FORM APPROVED COUNTY COUNSEL
BY: NEAL R. KIPNIS DATE 4/11/12

SUBMITTAL TO THE FLOOD CONTROL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT BOARD COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

8068

FROM: General Manager-Chief Engineer

SUBMITTAL DATE: May 15, 2012

SUBJECT: Environmental Impact Report for Lakeland Village Master Drainage Plan
Project No. 3-6-00820
Amendment No. 1 – Consulting Services Agreement
District 1/District 1

RECOMMENDED MOTION:

1. Approve Amendment No. 1 to the Consulting Services Agreement between the District and Consultant.
2. Authorize the Chairman to execute Amendment No. 1 documents on behalf of the District.

BACKGROUND:

Continued on Page 2.

Departmental Concurrence

FISCAL PROCEDURES APPROVED
IVAN M. CHAND, FINANCE DIRECTOR
BY IVAN M. CHAND 3/21/2012

KEC:blj

WARREN D. WILLIAMS
General Manager-Chief Engineer

FINANCIAL DATA				
	Current F.Y. District Cost:	$100,000	**In Current Year Budget:**	YES
	Current F.Y. County Cost:		**Budget Adjustment:**	NO
	Annual Net District Cost:	$50,411	**For Fiscal Year:**	11-12 &12-13

SOURCE OF FUNDS: 25130 947440 525440
Zone 3 Misc. Professional Services

Positions To Be Deleted Per A-30 ☐

Requires 4/5 Vote ☐

C.E.O. RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE

BY: Michael R Shetler
Michael R. Shetler

County Executive Office Signature

☐ Policy ☐ Consent — Dep't Recomm.:

☐ Policy ☐ Consent — Per Exec. Ofc.:

Prev. Agn. Ref.: 10-5-10, 11.4 | **District:** 1st/1st | **Agenda Number:** 11.3

ATTACHMENTS FILED
WITH THE CLERK OF THE BOARD

FLOOD CONTROL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT BOARD SUBMITTAL
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SUBJECT: Environmental Impact Report for Lakeland Village Master Drainage Plan
Project No. 3-6-00820
District 1/District 1

SUBMITTAL DATE: May 15, 2012

BACKGROUND:

This Amendment No. 1 increases the scope of the original assigned tasks and compensation as provided for in the Consulting Services Agreement (Agreement) approved by the Board on October 5, 2010 (Agenda Item 11.4).

The Amendment No. 1 is necessary to provide additional funding for optional tasks determined necessary by the District and described in the original Agreement.

County Counsel has approved this Amendment No. 1 as to legal form and the Consultant has executed the Amendment.

FINANCIAL:

Sufficient funds are available in the District's Zone 3 budget for Fiscal Year 2011-2012 and will be included in the budget for Fiscal Year 2012-2013.

KEC:blj
P8/145579

CONSULTING SERVICES AGREEMENT
Environmental Services
Lakeland Village Master Drainage Plan
Amendment No.1

The RIVERSIDE COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT, hereinafter called "DISTRICT", and DUDEK, hereinafter called "CONSULTANT", previously entered into that certain Agreement on October 5, 2010, for the project described as the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Lakeland Village Master Drainage Plan (MDP), hereinafter called "AGREEMENT"; and

DISTRICT desires CONSULTANT to perform an optional task described in Attachment "A" (page K-7, Aesthetics) and in Attachment "B" of AGREEMENT.

NOW, therefore, the parties hereto mutually agree to amend the AGREEMENT as follows:

1. Provision 4 is changed to read:

4. COMPENSATION - DISTRICT shall pay CONSULTANT for services satisfactorily performed and expenses incurred in accordance with CONSULTANT'S fee schedule as set forth on Attachment "B" attached hereto and made a part hereof. Unless otherwise specifically stated in Attachment B, DISTRICT shall not be responsible for payment of any of CONSULTANT'S expenses related to this Agreement. The total amount of compensation paid to CONSULTANT under this Agreement shall not exceed the sum of two hundred thousand four hundred eleven dollars ($200,411).

2. Provision 20 is added to read:

20. DISCREPANCY – In the event of a conflict between the terms of this Agreement, including any documents attached to or incorporated into the Agreement, the following

precedence of documents shall, unless otherwise stated, apply (with the earlier listed document controlling): the main agreement; Attachment "A"; and Attachment "B".

Except to the extent specifically added to, modified or amended hereunder, all of the terms, covenants and conditions of said AGREEMENT dated October 5, 2010 remain in full force and effect between the parties hereto.

