

SAN RAMON VALLEY FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT

Administration
Phone: 925-838-6600
Fax: 925-838-6629
www.firedepartment.org

1500 Bollinger Canyon Road
San Ramon, California 94583

Fire Prevention
Phone: 925-838-6680
Fax: 925-838-6696

MEMORANDUM

Date: April 16, 2010
To: Board of Directors
From: Steven J. Hart, Assistant Fire Chief, Support Services
Subject: Agenda Item 4.1

Background:

On February 17, 2010, the District's Land Use Permit application for the proposed Fire Station 32 was deemed complete.

The next step in the process is to comply with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development serves as the Lead Agency for this environmental review. Staff from the Department of Conservation and Development posted a Request for Proposals (RFP) on March 2nd with a deadline of March 24th. A total of 4 CEQA consultants responded to the RFP.

County staff has recommended that Christopher A. Joseph and Associates be selected to conduct the CEQA Initial Study. Total cost estimate for the consultant is \$54,075. Contra Costa County assesses a 30% Administrative Fee which amounts to \$16,222. The study is expected to be completed in 14 weeks from the notice to proceed.

Recommended Board Action:

District staff recommends approval to contract with Contra Costa County for the CEQA Initial Study for Fire Station 32 for an amount not to exceed \$75,000.

April 8, 2010

Ruben Hernandez, Senior Planner
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY
Department of Conservation and Development
651 Pine Street, 2nd Floor, North Wing
Martinez, CA 94553

Re: Amended Scope of Work, Budget, and Schedule for the Stone Valley Road Fire Station Project Proposal

Dear Mr. Hernandez:

Per our conversation on April 7, 2010, Christopher A. Joseph & Associates (CAJA) is pleased to submit this Amendment to our March 24, 2010 *Proposal to Prepare an Initial Study for the Stone Valley Road Fire Station Project* ("Proposal Amendment"). This Proposal Amendment has been revised based on our telephone conversation on April 7, 2010. Specifically, Task 3 (Finalize Work Scope and Budget) from our Original Proposal has been removed under the assumption that the scope of work and budget presented in this Proposal Amendment will serve as the final scope of work and budget. This resulted in a cost reduction of \$600 and a revised total cost estimate of **\$54,075**.

Please find the revised portions of the proposal below:

SCOPE OF WORK

Based on our understanding of the project, CAJA proposes to prepare an expanded Initial Study (IS) that will include sufficient detail to support a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) if the analysis results in no significant unavoidable environmental impacts. A budget and schedule for the following scope of work are provided at the end of this Proposal Amendment.

This scope of work does not include tasks related to public circulation, noticing, hearings, or responding to comments, as those tasks will depend on whether the IS analysis results in the processing of an MND or Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the project. A separate scope of work and budget to complete the CEQA clearance process will be provided when this determination is made.

The following tasks will be conducted by the project team to prepare the IS:

Task 1: Review and Digitize Existing Information

CAJA staff will review all available documentation related to the project, including but not limited to project site plans, previously prepared technical reports, the County General Plan and Zoning Code, and regional planning documents. As requested in the RFP, CAJA will also scan hard copies of previously prepared technical reports to digital format for use by the project team.

Deliverables: CAJA will document additional information needed for the environmental analysis in a memorandum to the County (if necessary) and provide digital copies of available technical documentation in PDF format.

Task 2: Attend Kick-Off Meeting with County Staff

Principal-in-Charge Geoff Reilly and Project Manager Heidi Mekkelson will attend a kick-off meeting with County staff. The purpose of the meeting is to: 1) introduce the project team to County staff; 2) collect all relevant reports and drawings; 3) discuss the desired format of the IS; 4) resolve issues regarding overall assumptions; 5) identify other key contacts at the County (including Fire District personnel); and 6) discuss communication protocols.

Deliverables: CAJA can document the kick-off meeting with a memorandum that will be emailed to all team members (if requested).

Task 3: Prepare Preliminary Project Description

Because the project description is the basis for analyzing the environmental impacts of the proposed project and identifying appropriate mitigation measures, it is important to prepare the project description as early in the CEQA process as possible. CAJA will review all relevant project description materials and will prepare a preliminary version of the project description that will be used in the IS. The project description will include discussions of the following: 1) the project site's regional and local location; 2) project objectives and goals; 3) project characteristics, including but not limited to building design characteristics, landscaping, access/circulation, utilities/infrastructure, stormwater management, grading/excavation, and construction phasing/scheduling; and 4) required discretionary actions.

Deliverables: CAJA will submit two (2) electronic copies of the preliminary project description (one in MS Word format and the other in PDF format) to the County for review and comment.

