APPENDIX J

Draft Site Management Plan



AEI Consultants Environmental & Engineering Services

DRAFT

March 2, 2016

SITE MANAGEMENT PLAN

Property Identification:

Carlos Street at Sierra Street Moss Beach, California 94038

AEI Project No. 350428

Prepared for:

MidPen Housing Corporation 1970 Broadway, Suite 440 Oakland, California 94612

Prepared by:

AEI Consultants 3880 S. Bascom Avenue, Suite 122 San Jose, California 95124 (408) 559-7600 Environmental & Engineering Due Diligence

Site Investigation & Remediation

Energy Performance & Benchmarking

Industrial Hygiene

Construction Consulting

Construction, Site Stabilization & Stormwater Services

Zoning Analysis Reports & ALTA Surveys

National Presence Regional Focus Local Solutions

www.aeiconsultants.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND	2
2.0 SMP BACKGROUND	4
2.1 PLANNED DEVELOPMENT2.2 CONTAMINANTS OF POTENTIAL CONCERN2.3 SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS	4 4 5
3.0 SITE MITIGATION PLAN	5
 3.1 SMP APPLICABILITY	5 5 6 8 8 8 9 9 9 10
4.0 NOTIFICATION AND DOCUMENTATION	11
4.1 NOTIFICATIONS4.2 KEY CONTACTS4.3 DOCUMENTATION	11 11 12
5.0 REFERENCES	12
6.0 LIMITATIONS	12

FIGURES

Figure 1	Topographic Map
Figure 2	Site Map
Figure 3	Boring Location Map

TABLES

Table 1Soil Sample Data Summary



Environmental & Engineering Services

<u>DRAFT</u>

March 2, 2015

Ms. Jennifer Liu Acquisitions Analyst MidPen Housing Corporation 1970 Broadway, Suite 440 Oakland, California 94612

Subject: Site Management Plan Carlos Street at Sierra Street Moss Beach, San Mateo County, California 94038 AEI Project No. 350428

Dear Ms. Liu:

AEI Consultants (AEI) is pleased to provide this Site Management Plan (SMP) for the property located at Carlos and Sierra Streets in Moss Beach, California ("the Site"). The location of the Site is shown on Figure 1. The SMP has been prepared in accordance with AEI proposal dated November 19, 2015 (AEI Proposal No. 44236). The SMP has been developed to address worker protection and environmental concerns during construction activities at the Site.

This SMP applies to subsurface disturbances at the Site related to the planned redevelopment activities. The purpose of this SMP is to assess and communicate the presence of contaminants of potential concern (COPCs) that are known or may be present, but unknown at this time, within Site soils and groundwater so that, if necessary, appropriate safety measures can be implemented to protect persons doing invasive work. The only current known COPC includes one metal (lead), which was identified in surface soils, as discussed below. This SMP also provides for the proper management of other unknown environmental conditions that may be identified during redevelopment activities at the Site.

This SMP is not intended to replace Federal, State, or local regulations dictating the handling of contaminated media or regulations addressing worker exposure including Federal and California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) training and worker protection rules and regulations, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Title 29, Part 1910.120 and California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 8, § 5192.

This SMP includes the following components:

- 1. A description of the Site and conceptual project activities;
- 2. A summary of known and potential environmental conditions;

- 3. Provisions for an updated Health and Safety Plan (HASP), as well as provisions for odor, storm water, noise, and dust control plans;
- 4. Guidelines for managing and sampling impacted or potentially-impacted soil and groundwater that may be encountered (contingency plan);
- 5. Notifications and documentation.

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND

The subject property comprises approximately 10.4 acres of vacant land, located northnortheast of the intersection between Carlos Street and Sierra Street in Moss Beach, an unincorporated community within San Mateo County, California. As shown on Figure 2, the property is bounded by residential properties along 16th Street (in Montara), and vacant land to the north, residential properties along Carlos, Sierra, and Stetson Streets to the south, residential properties along Lincoln and Buena Vista Street to the east, and one residential property and vacant land along Carlos Street to the west. Numerous concrete slab-on-grade building foundations, along with foundation retaining walls exhibiting scattered areas of graffiti, are present within the western and southwestern portions of the property. In some areas, building foundations and retaining walls are covered by thick vegetation consisting of trees and shrubs. Heavy vegetation also covers the majority of the property outside the areas of the building foundations. Unpaved roadways extend northwest-southeast across the north and central portions of the property.