//

//

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have executed this Agreement on

_____.
(to be filled in by Clerk of the Board)

RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL:

By _____
WARREN D. WILLIAMS
General Manager-Chief Engineer

RIVERSIDE COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

By _____
MARION ASHLEY, Chairman
Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District Board of Supervisors

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

PAMELA J. WALLS
County Counsel

By _____
NEAL KIPNIS
Deputy County Counsel

ATTEST:

KECIA HARPER-IHEM
Clerk of the Board

By _____
Deputy

(SEAL)

Consulting Services Agreement – Dudek. - Amendment No. 1:
3/21/12
KEC:blj

DUDEK

By _____
FRANK DUDEK
President and Chief Executive Officer

Consulting Services Agreement – Dudek. - Amendment No. 1:
3/19/12
KEC:blj

K. TECHNICAL APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY – REVISED MAY 17, 2010

Based on negotiations between Dudek and the District on April 29, 2010, the original scope outlined in this section in our original proposal is being modified.

The creation of the Lakeland Village MDP is an important step in controlling flooding and protecting the properties in the project area. Dudek understands that the MDP will not necessarily be built by the District. Developers, who are conditioned to put in the infrastructure necessary to support their projects, will most likely construct the MDP facilities. Because the MDP is a conceptual planning document, actual construction of the MDP facilities will most likely take place over the next 20 to 30 years. Because the MDP facilities will not have final engineering at the time the EIR is being completed, the analysis used in the EIR will be based on the estimated locations and sizes of the facilities. Given all of these project characteristics, the District has made an appropriate decision to prepare a "first tier" or programmatic-level EIR for the MDP facilities.

Tasked with preparing a legally adequate first tier EIR for the MDP in accordance with the provisions of the CEQA (Section 15000 et seq. of the State CEQA Guidelines), Dudek proposes to create a PEIR to be used by the District, as the lead agency, to comply with CEQA.

A first tier EIR can be any number of types of EIRs, including a PEIR, general plan EIR, or master EIR. Each acts in the same manner, to create a document to cover broader planning actions, where future site-specific analysis may be considered at a later date as detailed projects are formulated. While a lead agency must discuss in appropriate detail any reasonably foreseeable significant environmental impacts, the level of detail of the first tier document only needs to correspond to the level of detail of the program or plan being proposed. Pursuant to CEQA case law, a reasonably foreseeable significant environmental impact evaluated in a first tier document is one where the lead agency has sufficient reliable data and information in order to prepare meaningful and reasoned analysis on that potential impact.

Utilizing a PEIR in such a manner helps avoid the use of multiple EIRs in the future, while also simplifying later environmental review for activities that fall within the program. Further, so long as the future activity considered falls within the scope of the program evaluated in the PEIR, the second tiered document will benefit from the substantial evidence standard and not the fair argument standard regarding whether or not a later EIR is required.

As a result of discussions on April 29, 2010 between the District and Dudek regarding the scope of this EIR, it was decided that an additional task would be added to the scope originally proposed by Dudek during the RFP process. It was decided that Dudek would add a "Task 0", which would occur prior to Task 1, as originally proposed. Dudek's responsibilities for this specific contract will include, but will not necessarily be limited to the following:

TASK 0. Internal Project Scoping/Environmental Constraints Analysis

The purpose of this task will be for the District to include Dudek in its decision making process of choosing a preferred alternative for the Lakeland Village MDP.

First Internal Scoping Meeting

The first part of this task will be an internal scoping meeting where the District will brief the Dudek team of its potential alignments for the various alternatives being considered. It is assumed for this meeting that the District will provide all the maps and data needed to orient Dudek to the project, and provide Dudek with this information (hard copy and electronic) to be used in our analysis. This first internal meeting is assumed to take no more than 3 hours.

Environmental Constraints Analysis

After the internal scoping meeting, Dudek will analyze and prepare an environmental constraints analysis focusing only on the biological, cultural and geotechnical resources potentially occurring in the area of the alternatives (assumes no more than 5) that could affect the siting of the preferred alternative. Dudek's analysis will be limited to windshield surveys in order to assess the general conditions of the project alignments. No focused or detailed field work will be completed under this task.