Task 4: Prepare Administrative Draft Initial Study

CAJA will prepare an IS that will evaluate the potentially significant impacts of the proposed project as the project relates to the 18 environmental topics in the Environmental Checklist Form of the CEQA Guidelines or the County's IS Checklist (if applicable). The analysis in the IS will consider information contained in existing

technical reports and documents related to the project, relevant regulations and policies, and other applicable information obtained through the research efforts of CAJA staff. The IS will include the following sections:

- 1) Project Description (refer to Task 3);
- 2) CEQA Checklist with an analysis of each issue and mitigation measures where needed to reduce or avoid any potentially significant impacts identified for the project;
- 3) Mitigation Monitoring Program, if applicable (refer to Task 7); and
- 5) Technical Appendices.

If it is determined that all of the potentially significant impacts of the proposed project can be mitigated to a less than significant level, a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) will be prepared and added to the IS for public circulation. If it is determined that the project would have the potential to result in significant unavoidable impacts to the environment, CAJA will recommend the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and the IS would be included as an appendix to the EIR to support the EIR analysis. In either case, MND or EIR preparation and circulation tasks are not included in this scope of work and budget. A separate scope of work and budget to complete the CEQA clearance process will be provided when the determination is made regarding which type of document is appropriate.

The following is a detailed description of CAJA's anticipated approach to analyzing the potential impacts for each environmental issue area in the IS, presented in order of the CEQA Checklist:

Aesthetics:

The project site is currently occupied by a vacant single-family home in an area designated as "Single-Family Residential – Low" in the County General Plan. CAJA will conduct the following tasks related to aesthetics:

1. Based on a site visit and using information in the County's General Plan, recent County CEQA documents, and various area plans, describe the regional and local context relative to aesthetics. Describe the existing physical characteristics of the project site, focusing on visual features such as topography, vegetation, existing structures and uses, and the site's relationship to nearby uses. In addition, describe views from and of the project site, focusing on character-defining features and the project site's relationship to the entire field of view.
2. Define scenic vistas and scenic resources in the project area. Generally describe any scenic vistas available from nearby vantage points and the location of any scenic resource in relation to the project site. Note whether the project site is visible and/or how much of the project site is visible within these views. Describe how these views and/or resources might change due to the proposed project.

3. Describe the overall visual character of the project site and areas surrounding the site. Describe how the project would alter the existing visual character of the site and surrounding area, focusing on how the project would change the character-defining features described previously. This discussion will be based on project plan elevations and descriptions of building materials and design. Based on this discussion, determine whether the proposed project would adversely change the existing character of the site and/or the surrounding area, and the potential to result in a significant impact under CEQA.
4. Describe the types and relative amounts of light and glare that would be associated with the proposed project and describe how these sources might affect the surrounding area. Based on this discussion, determine whether the proposed project would result in significant light and/or glare impacts.
5. Determine whether any cumulative development: a) would be within the same viewshed or same general area as the proposed project; or b) would affect any of the same scenic resources as would the project. Based on this discussion, determine whether the project in conjunction with cumulative development would result in cumulative impacts.
6. For each of the sub-issues analyzed in the Aesthetics section, identify mitigation measures to reduce or avoid significant visual impacts if any significant impacts are identified.

Agriculture and Forestry Resources:

The project site is not used for agricultural production and there are no agricultural lands in the immediate vicinity of the project site. There are no forest resources, including timberland or forest land, located on the project site. CAJA will conduct the following tasks related to agriculture and forestry resources:

1. Document that the project site is not zoned or currently used for agricultural uses and is not under Williamson Act Contract.
2. Document that the project site does not contain any forest land, timberland, or land zoned for timberland production.

Air Quality:

The project site is located in Contra Costa County within the San Francisco Bay Air Basin (Basin). The Bay Area Quality Management District (BAAQMD) is the agency principally responsible for comprehensive air pollution control in the Basin. CAJA will prepare an Air Quality Impact Analyses for the IS that addresses the projects' contribution to existing air quality violations and the exposure of persons to substantial pollutant concentrations. The analysis will follow the recommendations of the BAAQMD's CEQA Guidelines reference material and will also incorporate information from the BAAQMD's rules and regulations. CAJA will conduct the following tasks related to air quality:

1. Describe baseline air quality information, including the pollutants of concern in the Bay Area, and the agencies responsible for improving air quality in the Bay Area. Existing regional emissions for the past three years will be identified using information obtained from the California Air Resources Board (CARB).
2. Construction-related activities are generally short-term in duration, and the BAAQMD does not require quantification of construction-related emissions nor does it recommend any thresholds of significance for their associated emissions. Instead, the BAAQMD bases the determination of significance on a consideration of the control measures to be implemented. Thus, CAJA staff will recommend the appropriate BAAQMD measures that would reduce any identified significant impacts to a less than significant level.
3. Compare the project to applicable screening criteria that provide conservative indications of whether the project could result in potentially significant air quality impacts. Consider the net effects of relocating the former fire station to the project site when comparing the project to the screening criteria. It is anticipated that none of the applicable screening criteria will be exceeded. If the screening criteria are exceeded, evaluate the potential air quality impacts associated operation of the project with respect to the thresholds of significance recommended by the BAAQMD. Evaluate criteria air pollutants and precursors as well as greenhouse gases.
4. Qualitatively evaluate the potential impact of toxic air contaminants (TACs) and odors from the project to nearby sensitive receptors.
5. Discuss the consistency of the project with the current Clean Air Plan for the Bay Area.
6. Discuss the potential for the project to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in emissions. It is anticipated that the County will provide a list of "related projects" for consideration in this discussion.
7. Identify mitigation measures as necessary to reduce or avoid any potential project-specific or cumulative impacts to air quality, and quantify their effectiveness based on methodologies available from the BAAQMD and other sources.

Biological Resources:

The project site is comprised of a 1.1-acre parcel and is currently occupied by a single-family residence. In addition to landscaping vegetation associated with the residence, the parcel supports non-native annual grasses and herbs and native trees (e.g., California buckeye and valley oak). The native trees generally follow the alignment of Stone Valley Creek, which flows along the northern parcel boundary. Biological resources that may be impacted by the proposed project include sensitive habitat features (e.g., potentially

jurisdictional waters and protected trees) and special-status plant and animal species. Based on the RFP, CAJA understands that a tree survey has been prepared for the project site and will be available for use in the IS. The following tasks will be undertaken to adequately evaluate potential impacts to these resources in the IS according to the checklist items from Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines:

1. Review existing background information pertaining to the biological resources in the vicinity of the proposed project. Information that will be reviewed includes (but is not limited to) the following:
 - California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB);
 - California Native Plant Society's (CNPS) Electronic Inventory;
 - U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Endangered and Threatened Species List;
 - USFWS National Wetland Inventory (NWI) maps;
 - U.S. Department of Agricultural (USDA) Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) soil survey information;
 - U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) topographic maps; and
 - Previously-prepared biological studies/reports for the proposed project site and/or surrounding area (if available).
2. As necessary, informally consult with representatives from governmental and non-governmental agencies and other biological consultants to obtain any site-specific information and/or to clarify the sensitivity of biological resources. Review regulatory information, such as the implementing procedures associated with the various local, state, and federal agencies including (but not limited to) the Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development, CDFG, State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board), and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps).
3. Following review of existing information, conduct a reconnaissance-level field survey. The purpose of this survey will be to assess the existing conditions of the project site, including characterizing and delineating the vegetation communities and wildlife habitats, evaluating the potential presence for sensitive habitat features and special-status plant and animal species and sensitive communities, and assessing the potential biological resources impacts associated with the proposed project.
4. Based on the findings of the Tree Survey prepared for the project site, evaluate potential impacts to on-site trees. Prescribe mitigation measures as needed (e.g., tree replacement program) to reduce or avoid any potentially significant impacts that are identified.
5. Prepare the Biological Resources section of the IS based on the results of the review of existing information and reconnaissance-level field survey. Identify sensitive biological resources that occur or

have the potential to occur in the project vicinity and the potential impacts to those resources.
Recommend feasible mitigation as needed.

Cultural Resources:

The project site has been previously developed with a single-family home. Due to its age, the on-site structure is not believed to be potentially historic. CAJA will conduct the following tasks related to cultural resources:

1. Document that there are no potentially historic resources on the project site.
2. Refer to the City's General Plan and any other readily-available documents related to archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains in the City to assess the potential for archaeological resources to occur at the site.
3. Recommend appropriate mitigation measures if it is determined that cultural resources could be affected by the proposed project.