As shown on an Old Republic Title Company Preliminary Title Report Map dated October 8, 2015, easements for Montara Water and Sanitary District (MWSD) and Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) utilities extend along the unpaved roadways within the property. MWSD infrastructure consisting of water storage tanks, a booster pumping system, and distribution facilities are located within a small, fenced-in parcel of land (known as Schoolhouse) adjacent to and west of the intersection of Lincoln Street and Buena Vista Street near the eastern boundary of the property. Another MWSD easement also extends southward form this fenced-in parcel to Sierra Street.

Topographically, the property generally slopes to the west-southwest with the exception of a steeply inclined, north-facing slope along the northern property boundary. Localized, relatively flat areas or topographic benches are present near the west and southwest boundaries of the property, as well as adjacent to Lincoln Street along the northeast corner of the property. Surface elevations at the property generally range between approximately 100 and 200 feet above mean sea level. The closest surface water body includes an unnamed, east-west trending, ephemeral drainage which parallels 16th Street to the north of the property.

Based on our review of a United States Geological Survey (USGS) Open File Report 98-137 Map entitled *Geology of the Onshore Part of San Mateo County, California* (Brabb, et.al., 1998), the subject property is situated upon a marine terrace underlain by Quaternary-aged alluvial deposits, along with thin, scattered veneers of residual soils. These units are further underlain by Montara Mountain granitic bedrock of Cenozoic age. Artificial fill consisting of soils, construction debris, wood debris, and other miscellaneous materials are scattered throughout the entire property.



The current estimated depth to groundwater beneath the property is unknown at this time. Well yield report information associated with a domestic water supply well installed on the property in 1986 showed a static water level of 168 feet below ground surface (bgs). Based on the local site topography, the direction of groundwater flow is inferred to generally flow to the west-southwest, except for a northerly flow direction inferred along the north property boundary into the drainage adjacent to 16th Street.

In October and November 2015, AEI performed a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) at the Site. Phase I ESA findings were presented in a report dated November 10, 2015 (AEI Project Number 350428). As described in AEI's Phase I ESA report, historical sources indicated that the Site was part of a large World War II training area circa 1945. Numerous military buildings had been present on the subject property, as shown on a drawing entitled Map of Anti-Aircraft Training Center, Point Montara, California, Twelfth Naval District, Showing Conditions on June 30, 1945, which was presented in Appendix F of AEI's Phase I ESA report. These military buildings included barracks, offices, a mess hall, a library, a garage, a boiler room, an incinerator, a "TDD hanger", and a "drill field". After the war was over, the mess hall building was converted into a grammar school, and was later abandoned after a new school site was built (date unknown). By the late 1960s, the property was then used as a training ground for firefighters. During such firefighter training, AEI assumed that accelerants, such as those containing gasoline, may have been used along concrete pad surfaces. Burned materials from the firefighter training potentially may have been washed off the pads and into surrounding, unpaved areas. Between approximately 1968 and 1970, a controlled burn occurred, which resulted in the burning of several remaining buildings, leaving only exposed concrete foundations. Since at least 1970, the property has been vacant with the exception of the scattered, older building foundations, as well as the fenced area containing MWSD infrastructure used to support current water storage and distribution operations.

Several recognized environmental conditions (RECs) were identified during the course of the Phase I ESA. These included 1) the potential presence of lead-based paint in soils around building foundations, 2) the "drill field", which may have been used for weaponry or as a shooting range, 3) concrete pad areas potentially used for firefighter training, and 4) an incinerator likely used for burning wastes. During the planning stages of the Phase II investigation, a boiler room also was identified as a REC to be further investigated. Other environmental considerations noted during the Phase I ESA included two (2) former domestic water supply wells that were reportedly no longer in use. The locations of these wells were unknown. It was also unknown if the wells were properly abandoned in accordance with local County regulations.

In December of 2015, AEI performed a limited Phase II subsurface investigation at the Site. The results of this investigation were presented in AEI's report dated February 15, 2016. The purpose of the investigation was to assess whether or not release(s) had occurred into the subsurface that resulted from historic Site operations. Thirty-three (33) exploratory soil borings were advanced during the investigation. Soil samples were obtained for various laboratory analyses, including lead, total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPHs), volatile organic compounds (VOCs), polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), California Assessment Manual (CAM) 17 Metals, and Dioxins/Furans.