Dudek biologists will perform a search and review of applicable data sources (e.g., California Natural Diversity Database, Western Riverside County MSHCP, USFWS, and U.S. Geologic Service soils maps) for the MDP program area, focusing on areas of the five project alternatives. Dudek will then perform a field reconnaissance visit of the program area to evaluate existing conditions and potential biological resources affected, conducting habitat assessments where feasible, in order to develop a list of special-status species and habitats that might be affected by the project. Additionally, Dudek will also perform a preliminary wetland delineation to assist the District for planning purposes. This wetland delineation will only be limited to identifying based on field observations resources that could potentially require regulatory permitting, and does not include specific testing or field work.

Dudek archaeologists will determine the potential for archaeological resources within the proposed five alternative areas and assess the likely extent to which integrity of the substrate/soil has been compromised by modern development. This will be undertaken with the following tasks:

- Conduct a records search of the California Historical Resources Information System, at the Eastern Information Center, University of California, Riverside, to determine the location and contents of any prehistoric sites within or adjacent to the project area, and previously completed archaeological investigations.
- Request a search of the California Native American Heritage Commission's (NAHC) Sacred Land File. The NAHC will provide a list of any properties that are recognized by contemporary Native Californians in the project vicinity as having important heritage values.

The results of these data searches will provide a distribution of any recorded archaeological sites and heritage resource areas located within the five alternative alignment areas.

The environmental constraints analysis will also include a general evaluation of the geologic characteristics of the project area. To help the District evaluate the preferred alternative alignments for the Lakeland Village MDP, Leighton will conduct a review of the overall geologic setting, geologic hazards, groundwater conditions and any potential grading challenges known in the area. This information will allow the District to be aware of any unique or challenging geologic conditions that may affect siting and design of the MDP facilities.

The results of the environmental constraints analysis will be presented in a memo format to the District for consideration.

Second Internal Scoping Meeting

After the District has reviewed and considered the environmental constraints analysis, Dudek and District will meet one more time to discuss the options for the preferred alternative. This second internal scoping meeting will be used for Dudek to discuss or clarify any of its findings.

After this meeting, the District will then confer and decide upon the preferred alternative and direct Dudek as to which alternative will be the subject of the EIR analysis.

Deliverables:

1. 1st Internal meeting minutes.

2. Environmental Constraints Analysis Memo

3. 2nd Internal meeting minutes.

TASK 1. EIR Kick-Off Meeting

After the District has reviewed and considered the environmental constraints analysis prepared under Task 0 discussed above, the District will notify Dudek of the preferred alternative for the project. Upon this determination, Dudek and the District will hold an internal EIR Kick Off Meeting on the preferred alternative.

Dudek will help organize and participate in a project kick-off meeting to initiate the process for preparation of the MDP CEQA document. The purpose of the kick off meeting will be to discuss the preferred alternative, any remaining data needs required to complete a thorough environmental impact analysis, coordination of project mailing lists for noticing purposes, and overall EIR schedule.

Dudek views this task as a key component of the work program and as important in effectively initiating and maintaining momentum on the project. At the District's direction, Dudek will meet during this portion of the work effort both internally, and with the District and the project team, to accomplish the following objectives:

- Ensure that team members have a common understanding of the project, including project description and the overall approach to the PEIR
- Review environmental issues as identified in any applicable studies prepared thus far
- Establish protocols for communication and data transfer throughout the work effort, recognizing that working with a common data exchange procedure will contribute substantially to project efficiency
- Work collaboratively to discuss potential project pitfalls and issues and identify upfront strategies to address those issues
- Develop a common schedule for the work effort with identified short-term and long-term milestones.

One of the key assumptions to the project scope and estimate included herein is that once the PEIR process is started, the project description does not significantly change. Modifications to the project description throughout the EIR process can cause schedule and budget impacts.

Deliverables:

1. EIR kick-off meeting minutes.

TASK 2. Initial Public Scoping

Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15082(C)(1), a public scoping meeting is required by a lead agency for any projects that are deemed to be of statewide, regional, or area-wide significance. Dudek finds that early consultations with various agencies and members of the public aid in the identification and focusing of potential environmental impacts, feasible mitigation measures, and project alternatives. Moreover, such scoping meetings can help resolve disputes and disagreements early in the EIR process as opposed to after the document has already been completed and out for public review.

Dudek will coordinate a pre-scoping meeting "briefing session" with the resource agencies to summarize the approach being undertaken by the District and to solicit early input from the regulatory agencies (e.g., ACOE, USFWS, CDFG, and Regional Water Quality Control Board). Since the MDP project is programmatic, it will be critical to explain the programmatic approach to EIR analysis to the agencies ahead of time. A clear understanding of the project characteristics and limitations in analysis will be important for the regulating agencies to know up front.