Geology & Soils:

The project site is located in the seismically active San Francisco Bay Area. The existing slope on the project site is 48 percent and the project would require the construction of a retaining wall. Based on the RFP, CAJA understands that a geotechnical exploration and peer review have been prepared for the project and will be available for use in the IS. It is assumed that the County has determined that the project is feasible from a geotechnical standpoint. Using information in the County's General Plan, recent County CEQA documents, various area plans, and existing geotechnical information for the project, CAJA will conduct the following tasks to evaluate the potential for the proposed project to be subject to seismic hazards related to shaking, fault rupture, liquefaction, and groundshaking:

1. Describe the regional and site-specific geologic and seismic conditions for the site, based on review of available geotechnical reports and other technical reports and memoranda for the site.
2. Identify potential sources of regional earthquakes and describe expected levels of seismic shaking (and related potential for ground failure) at the project site.
3. Describe potential seismic impacts related to the proposed project, including fault rupture, seismic shaking, and earthquake-induced liquefaction.
4. Describe soil conditions (including erosion hazards) at the project site on the basis of Natural Resource Conservation Service mapping and available geotechnical investigations for the project site.

5. Identify mitigation measures as necessary to avoid or reduce potentially significant geology and soil impacts. It is assumed that the project applicant would be required to comply with all applicable recommendations made in a final geotechnical report that will be required to secure the project's building permits.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions:

In response to the passage of Assembly Bill 32, California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32), the recently approved 2010 amendments to the CEQA Guidelines have added a new section that requires lead agencies to consider a project's effect on global climate change. CAJA's comprehensive approach to greenhouse gas (GHG) analysis, which has been successfully employed in numerous CEQA documents, utilizes the following approach:

1. Discuss global climate change and the generation of GHG emissions and include a description of the existing regulatory setting as it pertains to GHG.
2. Reference the Air Quality analysis (above), specifically with respect to the project's relationship to the BAAQMD's screening thresholds, and the extent of analysis required. As noted above, in the unlikely event that the screening criteria are exceeded, both criteria air pollutants and GHG will be evaluated.
3. Evaluate the project's consistency with applicable GHG planning and policy documents.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials:

The project site is occupied by a single-family home and does not contain any uses known to generate substantial contaminants. CAJA will conduct the following tasks related to hazardous materials on the project site:

1. As a full-service fire and emergency response facility, the project would routinely transport, use, or dispose of hazardous materials. Note that all hazardous materials would be used in accordance with manufacturer's guidelines and industry standard safety practices.
2. Based on available geotechnical documentation, determine the potential for hazardous materials to be released at the site during project construction and long-term operation. (It is assumed that the project site has been or will be assessed for soil and groundwater contamination and that documentation will be available for use in the IS.)
3. Based on readily-available documents, determine whether the project site is included on a list of hazardous materials sites.

4. Note the distance to the nearest school, public airport, and private airstrip, and the project's potential to result in the release of substantial hazardous materials in the vicinity of such uses.
5. Describe any existing emergency and/or evacuation plans and the project's potential effects on such plans.
6. Document whether the project site is located within a designated hazardous fire area and prescribe adequate mitigation as required.
7. Identify additional mitigation measures as necessary to avoid or reduce potentially significant hazards and hazardous materials impacts.

Hydrology and Water Quality:

The project may alter the percent coverage of impervious to pervious surface area on the project site. In addition, the Stone Valley Creek flows along the northern parcel boundary. Based on the RFP, CAJA understands that a hydraulic analysis has been prepared for the project and will be available for use in the IS. CAJA will conduct the following tasks related to hydrology and water quality:

1. Describe hydrologic and storm drainage conditions, with particular focus on any flows directed to Stone Valley Creek. Describe the regional and site-specific hydrologic and storm drainage conditions for the project site and vicinity, including accounts of localized flooding, if any.
2. Describe drainage and water quality conditions, with particular focus on any flows directed to Stone Valley Creek. Describe existing surface and groundwater quality conditions at the project site and vicinity based on existing reports. In addition, summarize water quality-related observations made during the site reconnaissance.
3. Describe requirements and regulations. Describe existing flooding and stormwater requirements and regulations, as well as existing policies from the County General Plan related to flooding and stormwater. Summarize the regulatory framework for stormwater quality including federal, State, and local plans, laws, and regulations, and the C.3 requirements of the Countywide NPDES (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) permit.
4. Identify additional mitigation measures as necessary to avoid or reduce potentially significant hydrology and water quality impacts.