Analytical results showed the presence of lead and other metals in surface soils across the Site. A low concentration of TPH quantified as diesel (TPH-d) was detected in shallow soils around the location of the former boiler room. A low concentration of total hexafurans was detected in shallow soils around the area of the former incinerator. No TPH quantified as gasoline (TPH-g) or motor oil (TPH-mo), VOCs, or PCBs were detected in soils at concentrations at or above the laboratory reporting limits during the investigation. Analytical results for soils are presented in Table 1.

Detected concentrations of the various chemical constituents in soil were compared with their respective screening levels, including California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) Environmental Screening Levels (ESLs) and United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) Regional Screening Levels (RSLs). None of the detected chemical constituents were found to exceed their respective screening levels, except for lead in surface soils at two (2) locations and arsenic at the 1.5-foot depth at one (1) location. Additional laboratory analyses for lead were run on soil samples from the 1.5-foot depth at the two (2) locations to assess the vertical extent of lead-impacted soils Analytical results for lead in soils at the 1.5-foot depth showed concentrations below established screening levels. The detected concentration of arsenic at the one (1) location was found to be representative of naturally-occurring background conditions, which is within the range of arsenic concentrations in soils within the San Francisco Bay Area.

Analytical results generated during this investigation suggest that the lead concentrations in soils at the two (2) locations may have originated from lead-based paint associated with former building exteriors. Furthermore, analytical results also suggest that lead concentrations at the two (2) locations are somewhat localized and appear to be restricted to surface soils. Analytical results show that the vertical extent of lead-impacted soils has been delineated at these two (2) locations. However, the horizontal extent of lead-impacted soils at these two locations is undefined Further delineation of shallow lead-impacted soils was recommended and will be investigated during the Second Quarter of 2016 in accordance with MidPen Housing Corporation's request.

2.0 SMP BACKGROUND

2.1 PLANNED DEVELOPMENT

Conceptual development plans include the demolition and removal of existing building foundations, retaining walls, and miscellaneous construction debris and garbage scattered across the Site. ____ () will be constructed for residential land use. Proposed excavation depths will be approximately ____ feet bgs.

2.2 CONTAMINANTS OF POTENTIAL CONCERN

Based upon the results from the Phase II investigation, lead was identified as a contaminant of potential concern (COPC) at the Site. Concentrations of this constituent were detected in surface soils at two (2) locations (B-7 and B-21). Detected concentrations I surface soils were found to exceed the RWQCB ESL for direct exposure under a residential direct exposure scenario, but below construction/trench work exposure scenario. If excavated and transported



offsite for disposal, these surface soils will require further characterization and waste profiling to determine appropriate disposal requirements.

2.3 SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS

The results from the Phase II drilling program show that the subject property is underlain by alluvial and residual soils primarily consisting of sandy clays and clayey sands to the depths explored. No groundwater was encountered during drilling operations. No visual or olfactory evidence (i.e., soil discoloration, odor) of impacted soils was observed in any of the recovered soil cores during drilling operations. No photo-ionization (PID) readings for assessing the presence of VOCs in soils above background levels were noted during headspace testing.

3.0 SITE MITIGATION PLAN

3.1 SMP APPLICABILITY

This SMP presents protocol for the following construction activities that may encounter the COPC, including the following:

- Removal of building pads and slab-on-grade foundations;
- Removal of below grade features, such as footings, deeper building foundations, utilities, and other underground features;
- Mass excavation; and
- Construction dewatering, if needed.

Contractors and their subcontractors shall follow the protocols presented in this SMP while performing the aforementioned onsite activities. Contractors and their subcontractors are responsible for the health and safety of their employees, and are required to prepare their own Site-specific HASPs.

3.2 ENVIRONMENTAL RISK MANAGEMENT

This section presents risk management procedures to be followed during the above described construction activities during Site development, including worker training and impact mitigation measures.

3.2.1 Pre-Construction Planning and Notification

Prior to the start of any construction activity that involves below ground work (e.g., slab removal or excavating), a copy of this SMP will be provided to the contractors for their review. In addition, AEI recommends that each contractor provide such information to its subcontractors.