Once the agencies have been briefed, Dudek will support the District staff in conducting an initial public scoping meeting. The meeting shall be conducted at the District's offices or at an alternative location within the MDP study area, at the discretion of the District. Dudek will prepare meeting minutes after the scoping meeting to include listing the names of the attendees, identifying which agencies or individuals provided comments, and summarizing the issues raised by each commenter regarding the PEIR. Much like the education of the agencies, it is also important to explain the project and the process to the public, especially those affected by the proposed project. Explaining the project details and type of

analysis to be contained in the PEIR will be an important aspect of the public scoping meeting.

Deliverables:

1. Participation in planning, organizing, and discussions at one public scoping meeting. Provide meeting minutes listing the names of the attendees, identifying which individuals provided comments, and summarizing the PEIR issues of concern.
2. Attendance at one pre-scoping briefing session with regulatory agency staff to receive input on issues to be addressed in the Draft PEIR and provide minutes of the meeting.

TASK 3. Initial Study/Notice of Preparation

Dudek will prepare an IS in accordance with the requirements of the State CEQA Guidelines. Dudek will provide the District with a screencheck IS. The IS will include reasons supporting each checklist answer, and applicable references and exhibits as necessary. The IS will include a detailed explanation of environmental responses, a complete project description, and an environmental determination. The IS/Notice of Preparation (NOP) will be provided to the District for one round of review.

This task also includes preparation of a detailed project description that will form the basis of the environmental analysis. In consultation with the District, Dudek will help prepare the project description to be used in the environmental document. The IS will identify potential impacts from both construction and operation of the project. However, since the exact location or timing of improvements will not be known at the time of the environmental analysis, there may be the need for the District to provide assumptions related to construction and operations in support of the environmental document.

Dudek plans to utilize the IS as a tool to streamline the PEIR as much as possible. There may be issue areas or certain thresholds that can found to be less than significant without further study, and therefore not needed to be analyzed in the PEIR. This approach will focus the PEIR on the most germane issues of the project.

Based on our understanding of the project, Dudek anticipates that the following impact categories could likely be found to be less than significant within the IS:

- Agricultural resources
- Mineral resources
- Population/housing
- Public services
- Recreation
- Traffic.

The advantage of evaluating and "eliminating" some of the issue areas at the IS level is to streamline the PEIR analysis and communicate to the public areas that the project is not expected to significantly affect. If in the future there are alignments or changes to the project that appear to generate impacts to issue

areas found less than significant in the IS, or if upon review of the project-level details it appears potential impacts may exist, the District would be required to evaluate those issues and determine if additional analysis is required. Regardless, the analysis should only be required to focus on environmental effects not adequately considered in the PEIR.

Upon District approval of the final IS/NOP, Dudek will distribute a copy of the IS/NOP to the appropriate state agencies through the State Clearinghouse, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15082, as well as to any other responsible agencies and interested parties, as determined by the District. The District will provide a digital mailing list for recipients of the IS/NOP. Dudek will utilize this mailing list into a master mailing list for all public noticing purposes for the PEIR. The mailing of the NOP will start the mandatory 30-day NOP review period.

Deliverables:

1. Draft and Revised Draft IS/NOP for project team review.
2. Mailing of the Final IS/NOP by certified mail, return receipt, using the mailing list provided by the District (estimated at 15–20 mailings).

TASK 4. NOP/Scope Screencheck PEIR Comments

At the conclusion of the NOP 30-day review period and after receipt of all comments from the State Clearinghouse, Dudek will prepare a memorandum that documents the agencies, firms, and individuals who submitted comments on the IS and NOP for submittal to the District. It will be important for the issues raised during the NOP public review period to be addressed in some manner in the Draft PEIR.

Deliverables:

1. Memorandum summarizing comments received on the NOP.
2. Attendance at one project team meeting.

TASK 5. Administrative Draft PEIR

We understand that the District currently has five alternatives to the MDP. Based on our understanding, the PEIR will be based upon one alternative, as the proposed project. The remaining alternatives will be evaluated in the Alternatives section of the PEIR, but those will not be evaluated to the same degree as the project alternative.

The PEIR will include a programmatic-level evaluation of the preferred MDP identified by the District. Based on the analysis contained within the IS, as well as the programmatic-level analysis we will conduct, the PEIR will analyze only those issues found to be potentially significant. Issue areas found to be less than significant or not significant will be listed in the Effects Found Not Significant section of the PEIR.

