion amongst the team as to specifically which two trees those were, as well as confusion regarding the extent of grading/disturbance within proximity of the trees. Several trees (+/-5?) were included in the tree protection zones on Lot 9. According to COA 21, "Tree protection zones shall be delineated using 4-foot tall orange plastic fencing supported by poles pounded into the ground, located as close to the driplines as possible while still allowing room for construction/grading to safely continue". Tree protection fencing was installed near the trunk of the trees and did not extend to the outer extent of the dripline. To ensure grading activities do not result in adverse impacts to the oak trees slated for protection, I recommend the contractor more accurately determines the extent of grading/disturbance and that the tree protection fencing is extended to the outer extent of the dripline of the trees that are slated for protection. If the tree protection buffers cannot be expanded due to the limits of grading, then I recommend that a certified arborist or registered forester inspect the trees/roots before any roots or root masses need to be cut, per COA 21.
- The silt fence was installed on Lot 9 in an area slightly beyond the limits of grading shown on the Erosion Control Plan. The silt fence was installed along the western edge of the property whereas the Erosion Control Plan shows it will be installed on the inside (east side) of the trees slated for protection. Similar to the comment above, I recommend the contractor more accurately determines the extent of grading/disturbance and that the silt fence is installed in accordance with the Erosion Control Plan. This will ensure compliance with COA 7 and ensure actual impacts are consistent with those that were used in the CEQA analysis.

- Woodrat middens were included within the tree protection zone to ensure they are not impacted by grading activities. It was assumed that the woodrat nests are active with young present, until proven otherwise. In accordance with Mitigation Measure BIO-2, it is recommended that the biologist consult with CDFW to determine an appropriate buffer that will provide sufficient foraging habitat.

LOT 10:

- There are eight trees on the Civil Plan that were slated for protection, all of which were fenced off during the site visit. Please note that the two trees along the northwest end of the lot that are slated for protection are included in the tree protection zone and are well outside the limits of grading; however, they did not have 4-foot tall orange plastic fencing as required by COA 21. This is because these trees are within the fence line of the adjacent landowner. Similar to what was discussed above for Lot 9, tree protection fencing was installed near the trunk of the trees and did not extend to the outer extent of the dripline. To ensure grading activities do not result in adverse impacts to the trees slated for protection, I recommend the contractor more accurately determines the extent of grading/disturbance and that the tree protection fencing is extended to the outer extent of the dripline of the trees that are slated for protection. If the tree protection buffers cannot be expanded due to the limits of grading, then I recommend that a certified arborist or registered forester inspect the trees/roots before any roots or root masses need to be cut, per COA 21.
- The silt fence installed on Lot 10 appeared to be installed in an area larger than what is shown on the Erosion Control Plan. I recommend the silt fence is installed in accordance with the Erosion Control Plan. This will ensure compliance with COA 7 and ensure actual impacts are consistent with those that were used in the CEQA analysis.

BOTH LOTS:

- The disturbance coordinator contact sign was posted on site with the appropriate contact info.
- The construction entrance/exit was not yet installed, but according to Noel will be installed prior to any grading activities.
- The contractor will provide their own QSP; SWCA will provide 3rd party compliance inspection on behalf of the County.

Please let me know if you have any questions or would like to discuss this in more detail. Also, I will upload the photos to the project SharePoint site later today. Let me know if you need me to resend you the link to that site.

Thanks,
Kristen

Kristen Outten
Project Manager / Senior Biologist

SWCA Environmental Consultants
60 Stone Pine Road, Suite 100
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019
P 650.440.4160 x 6404 | C 831.331.5264 | F 650.440.4165



The contents of this email and any associated emails, information, and attachments are CONFIDENTIAL. Use or disclosure without sender's authorization is prohibited. If you are not an authorized recipient, please notify the sender and then immediately delete the email and any attachments.