3.2.2 Site-Specific Health and Safety Worker Requirements

A Site-specific health and safety plan (HASP) for the development project will be prepared by the General Contractor. As previously mentioned, the Contractor and subcontractors shall be responsible for the health and safety of their own workers, as required by Cal-OSHA, including but not limited to preparation of their own HASP and Injury and Illness Prevention Plan (IIPP). The purpose of these two (2) documents is to provide general guidance relating to the work



hazards that may be encountered during each phase of Site construction activities. The Contractor and subcontractors are also required to determine the requirements for worker training, based on the level of expected contact to potentially impacted soil and/or groundwater, if any, associated with the Contractor's activities and locations with respect to the COPC described in Section 2.2. The HASP(s) will contain provisions for limiting and monitoring chemical exposure to construction workers, chemical and non-chemical hazards, emergency procedures, and standard safety protocols.

As required by the appropriate regulatory agency, the General Contractor will submit the HASP at least two weeks prior to beginning construction field work. HASPs will be updated as the project proceeds if unforeseen conditions are identified and necessitate modification(s).

3.2.3 Construction Impact Mitigation Measures

During construction activities, measures will be taken by the Contractor and subcontractors to minimize dust generation, appropriately manage storm water runoff, minimize tracking of soil off-site, and minimize other construction related impacts. The construction impact mitigation measures are described below.

3.2.3.1 Site Control

Site control procedures will be implemented by the contractor to control the flow of personnel, vehicles, and materials in and out of the Site while working with potentially contaminated materials. In addition, Site control measures will help control the spread of the COPC from the Site. The Site perimeter will be fenced by the contractor. Access and egress will be controlled at selected locations. Signs will be posted at each Site entrance by the Contractor, instructing visitors to sign in at the project support area.

3.2.3.2 Equipment Decontamination

Decontamination procedures will be established and implemented by the Contractor to reduce the potential for construction equipment and vehicles to transfer potentially impacted soil onto public roadways or other off-site areas. At a minimum, gravel will be placed at all Site access points by the Contractor and excess soil will be removed from construction equipment using dry methods (e.g., brushing or scraping) prior to moving the equipment to off-Site locations.

3.2.3.3 Personal Protective Equipment

Appropriate Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) will be used to isolate workers from the COPC and physical hazards. The minimum level of protection for workers coming into direct contact with potentially contaminated materials is OSHA Level D PPE, listed below. The level of PPE will be evaluated by the Contractor on a continuing basis and modified, if warranted, based upon conditions encountered at the Site and/or type of work activity in accordance with their own HASP (see Section 3.2.2). The minimum PPE to be utilized during construction activities includes the following:

- Coveralls or similar construction work clothing;
- Reflective safety vests;



- Steel-toed boots;
- Hard hat;
- Work gloves, as necessary;
- Safety glasses, as necessary; and
- Hearing protection, as necessary.

3.2.3.4 Dust Control

All demolition and construction activities that have the potential to create dust must comply with specified dust control measures whether or not the activity requires a County-issued permit. Therefore, the following actions are required to adequately address dust control:

- Construction areas will be watered down at a sufficient frequency to eliminate visible dust. Additional watering may be required whenever the wind speed exceeds 15 miles per hour. Watering should be performed in a manner such that runoff will not be produced at any time.
- At the end of each work day, all streets, sidewalks, paths, and intersections, where work has occurred, will be swept or vacuumed to remove visible soil(s).
- All inactive soil piles expected to remain in-place for more than seven (7) days will be covered with plastic sheeting or an equivalent tarp and properly secured to avoid wind damage.
- Signage will be placed along Lincoln, Sierra, Carlos, and Stetson Streets to inform surrounding community members of the hotline phone number(s) to call and report visible dust problems.
- If proposed dust suppression efforts are unsuccessful, other measures will be implemented to help control dust, such as wind breaks and/or dust curtains along street frontages, pending final resolution of necessary dust suppression efforts.
- Materials contained in all loading trucks or metal bins carrying excavated materials will be maintained below the sides and back of the truck or metal bin, and will be properly covered to avoid dust generation and drying of soils during transport. Excavated materials may be moistened prior to transport.
- Drop heights will be minimized while loading and unloading soil.
- Truck tires will be brushed prior to leaving the Site, and truck loading areas will be routinely swept and cleaned to avoid creating visible dust. Soil handling activities will be halted when the wind speed exceeds 25 miles per hour and visible dust is being created that cannot be mitigated by soil moistening.