The basis for the PEIR analysis will be the information provided by the District. We understand that the MDP is a conceptual planning document for facilities that have not been officially sited, and for which the timing of construction is expected to take place over the next 20 to 30 years. Our approach to the PEIR analysis will be to prepare as much background and reconnaissance-level analysis on the

proposed project alignments as possible. Since this is a first tier or programmatic-level EIR, preparing full-blown technical reports and analysis is not warranted at this time. Instead, Dudek will prepare a methodology for future analyses in the PEIR, which can be used and followed over time as MDP facilities are built out.

The following is general outline and brief description of the Draft PEIR:

Executive Summary

The Draft PEIR will include an executive summary, which will summarize the proposed project, explain the function of the EIR as a programmatic-level document, include a matrix of the mitigation measures, and summarize any significant impacts that cannot be mitigated to levels less than significant. Using the IS as the basis for the outline of the issue areas to be addressed in the PEIR, the Draft PEIR will likely focus on the following impact categories.

Each environmental impact section of the Draft PEIR will contain the following: introduction, existing conditions/environmental setting, related regulations (including relevant plans and policies), significance threshold criteria (using agreed-upon significance thresholds), potential environmental impacts (construction and operational) related to each significance threshold criterion, recommended mitigation measures, detailed discussion of the level of significance after mitigation, and cumulative impacts.

Aesthetics

Significant impacts to aesthetics and visual quality are not anticipated given the type of site-specific projects envisioned as part of the MDP. However, according to the California Scenic Highway Mapping System, State Route 74, while not officially designated, is an Eligible State Scenic Highway from I-15, west to Orange County. Therefore, sensitivity to visual impacts and impacts to the viewshed are anticipated to be high.

Dudek will assess the overall MDP's potential effects on the existing environment, including impacts to sensitive views and the community character as a whole with as much detail as can be provided given the programmatic nature of the MDP. Depending on the location of project features and level of concern generated from the public during the public scoping meeting, a visual analysis may be needed, especially related to the detention and debris basins. If a visual quality technical report becomes desired at a later date, Dudek can provide an additional scope/cost estimate for this work. This scope of work has been included as an optional task in our updated cost estimate. This optional task would create photographic simulations of the proposed debris and water quality basins. The 3d simulations will include existing site photographs as backgrounds and true scale 3d models for the proposed facilities rendered into the background photos. The renderings will also include proposed landscaping if required.

This scope is based on the nine (9) debris basins and three (3) water quality basins as reflected by Alternatives 4 and 5 of the "Lakeland Village Master Drainage Plan" provided in the RFP. Dudek will provide two simulations for each basin modeled. For additional basins above the twelve (12) basins assumed in our scope, there will be an additional cost.

It is assumed that AutoCAD drawings will be submitted to Dudek for these facilities and that no more than two site visits are needed in order to prepare the background photos. The AutoCAD drawings shall include existing topography and proposed grading plans. Contours in these drawings must be at their true z elevation.

Air Quality/Climate Change

The air quality section of the PEIR will include a discussion of the existing air quality conditions in the South Coast Air Basin and the project area and the applicable regulatory programs at the federal, state, and local levels for criteria pollutants. It will also include a description of global climate change, summarizing the scientific fundamentals of greenhouse gas (GHG) emission inventories at the global, national, state, and local levels. The key international, federal, state, and local regulatory actions for GHG emissions will be summarized for the regulatory setting for this topic with the primary focus on California's regulatory efforts.

Dudek will estimate the construction and operational emissions to the extent information (e.g., construction equipment, workforce, and schedule) is available from the District for each alternative. To estimate the maximum daily construction emissions from the proposed project, Dudek will use industry-standard emission estimation tools, such as URBEMIS2007, OFFROAD2007, or EMFAC2007 models. Using these emission estimates, we will assess the potential air quality impacts relative to South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) emission-based significance thresholds. In addition to the emission estimates and comparison to these significance thresholds, the SCAQMD also recommends that a project's construction emissions be assessed with respect to the SCAQMD's "localized significance thresholds" (LSTs).

The SCAQMD's LST methodology provides an exemption for "regional plans," such as general plans. While the MDP is not a wide-reaching regional plan, because of its programmatic nature, detailed analyses of impacts cannot be performed at this time. Nonetheless, mitigation measures to minimize impacts of future projects under the MDP to sensitive receptors will be evaluated and identified. The operational emissions are expected to be minor, reflecting periodic vehicle trips and equipment use to maintain the drainage facilities.