Land Use & Planning:

The proposed project site is designated as “Single-Family Residential – Low” in the County General Plan. Primary land uses permitted in this designation include detached single-family homes and accessory structures. Secondary uses generally considered to be compatible with low density homes are also allowed. CAJA will conduct the following tasks related to land use and planning:

1. Discuss existing land uses and features of the project site. Describe existing land uses in the vicinity based on aerial photographs provided by the County and a surrounding land use survey conducted by CAJA staff.
2. Discuss existing General Plan designations and zoning districts for the site and vicinity.
3. Discuss anticipated cumulative development in the vicinity, based on information provided by County staff. The discussion will define the area of study and types of development relevant to each environmental topic.
4. Evaluate the proposed project’s consistency with relevant plans, policies, and regulations. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15125(b), the analysis will include applicable general plans and regional plans, including (but not limited to) the County General Plan, County Municipal Code, San Francisco Bay Area Clean Air Plan, Basin Plan, and Countywide Transportation Plan. County staff will be consulted to identify other relevant plans, if any. Where appropriate, the evaluation will cross-reference other sections, such as Air Quality, Hydrology and Water Quality, and Transportation/Traffic.
5. Discuss potential impacts relating to policy inconsistency and land use compatibility. Typically, this discussion will cross-reference the analyses of other impacts in the EIR. Ultimately, the project’s consistency or inconsistency with General Plan policies is determined by the County.

Mineral Resources:

It is assumed that the project site does not contain any significant mineral resources. CAJA will conduct the following tasks related to mineral resources:

1. Based on a review of the County’s General Plan or other mineral resource mapping, note that the project site does not contain any significant mineral resources.

Noise:

Implementation of the project would result in an increase in noise levels within the areas surrounding the project site during project construction as well as during project operation (e.g., operation of fire engines, station crew activities, emergency response alarms and sirens, etc.). In terms of operational noise levels, fire stations can generate a wide range of noise levels, from quiet most of the time to loud when sirens are used. Based on previous work that CAJA had conducted for a new fire station in the City of La Habra, CAJA has available noise data documenting noise levels generated by fire station operations that can be utilized in the noise analysis for the proposed project. These noise data include noise levels generated by fire station operations such as normal daytime tasks within the station, simulated emergency calls and alarms, the starting of fire engines, and the backing of engines back into the apparatus bay. As such data is readily available to CAJA, it is recommended that these documented noise levels be used in the analysis of the proposed project. However, an alternative approach is to conduct new measurements at other existing fire stations in Contra Costa County if they are deemed by the County to be more representative of the noise levels that would be expected from the proposed project. From the noise data obtained from other existing fire stations, the operational noise levels for the proposed project would then be evaluated against the applicable County thresholds to determine whether these noise sources would cause a substantial increase in noise at noise-sensitive locations in the project vicinity.

Overall, the project's potential to (1) result in a substantial temporary and/or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project site and (2) expose on-site and off-site sensitive receptors to excessive noise levels, groundborne vibration, and/or groundborne noise levels will be assessed in the IS. Potential noise impacts from the proposed project will be assessed based on established Contra Costa County thresholds and guidelines for noise levels. CAJA will conduct the following tasks related to noise:

1. Identify existing noise-sensitive land uses (e.g., residences) in the project vicinity.
2. To identify representative (baseline) noise levels in the project area, measure existing daytime noise levels at locations both onsite and offsite using a Larson-Davis Model 831 precision sound level meter, which satisfies the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for general environmental noise measurement instrumentation.
3. Forecast construction noise levels and evaluate potential impacts utilizing information on the type of construction equipment that will be used, the amount of activity, and the distance that off-site sensitive land uses are from the construction site. It is assumed that the County and/or Fire District will provide the time frames for completing project construction and will review and approve a set of assumptions developed by CAJA with regard to the types of construction equipment that will be used at the project site.

4. Identify sources of groundborne vibration during construction of the proposed project and evaluate their potential impacts on nearby off-site sensitive receptors based on the methodology recommended by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA).
5. Evaluate noise levels generated by the project, either by using previous data gathered by CAJA for similar fire station projects, or by taking new measurements at other existing fire stations in Contra Costa County. Evaluate operational noise levels for the proposed project against the applicable County thresholds to determine whether these noise sources would cause a substantial increase in noise at noise-sensitive locations in the project vicinity.
6. Qualitatively describe the expected increases in noise levels at noise sensitive locations along roadways most affected by project traffic using data from the project traffic report. Discuss the potential for noise from the project or related activities to adversely affect sensitive land uses or activities, or to conflict with established noise compatibility guidelines. Evaluate the compatibility of the proposed land uses with the existing and future noise environment at the site.
7. Identify mitigation measures as necessary to avoid or reduce identified significant noise impacts, and evaluate their effectiveness based on published technical documents.

Population & Housing:

The project site is currently developed with a vacant, single-family unit. Therefore, the project would not displace any residences. The project is a relocation of an existing fire station. As such, it would not create jobs that would attract a significant number of new residents to the City. CAJA will conduct the following tasks related to population and housing:

1. Note that displacement of homes or people would be negligible as a result of the project. Note that the project would not induce growth through the development of infrastructure or new homes.