3.2.3.5 Storm Water Control Plan



A storm water control plan will be prepared by the General Contractor and submitted to the County of San Mateo prior to beginning construction activities. The General Contractor and subcontractors shall comply with the provisions and protocols of the Storm Water Control Plan. As part of the plan, sediment and erosion control procedures may include, but are not limited to the following:

- Constructing temporary berms or erecting silt fences around exposed soils;
- Placing straw bale barriers or sediment traps around catch basins or other entrances to storm drains;
- Covering soil stockpiles with plastic sheeting or tarps during rainfall events; and
- Implementing other appropriate best management practices (BMPs), especially, for sediment and erosion control, as identified in the Storm Water Control Plan.

3.2.3.6 Odor and Noise Controls

Odor and Noise Control Plans will be prepared by the General Contractor and submitted to the County of San Mateo prior to beginning construction activities. These plans will be prepared in accordance with applicable regulations and address the work practices required for the project.

3.3 GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT PROTOCOLS

No groundwater is anticipated to be encountered during the proposed Site redevelopment activities. However, if groundwater is encountered during excavation activities or water resulting from rainfall occurs and fills excavation areas, if any, then appropriate mitigation measures will be implemented as follows:

3.3.1 Excavation Dewatering

AEI does not anticipate that installation of a dewatering system will be required. However, if groundwater is encountered or accumulates in any excavation(s) due to rainwater, such water will be handled in accordance with the following protocol.

- For relatively small volumes of water, a temporary storage tank (frac tank) will be utilized to hold such groundwater on a short-term basis while testing and disposal is arranged.
- If conditions require installation of a dewatering system or larger volume of groundwater requires handling, proper permits will be obtained and permit conditions followed for discharge into the nearby existing sanitary sewer or storm water system.

3.4 SOIL MANAGEMENT PROTOCOLS AND CONTINGENCY PLAN

The soils management program is designed to ensure proper handling and disposition of soils from an environmental perspective and includes the following components:



- A protocol for screening and monitoring for environmental conditions identified during demolition and excavation work;
- A protocol for properly managing the handling and disposal of impacted soils; and
- A criteria for import fill soils, if needed.

3.4.1 Soil Monitoring and Screening

Soil may be field-screened by the Environmental Consultant in areas of potential environmental impact during demolition and excavation work on an as-needed basis to assess whether metals specifically, lead, in soils may be present. At this time, field screening is not anticipated; however, the Environmental Consultant will be notified if any of the following are encountered:

- Discovery and removal of previously unidentified features of concern, such as underground storage tanks (USTs), sumps, clarifiers, former water supply wells or similar features of potential environmental concern. However, based on the Site background, it is not anticipated that any of the aforementioned features will be encountered during construction activities except for the former water supply wells.
- Areas of suspected contaminated soils as deemed appropriate by the Environmental Consultant or as reported by the contractor.

The Environmental Consultant will be notified by the Contractor of the discovery of the above conditions and will be on-site to perform screening and possible sample collection as discussed below. The Contractor is responsible for notification to the Owner and Environmental Consultant of suspected impacted soils or possible conditions of environmental concern.

If a UST or other features are discovered, work will be suspended in its immediate vicinity, and the Owner and Environmental Consultant will be notified. San Mateo County Department of Environmental Health (SMCDEH) will then be notified of the proposed response actions. Should a UST be encountered, it shall be addressed under permit with the SMCDEH. In addition, SMCDEH will be provided copies of the required reports.

Prior to any significant construction that will result in excavation within impacted soil areas, AEI should be contacted to assess the work area(s). Depending upon the nature of the work, AEI may conduct soil sampling before the start of construction to test for potentially elevated concentrations of lead. AEI also may use a portable, x-ray fluorescence (XRF) analyzer to field screen work area(s) during construction. Work area soils also may be monitored based upon visual observations.