Due to the federal (ACOE) permit needed for future work under the MDP, Dudek will conceptually address the federal general conformity requirements, which apply to federal agencies that would issue a permit, fund, or otherwise approve a project. It is expected that the estimated construction emissions associated with a proposed project would not exceed the "de minimis" thresholds, and the project would not be subject to the conformity requirements. Accordingly, the air quality section would provide a brief overview of the conformity requirements, an estimate of the annual construction emissions based on available information and schedules, and a comparison of those emissions with the de minimis thresholds.

The air quality section would also include an assessment of the proposed project's estimated GHG emissions from construction equipment and vehicles and assess the potential contribution to global climate change. The analysis will be based on evolving approaches for other projects in California, taking into consideration existing conditions and including quantification of GHG emissions associated with

project development. It should be noted that the SCAQMD has been developing guidelines for assessing such impacts, which are expected to be adopted this year. Adoption of these guidelines may change the final approach taken in the PEIR.

Biological Resources

As stated above under Task 0, as part of the environmental constraints analysis, Dudek biologists will perform a detailed search and review of all applicable data sources (e.g., California Natural Diversity Database, Western Riverside County MSHCP, USFWS, and U.S. Geologic Service soils maps) for the MDP program area, focusing on areas of potential future project development based upon the proposed project. Dudek will then perform a field reconnaissance visit of the program area to evaluate existing conditions and potential biological resources affected, conducting habitat assessments where feasible, in order to develop a list of special-status species and habitats that might be affected by the project. Additionally, Dudek will perform a preliminary wetland delineation to assist the District for planning purposes. Dudek will incorporate these findings into the PEIR, as well as creating strategies and mitigation measures for conducting subsequent surveys if needed for future drainage projects.

In addition to evaluating the potential biological impacts of the MDP facilities, the District will also be required to demonstrate consistency with the Western Riverside County MSHCP. As the authors of the MSHCP, and current extension of staff to the RCA, Dudek understands the MSHCP and its requirements. For this project, and given its programmatic nature, we propose to provide the District with an analysis of potential impacts related to Section 6.1.2 (riverine/riparian/vernal pool/fairy shrimp), Section 6.1.3 (plant surveys), Section 6.3.2 (additional species surveys) that may be applicable and Section 6.1.4 (Urban Wildlands Interface). From there, Dudek will provide a framework of potential issues that may occur for MDP facilities, and provide programmatic guidelines of how to achieve MSHCP consistency in the future. Our approach will enable the District to make its MSHCP findings along with its CEQA findings when the PEIR is certified.

Should it be determined that a Joint Project Review (JPR) is needed for the project, Dudek will prepare an MSHCP Consistency Determination report that can be submitted by the District to the Regional Conservation Authority for the JPR. It is assumed that the District will be responsible for the submittal and coordination of the JPR itself.

Cultural Resources

The analysis utilized in the environmental constraints analysis prepared under Task 0 will also be utilized in the preparation of the PEIR. The proposed project area is located within the Lake Elsinore watershed, and includes drainages that would have represented desirable contexts for prehistoric occupation. It is reasonable to assume that urban development has affected the integrity or intactness of soils within many proposed Lakeland Village MDP infrastructure improvements, minimizing the potential for significant archaeological resources to exist.

The results of these data searches reported earlier in the environmental constraints analysis prepared under Task 0 will provide a distribution of any recorded archaeological sites and heritage resource areas located within the preferred

alternative alignments. Dudek will then complete the following as part of the PEIR project impact analysis for only the preferred alternative:

- Use the records search and NAHC Sacred Lands File results to determine the potential significance of known cultural resources, including the extent to which they have been previously disturbed and their resulting integrity and potential to fulfill significance criteria defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.
- Determine the potential for alternative project site areas to contain unknown but potentially significant cultural resources, based on the distribution of recorded archaeological sites and areas where archaeological investigations have had negative results.
- Assess the likelihood that proposed alternative site improvements would impact the following: (a) recorded significant archaeological resources; (b) recorded, potentially significant archaeological resources; (c) unknown, potentially significant resources within areas that have not been previously investigated but are considered locations where such resources may be located; (d) archaeological sites that have been destroyed by previous development; and (e) areas that have been previously investigated and no archaeological resources were identified.

In the event that potentially significant impacts on cultural resources are identified, programmatic-level development standards will be proposed as PEIR mitigation measures. The measures would emphasize achieving project objectives while minimizing archaeological site disturbances. They would be characterized at two levels: general programmatic guidelines for pursuing specific discreet projects for the preferred MDP .