Public Services/Recreation:

The project is a fire station that would serve the existing population and improve the County's ability to provide public services to the community. CAJA will conduct the following tasks related to public services and recreation:

1. Note that the project would serve the existing population and would not generate significant numbers of new residents in the County.

2. Note that the project would directly result in the construction of new public facilities and that the environmental impact of that construction is evaluated throughout the IS. Note that the project would reduce future need to construct new public facilities.

Transportation/Traffic:

Based on the RFP, CAJA understands that a traffic memorandum has been prepared for the project and will be available for use in the IS. Based on the findings of the traffic memorandum, CAJA will conduct the following tasks related to transportation/traffic:

1. Evaluate the project's potential to conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the County's circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation.
2. Based on the frequency of emergency calls and the use of emergency-related vehicles, evaluate the project's potential to result in significant safety and congestion impacts on the local circulation system. Consider the design features of the project and standard precautionary measures taken by drivers of emergency vehicles.
3. Evaluate the project's potential to conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.
4. Identify mitigation measures as necessary to avoid or reduce identified significant traffic and safety impacts, and evaluate their effectiveness based on published technical documents.

Utilities & Service Systems:

CAJA will conduct the following tasks related to utilities and service systems:

1. Based on information provided by the County and consumption/generation rates employed by County engineers, calculate the amount of water and wastewater that would be consumed/generated by the project. Review the applicable Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) to determine water usage assumptions for the project site and compare this assumption to the amount of water that would be consumed by the project. Document whether adequate water supply is available to serve the project.
2. Determine whether the project's consumption of water or generation of wastewater would require the expansion of existing water entitlements or expansion of the wastewater treatment plant.
3. Note that the project would not generate a significant amount of solid waste.

4. Assess cumulative impacts related to water, wastewater, and solid waste.
5. Identify any mitigation measures needed to reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level. For potential impacts related to water quality, these measures are likely to be oriented toward water conservation measures that could be implemented into the project.

Mandatory Findings of Significance:

1. Information and analysis used for the issues listed above will be referenced for this topic.

CAJA will submit an Administrative Draft IS to the County for review and comment. The County may also elect to submit the IS to the Fire District for review and comment. It is assumed that all comments on the IS will be consolidated to the extent feasible prior to submittal to CAJA.

Deliverables: CAJA will submit two (2) electronic copies of the Administrative Draft IS (one in MS Word format and the other in PDF format) to the County for review and comment. If requested, CAJA will submit up to five (5) hard copies.

Task 5: Address County Comments on Administrative Draft Initial Study and Submit Screencheck Draft Initial Study

CAJA will address all of the County staff's comments on the Administrative Draft IS, as well as Fire District comments if the County requests the Fire District's review of the IS. It is assumed that the comments will be consolidated to the extent feasible, which will aid the team in completing the documents in the most timely and efficient manner. CAJA will prepare a Screencheck Draft IS for review by the County to confirm that all comments have been addressed.

Deliverables: CAJA will submit two (2) electronic copies of the Screencheck Draft IS (one in MS Word format and the other in PDF format) to the County for review and comment. If requested, CAJA will submit up to five (5) hard copies.

Task 6: Address County Comments on Screencheck Draft Initial Study and Finalize Initial Study

CAJA will address any remaining comments on the Screencheck Draft IS. It is assumed that comments at the screencheck stage will be editorial and will not require any substantive changes to the analysis. CAJA will finalize the IS so that it is ready to be included with the MND or EIR, depending on the outcome of the analysis. As previously discussed, this scope of work does not include tasks related to public circulation, noticing, hearings, or responding to comments, as those tasks will depend on whether the IS analysis results in the processing of an MND or EIR for the project. A separate scope of work and budget to complete the CEQA clearance process will be provided when this determination is made.

Deliverables: CAJA will submit two (2) electronic copies of the Final IS (one in MS Word format and the other in PDF format) to the County. If requested, CAJA will submit up to fifteen (15) hard copies.

Task 7: Prepare Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP)

If mitigation measures are prescribed, the IS will include a Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP). The MMP will be responsive to AB 3180 and subsequent legal interpretation, and the implementation approach will be organized around the County's policies and procedures as well as personnel limitations. In order to meet the requirements of AB 3180, the MMP will: 1) list project mitigation measures; 2) correlate the mitigation measures to the various governmental actions that the implementation of the project would require; and 3) identify other governmental offices or departments that would monitor the execution of the mitigation measures. Similar to the procedure for preparing the IS, this task includes two rounds of County review.

Deliverables: CAJA will submit two (2) electronic copies of each draft of the MMP (one in MS Word format and the other in PDF format) to the County for review and comment. Upon finalization of the MMP, the MMP will be integrated with the IS.