Soils with lead concentrations exceeding applicable regulatory screening levels or other California thresholds may be segregated for further characterization and laboratory analyses. Laboratory analytical results will be used for waste profiling purposes and to determine proper disposal requirements.

3.4.2 Management of Impacted Soil

Based on the analytical results during the Phase II investigation, soil excavated at the Site may require further assessment prior to its acceptance by a receiving facility. Such additional investigation and analysis will be coordinated by the Contractor, or Contractor's representative





with AEI's technical support for potential disposal facilities to ensure that the soils are properly characterized, segregated, and transported from the Site. Such analyses may include the testing of soil samples at additional locations and depths to delineate the lateral and vertical extent of impact(s) and assess waste disposal characteristics, such as Soluble Threshold Leaching Concentrations (STLCs), Toxic Characteristic Leaching Procedures (TCLPs), and other waste classification analyses, as required. Prior to transportation of impacted soils from the Site, a waste profile acceptance will be obtained by the Contractor and/or subcontractors, along with pre-printed, signed manifests provided to the transporter.

During construction activities and based on the procedures outlined in Section 3.4.1, if soil is encountered that is suspected of being contaminated, or if buried structures, such as clarifiers, tanks, debris or un-abandoned wells are encountered, earthwork in these suspect area(s) will be stopped and worker access to the suspect area(s) will be restricted. Areas will be cordoned off using delineators and caution tape, or similar materials provided by the Contractor, followed by notifying the Environmental Consultant. Soils suspected as being contaminated will then be evaluated through screening and/or analytical testing performed by the Environmental Consultant so that appropriate handling and disposal alternatives can be determined.

Site development activities may result in a net export of soil. Such soil shall be properly characterized in accordance with applicable regulations prior to transportation from the Site.

If on-site re-use of potentially contaminated soil is desired, soil samples shall be collected from such soil and analyzed for the COPC. If the COPC is detected, whether above or below regulatory agency screening levels, further investigation of such soils may be performed as determined by the Owner in coordination with the Environmental Consultant. For soils considered for re-use, if the COPC is detected below the applicable ESL, re-use of the soil may be deemed appropriate, at the discretion of the Owner. If the COPC is detected above the applicable ESL and soils are being considered for reuse on-Site, the results and conditions will be communicated to the SMCDEH for concurrence. Otherwise, impacted soils will be profiled for proper disposal at landfill facilities under appropriate waste manifests. Prior to off-site disposal, additional soil samples may be collected and analyzed in accordance with the requirements of disposal facility(s).

Soil suspected of being contaminated during excavation, shall be stockpiled or otherwise segregated from "clean" soil. Such soil shall be stockpiled on-site on top of and covered by an "impermeable" liner (e.g., 6 mil plastic sheeting) or other appropriate materials to reduce infiltration by rainwater and contamination of underlying soil while its disposition is being determined. Any such stockpiles shall be checked daily by the Contractor to verify that they are adequately covered.

3.4.3 Management of Mass Excavation Surplus Soil

In addition to the procedures outlined above for impacted or potentially-impacted soils, surplus soils generated during grading activities will be profiled for acceptance at appropriate facilities. Criteria for acceptance (e.g., concentrations of specific contaminants, odors, additional analytical testing, etc.) will be determined by the acceptance facility(s) as part of the acceptance process.



Transporter information and disposal location(s) for soils have not yet been finalized. The names and applicable license information of such operators will be provided to the SMCDEH once confirmed.

3.4.4 Import Fill

The Environmental Consultant and Geotechnical Engineer will be notified prior to importing fill soils onto the Site. An evaluation of import fill materials will be conducted to ensure such fill meets the geotechnical and environmental requirements for the proposed redevelopment To minimize the potential introduction of contaminated fill onto the Site, AEI activities. recommends that all selected sources of import fill have adequate documentation or certification to verify that the fill source is appropriate for the Site. Documentation should include detailed information on previous land use of the fill source, any Phase I Environmental Site Assessments performed and findings, and the results of any analytical testing performed. If no documentation is available or the documentation is inadequate or if no analytical testing has been performed, AEI recommends that samples of the potential fill material be collected and analyzed prior to delivery of such soil to the Site. The analyses selected should be based on the fill source(s) and knowledge of the previous land use, as determined by the Environmental Consultant. AEI recommends that the sample frequency for potential fill material be conducted in accordance with that outlined in the technical document entitled "Information Advisory on Clean Imported Fill Material' (Department of Toxic Substances Control, October 2001). The Environmental Consultant will provide guidance to the Contractor regarding acceptability of imported fill. No fill material will be accepted if contaminant levels exceed current residential environmental screening goals and/or regional background concentrations.