Examples of such programmatic guidelines could include the following: (a) initial infrastructure project screening for archaeological sensitivity; (b) evaluation of design components to reduce potential impacts, costs, and timing; (c) excavations to identify the horizontal and vertical extent of archaeological deposits; (d) construction monitoring; and (e) Native American consultation.

Appropriate timing and process for implementing each mitigation measure/programmatic guideline will be identified to fulfill the components of the PEIR mitigation monitoring and reporting plan, as necessary.

According to the Riverside County Land Conservation System, the majority of the proposed MDP area is identified as having a low potential for paleontological resources. This characteristic will be explained, as will the resulting reduced potential for impacts on paleontological resources.

Geology/Soils

Dudek has included the Leighton Consulting, Inc. (Leighton) on our project team to prepare the geotechnical constraints and opportunities section of the PEIR. Leighton's scope of work for the environmental constraints analysis will be the basis for the information utilized in the preparation of the PEIR. Leighton's scope will begin with the acquisition of existing background information. This information can include geologic maps and reports, including fault maps, geologic hazard maps,

topographic maps (old and new), historical aerial photographs, and any existing geotechnical reports that the District has in its possession.

A preliminary evaluation of the MDP program area did not locate any Alquist-Priolo faults within the boundaries of the MDP, but there do appear to be identified faults located both northwest and southeast of Lake Elsinore, in close proximity to the MDP. Additionally, the MDP does not appear to be in a high-liquefaction area or susceptible to subsidence, aside from the area located directly along Lake Elsinore's boundary. The MDP does appear to be located within an area of high susceptibility to seismically induced landslides and rockfalls.

The data obtained will be compiled and analyzed, particularly with respect to potential geotechnical constraints. Potential constraints could include high groundwater, liquefiable soils, faulting and seismicity, and compressible and expansive soils. Leighton will help formulate the required analysis pursuant to CEQA and any mitigation measures given the type of future development proposed as part of the overall MDP.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The PEIR will include a hazards technical study, which will assist in addressing the questions on the CEQA checklist as well as Government Code Section 65962.5 relating to hazardous materials. The hazards technical study will summarize the findings of a computerized database search of federal, state, and local regulatory agency records. This database search will flag sites within the project area that currently have or previously had hazardous materials contamination or sites that used hazardous materials. Historical aerial photographs will be reviewed as part of Dudek's scope of services. The aerial photos will be used to identify past land use, such as farming, and consequently the use of pesticides/herbicides, that would have environmental impacts on the subject property.

Online databases and hard copies of records maintained by local environmental agencies will also be reviewed, if available. Potential sites of concern and their potential impact to the project area will be identified. This program-level evaluation will identify sites with potential environmental concerns within the study area, which may require future consideration as MDP facilities are sited near them. Dudek will provide programmatic guidelines in the PEIR of how to address any potential hazardous sites in proximity to the MDP project.

While the MDP program area appears to be located within a high fire hazard zone, it is anticipated that given the types of development involved with the MDP program, impacts regarding fire risk will be less than significant.

Hydrology/Drainage/Water Quality

According to Addendum No. 1 of the RFP, the District will complete the necessary hydrology studies internally, and Dudek will appropriately incorporate this material into the PEIR. Dudek will utilize our in-house experts in hydrology and water quality to address any outstanding issues and/or support the District engineering as so desired. Additional information may include items such as potential water quality impacts to downstream waters, impacts to existing stormwater facilities, or the need for appropriate mitigation measures, including best management practices for construction and post-construction conditions.

Noise

A project-specific technical report for noise is not anticipated to be required for the PEIR. The noise section of the PEIR will focus more on an overall discussion of the existing environment encompassed within the plan. The MDP will be evaluated in light of the County of Riverside's Noise Ordinance, and it will include typical mitigation measures and controls that would be anticipated as part of any specific projects that would fall within the MDP. Such measures may include, but not limited to, specified construction operating hours and days of allowed construction.

Utilities

This section of the PEIR will entail a description of existing utilities and an assessment of the overall MDP's potential impact on existing/mandated service levels. Services would first be analyzed in the IS and would include wastewater treatment and transmission facilities, water treatment and supplies, storm drain systems, and capacity availability at local and regional solid waste/recycling facilities. Dudek anticipates that a number of these specific issues can be disposed of within the IS.