Task 8: Attend Other Meetings

Geoff Reilly, Heidi Mekkelson, and other CAJA staff (if needed) are available to attend additional meetings and conference calls on a time-and-materials basis in accordance with the hourly billing rates presented in this proposal. By way of example, as shown in Table 1 (Proposed Initial Study Budget) in Section V of this proposal, a two-hour meeting attended by both Mr. Reilly and Ms. Mekkelson would cost \$560.

Task 9: Project Management

CAJA staff will provide management and oversight. It is anticipated that CAJA management staff would dedicate approximately 20 hours of project management labor over the duration of preparing the IS (excluding the kick-off meeting). CAJA will communicate, as necessary, with the County and project team to ensure compliance with the schedule, scope of work, and budget. The Project Manager will coordinate the project team's work and provide management liaison between the project team, the County, and the Fire District for communication of issues, transmittal of comments, financial management, and other project management matters, such as contract processing.

CAJA will communicate with the County at every step in the environmental review process to inform the County and Fire District of any issues that may require efforts not anticipated in this scope of work. CAJA will provide the County with status updates on a regular basis. The management approach described above allows regular interaction between the project team and the County, and requires frequent information sharing among team members.

This approach will foster efficient data acquisition and give the County advance input on environmental findings and any potential out-of-scope work. Such participation will minimize environmental impacts and duplication of research efforts, improve the technical quality and accuracy of the environmental analysis, and ultimately assist in the preparation of a successful CEQA document. In the event out-of-scope work is anticipated, CAJA will notify the County to explain the rationale behind the anticipated work, but will not undertake that work until authorized by the County and the Fire District. However, in the interest of the schedule, CAJA may also discuss methods of moving forward with the analysis until the additional work is authorized. Charges for out-of-scope work will be on a time and materials basis consistent with hourly rates as established in the project budget.

BUDGET

Based on the revised task list, our cost estimate for the preparation of the Initial Study (IS) is **\$54,075**. A detailed cost breakdown is provided in Table 1, Proposed Initial Study Budget (Amended), on the following page. Fees for professional services would be charged on a time-and-materials basis in accordance with our hourly rate schedule, and would not exceed the amount set forth above without prior authorization. Direct costs, such as document printing and publication, overnight mail, messenger services, travel to meetings, and other materials or supplies would be billed at 110 percent of actual costs.

Hourly Fee Schedule

This section provides CAJA billing rates for all services to be provided. Rates are effective January 1, 2010 through December 31, 2010.

- | | |
|----------------------------|---------------|
| • Principal | \$150.00/hour |
| • Project Manager | \$130.00/hour |
| • Technical Specialist | \$120.00/hour |
| • Environmental Planner | \$100.00/hour |
| • Graphics | \$75.00/hour |
| • Word Processing | \$75.00/hour |
| • Administrative Assistant | \$60.00/hour |

TABLE 1
PROPOSED INITIAL STUDY BUDGET (AMENDED)