4.0 NOTIFICATION AND DOCUMENTATION

4.1 NOTIFICATIONS

Notifications of the discovery of the COPC in field screening, observations, or analytical results or other conditions of potential environmental concern shall be immediately made to the Owner, Contractor, and Environmental Consultant. If analytical testing shows that the COPC is above its applicable screening level, the Owner and contractor will then be notified. The discovery of any subsurface features will also be reported to the Environmental Consultant, followed by notifying SMCDEH. If such discovery or conditions require notification to another Contractor or subcontractors, then such notification will be made by the Contractor.

Company	Role	Contact	Telephone Number			
Jennifer Liu	Owner	MidPen Housing Corporation	510-426-5672 (o)			
TBD	General Contractor	TBD	TBD			
AEL Consultants	Environmental Consultant	Adrian Angel	408-559-7600 (o) 831-331-3547 (c)			
		Tim Bodkin	408-559-7600 (o) 650-622-6560 (c)			

4.2 KEY CONTACTS



(o) office phone number; (c) cell phone number

4.3 DOCUMENTATION

The Environmental Consultant will prepare a report upon completion of excavation and earthwork performed in accordance with the SMP. The report will include a Site map showing areas of excavation and import fill, sample locations, and tables summarizing data. The report also will include appendices with copies of permits, including any dewatering permits, manifests or bills of lading for removed soil and/or groundwater, and laboratory reports for soil and water profiling not previously submitted. The certified final project report will be prepared for the Owner.

5.0 REFERENCES

- AEI Consultants, 2015, *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report, Carlos Street at Sierra Street, Moss Beach, San Mateo County, California 94038,* consultant report dated November 10, 2015, prepared for MidPen Housing Corporation.
- AEI Consultants, 2015, *Limited Phase II Subsurface Investigation, Carlos Street at Sierra Street, Moss Beach, San Mateo County, California 94038,* consultant report dated February 15, 2016, prepared for MidPen Housing Corporation.

6.0 LIMITATIONS

Contractors and subcontractors are responsible for review of this SMP prior to commencing work at the Site and for the health and safety of their own employees and subcontractors. The Owner is responsible for review of the provisions of this SMP and for incorporating its guidelines into their project planning and specifications. This document was prepared for the use and benefit of Midpen Housing Corporation, as well as for their Contractor, subcontractors, and consultants at the Site. Where information prepared by others has been provided, AEI cannot be responsible for its accuracy or completeness or for the availability of all information that may be relevant to the preparation of this document.

This report presents a summary of work completed by AEI Consultants. The completed work includes observations and descriptions of site conditions encountered. Where appropriate, it includes analytical results for samples taken during the course of the work. The number and location of samples are chosen to provide the requested information, subject to scope of work for which AEI was retained and limitations inherent in this type of work, but it cannot be assumed that they are representative of areas not sampled. This report should not be regarded as a guarantee that no further contamination beyond that which could have been detected within the scope of this investigation is present beneath the subject property. Undocumented, unauthorized releases of hazardous material(s), the remains of which are not readily identifiable by visual inspection and are of different chemical constituents, are difficult and often impossible to detect within the scope of a chemical-specific investigation.



If there are any questions regarding this report, please do not hesitate to contact us at 408-559-7600 or Peter McIntyre at (925) 746-6000.

Sincerely, **AEI Consultants**

DRAFT

Adrian M. Angel, GIT Project Geologist Timothy G. Bodkin, PG (4706), CEG (EG 1551) Senior Geologist – Site Mitigation



FIGURES









TABLES



TABLE 1: SOIL SAMPLE DATA SUMMARY Carlos Street at Sierra Street, Moss Beach, CA

Location ID	Date	Depth (feet bgs)	Lead (mg/kg)	TPH-g (mg/kg)	TPH-d (mg/kg)	TPH-mo (mg/kg)	VOCs (mg/kg)	PCBs (mg/kg)	Arsenic (mg/kg)	Barium (mg/kg)	Chromium (mg/kg)	Cobalt (mg/kg)	Copper (mg/kg)	Molybdenu (mg/kg)	Nickel (mg/kg)	Vanadium (mg/kg)	Zinc (mg/kg)	Remaining Metals (mg/kg)	Total Hexafurans (mg/kg)	Other Dioxins/Furans (mg/kg)
B-1-1.5	12/22/2015	1.5	4.5					<mrl< td=""><td>2.3</td><td>44</td><td>15</td><td>3.9</td><td>2.2</td><td>1.0</td><td>13</td><td>36</td><td>29</td><td><mrl< td=""><td>2.78 x 10^{-₀}</td><td></td></mrl<></td></mrl<>	2.3	44	15	3.9	2.2	1.0	13	36	29	<mrl< td=""><td>2.78 x 10^{-₀}</td><td></td></mrl<>	2.78 x 10 ^{-₀}	
B-3-2.0	12/23/2015	2			1.3	<5.0														
B-3-5.0	12/23/2015	5			<1.0	<5.0														
B-4-0.0	12/23/2015	0	29																	
B-5-0.0	12/23/2015	0	54																	
B-6-0.0	12/23/2015	0	8.4																	
B-7-0.0	12/23/2015	0	230																	
B-7-1.5	12/23/2015	1.5	7																	
B-8-0.0	12/23/2015	0	23																	
B-9-0.0	12/22/2015	0	6.5																	
B-10-0.0	12/22/2015	0	45																	
B-11-0.0	12/22/2015	0	6.2																	
B-12-5.0	12/23/2015	5		<1.0			<mrl< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></mrl<>													
B-13-6.0	12/23/2015	6		<1.0			<mrl< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></mrl<>													
B-14-2.0	12/23/2015	2		<1.0			<mrl< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></mrl<>													
B-15-0.0	12/22/2015	0	25																	
B-15-7.0	12/23/2015	7		<1.0			<mrl< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></mrl<>													
B-16-0.0	12/22/2015	0	15																	
B-17-4.0	12/22/2015	4		<1.0			<mrl< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></mrl<>													
B-18-0.0	12/22/2015	0	12																	
B-19-0.0	12/22/2015	0	7.9																	
B-20-0.0	12/22/2015	0	41																	
B-20-1.5	12/22/2015	1.5	8.1																	
B-21-0.0	12/22/2015	1 5	88																	
B-21-1.5	12/22/2015	1.5	8.8																	
B-22-0.0	12/22/2015	0	19																	
B-23-0.0	12/22/2015	0	15																	
B-24-0.0	12/22/2015	0	10																	
B-25-0.0	12/22/2015	0	0.7 7 /																	
B-20-0.0	12/22/2015	0	6.3																	
B-28-0.0	12/22/2015	0	0.3																	
B-20-0.0	12/22/2015	0	87																	
B-30-0.0	12/22/2015	0	0.7																	
B-31-0.0	12/22/2015	0	7.8																	
B-32-0.0	12/22/2015	Ő	7.0																	
B-33-0.0	12/22/2015	0	39																	
B-34-0.0	12/22/2015	0	34																	
Regulatory RWQCB ESL _r USEPA RSL _{res}	Screening Le	evels	80 400	100 82 - 520	100 96 - 110	100 2500 - 230000	varies varies	varies varies	0.39 0.68	750 15,000	750 120,000	23 23	230 3,100	40 390	150 NE	200 390	600 23,000	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	N/A N/A

Notes:

mg/kg milligrams per kilogram

<MRL less than the method reporting limit

bgs below ground surface

TPH-g Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons as Gasoline

TPH-d Total Petroleum hydrocarbons as Diesel

VOCs Volatile Organic Compounds

PCBs

Polychlorinated biphenyls Result exceeds applicable Comparison Value Bold

Not analyzed ---

Not applicable N/A

NE Not established

Regulatory Screening Levels:

RVQCB ESLegionalia: California Regional Water Quality Control Board Environmental Screening Level for residential land use for shallow soils (<3 meters bgs) assuming groundwater is a current or potential drinking water resource RWQCB, 2013, Table A-1). USEPA RSL_{residential}: United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) Regional Screening Level for resident soil (USEPA, June 2015 revised)