Tasks		CAJA Staff							TOTAL HOURS	COST PER TASK	Total Cost
		Principal	Project Manager	Technical Specialist (AQ, Noise, Bio)	Environmental Planner	Graphics	Word Processing	Administration			
		\$150	\$130	\$120	\$100	\$75	\$75	\$60			
Start Up and Scoping Tasks											\$5,215
Task 1	Review and Digitize Existing Information	1	3	2	4	0	0	4	14.0	\$1,420	
Task 2	Attend Kick-Off Meeting with County Staff	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	9.0	\$1,250	
Task 3	Prepare Preliminary Project Description	2	4	0	12	6	1	0	25.0	\$2,545	
Initial Study Tasks											\$40,300
Task 4	Prepare Administrative Draft Initial Study										
	<i>I. Introduction</i>	0	0.5	0	1	0	8	1	10.5	\$825	
	<i>II. Project Description</i>	1	2	0	6	2	0	0	11.0	\$1,160	
	<i>III. Initial Study and Checklist</i>	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.0	\$230	
	<i>IV. Environmental Impact Analysis</i>										
	<i>A. Aesthetics</i>	0.5	1	0	0	4	0	0	5.5	\$505	
	<i>B. Agriculture and Forestry Resources</i>	0	0.5	0	0.5	0	0	0	1.0	\$115	
	<i>C. Air Quality</i>	1	4	14	2	0	0	0	21.0	\$2,550	
	<i>D. Biological Resources</i>	1	4	24	0	0	0	0	29.0	\$3,550	
	<i>E. Cultural Resources</i>	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	3.0	\$330	
	<i>F. Geology & Soils</i>	0.5	2	0	8	0	0	0	10.5	\$1,135	
	<i>G. Greenhouse Gas Emissions</i>	0.5	2	12	0	0	0	0	14.5	\$1,775	
	<i>G. Hazards & Hazardous Materials</i>	0.5	2	0	8	0	0	0	10.5	\$1,135	
	<i>H. Hydrology & Water Quality</i>	0.5	2	0	8	0	0	0	10.5	\$1,135	
	<i>I. Land Use & Planning</i>	0.5	1	0	4	2	0	0	7.5	\$755	
	<i>J. Mineral Resources</i>	0	0.5	0	0.5	0	0	0	1.0	\$115	
	<i>K. Noise (includes field measurements)</i>	1	4	24	8	1	0	0	38.0	\$4,425	
	<i>L. Population & Housing</i>	0	0.5	0	1	0	0	0	1.5	\$165	
	<i>M. Public Services</i>	1	4	0	16	1	0	0	22.0	\$2,345	
	<i>N. Recreation</i>	0	0.5	0	0.5	0	0	0	1.0	\$115	
	<i>O. Transportation/Traffic</i>	1	4	0	16	4	0	0	25.0	\$2,570	
	<i>P. Utilities & Service Systems</i>	1	3	0	12	1	0	0	17.0	\$1,815	
	<i>Q. Mandatory Findings of Significance</i>	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.0	\$230	
	<i>VII. Preparers of the Initial Study and Persons Consulted</i>	0	0.5	0	0	0	1	0	1.5	\$140	
Task	Address County Comments on Admin Draft	6	16	24	40	4	4	2	96.0	\$10,580	

**TABLE 1
 PROPOSED INITIAL STUDY BUDGET (AMENDED)**

Tasks		CAJA Staff							TOTAL HOURS	COST PER TASK	Total Cost
		Principal	Project Manager	Technical Specialist (AQ, Noise, Bio)	Environmental Planner	Graphics	Word Processing	Administration			
		\$150	\$130	\$120	\$100	\$75	\$75	\$60			
5	and Submit Screencheck Draft Initial Study										
Task 6	Address County Comments on Screencheck Draft and Finalize Initial Study	1	4	6	10	1	1	1	24.0	\$2,600	
Other Tasks											\$5,260
Task 7	Prepare Mitigation Monitoring Program (if necessary)	2	4	0	12	0	0	0	18.0	\$2,020	
Task 8	Attend Other Meetings (cost per meeting shown, assumes 2-hour meeting duration)	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	4.0	\$560	
Task 9	Project Management	4	16	0	0	0	0	0	20.0	\$2,680	
Direct Expenses											\$3,300
	Reproduction, Mailing/Shipping, Mileage, Communications, Etc.									\$3,000	
	10% Administrative Fee									\$300	
TOTAL COST										\$54,075	

Notes:

This budget does not include tasks related to public circulation, noticing, hearings, or responding to comments, as those tasks will depend on whether the Initial Study analysis results in the processing of an MND or EIR for the project. A separate scope of work and budget to complete the CEQA clearance process will be provided when this determination is made.

PROPOSED SCHEDULE

Table 2 presents the project schedule that corresponds with the tasks identified in this Proposal Amendment. We anticipate the Initial Study (IS) will be completed within approximately 14 weeks of receiving the Notice to Proceed.

**Table 2
 Proposed Initial Study Schedule**

Task	Milestone	Duration
1	Review and Digitize Existing Information	Week 1
2	Attend Kick-Off Meeting with County Staff	Week 1
3	Prepare Preliminary Project Description	Week 1 – Week 2
4	Prepare Admin. Draft IS	Week 1 – Week 6
	County Reviews Admin. Draft IS	Week 7 – Week 9
5	Address County Comments on Admin Draft and Submit Screencheck Draft IS	Week 10 – Week 11
	County Reviews Screencheck Draft IS	Week 12 – Week 13
6	Address County Comments on Screencheck Draft and Finalize IS	Week 14
7	Prepare Mitigation Monitoring Program	Week 14
8	Attend Other Meetings	Ongoing
9	Project Management	Ongoing

Ruben Hernandez, Senior Planner
Contra Costa County
April 8, 2010
Page 20

CAJA appreciates the opportunity to submit this Proposal Amendment. We look forward to working with Contra Costa County on this very important project. Should you have any questions or require any additional information, please contact me by phone at (415) 762-7684, or by email at heidi.mekkelson@cajaeir.com.

Sincerely,

Christopher A. Joseph & Associates

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Heidi Mekkelson".

Heidi Mekkelson
Project Manager