Other CEQA-Mandated PEIR Sections

In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines, the PEIR will contain a discussion of the irreversible environmental changes that will result from the proposed project, unavoidable significant impacts, and those effects found not to be significant.

Alternatives. The PEIR will address project alternatives, including a no project alternative, which could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the proposed project. Determination of specific alternatives will be made in coordination with District staff and project team. The focus of the alternatives discussion will be those project alternatives that reduce or avoid any identified significant environmental impacts, in accordance with the requirements of CEQA. The alternatives discussion will include a comparative analysis of the various project alternatives in relation to the proposed project.

Growth Inducement. The growth inducement discussion will assess the potential of the proposed project to induce economic or population growth. The PEIR will also discuss compliance with regional and local growth management policies and growth forecast assumptions.

Cumulative Impact Analysis. Cumulative impacts will be addressed within each subsection of the PEIR. The cumulative analysis will address, where applicable, cumulative growth forecasting methodology and cumulative impact analysis methodology. The cumulative analysis will be based on a list and description of closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects within the project vicinity that would have the ability to contribute to cumulative effects in any of the environmental issue areas discussed in the PEIR. The cumulative study area for each issue area will be identified within that particular section. The discussion will include an assessment of the proposed project's ability to compound or increase adverse environmental impacts when added to cumulative projects.

References, Persons, and Agencies Contacted, and PEIR Preparation. The PEIR will contain a list of all references, persons, and agencies contacted during

preparation of the PEIR. In addition, the PEIR will list all persons involved in the preparation of the document and their titles and roles.

Appendices. The appendices shall include the IS, a copy of the NOP, comment letters in response to the NOP, technical studies deemed appropriate, and any other pertinent information that may benefit the public in review of the PEIR.

Per the RFP, the Administrative Draft PEIR will undergo up to three separate reviews to establish a final Draft PEIR that is acceptable to the District. Upon receipt of comments on each administrative draft, Dudek will produce the Draft PEIR with track changes and submit it to the District for a final review prior to printing for public review.

Deliverables:

1. Four (4) copies of the first Administrative Draft PEIR for team review including the document on a CD.
2. Four (4) copies of the second Administrative Draft PEIR for team review, including the document on a CD.
3. Four (4) copies of the third Administrative Draft PEIR for team review prior to printing of the Draft PEIR for public review, including the document on a CD.

TASK 6. Draft PEIR

Upon approval of the final Administrative Draft PEIR by the District, Dudek will print and distribute copies of the Draft PEIR for public review. Distribution will include the County Clerk, State Clearinghouse and other agencies, firms, and individuals who received the NOP, as well as those who attended the scoping meeting, provided comments on the NOP, or who requested the PEIR from the District.

Dudek will prepare a Notice of Completion (NOC) to be filed by the District, County Clerk, and the State Clearinghouse. Newspaper notices regarding the availability of the Draft PEIR for public review and the start of the 45-day review period will be the responsibility of the District.

Dudek will also provide the Draft PEIR electronically in PDF format for upload to District website. Further, email comments received during the public review period on the Draft PEIR will also be included in the Response to Comments section in the Final PEIR.

Deliverables:

1. Production/printing of copies of the Draft PEIR and single volume technical appendices (three loose, unbound copies of each) and one electronic .pdf file.
2. Mailing of the Draft PEIR copies by certified mail, return receipt or equivalent.

TASK 7. Response to Comments on Draft PEIR

Dudek will compile all comments that the District receives on the Draft PEIR during the public review period, both in writing and via email, and will assess them to develop an appropriate response strategy. It is assumed for this task that the District provide all the comments to Dudek. This response strategy will be compiled into a memorandum that will be provided to the District for consideration and discussion.

Upon receipt of District comments on the Response to Comments document, Dudek will then finalize the Response to Comments and ultimately incorporate the comments into the Final PEIR. For purposes of cost estimation, it is assumed that Dudek will respond to up to twenty (20) individual comments on the Draft PEIR (note that a single comment letter may contain multiple comments). If more than 20 comments are received, Dudek will provide responses to these for a flat fee of $400 per additional comment.

The Response to Comment memorandum will also include Draft Findings and any Statements of Overriding Considerations that might be needed for impacts that cannot be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

Dudek plans to utilize Mr. Gettis for the preparation of the Draft Findings and Statements of Overriding Considerations. As a CEQA attorney, having Mr. Gettis prepare the Draft Findings and Statements of Overriding Considerations will reduce the amount of legal review and preparation required on the District's behalf. The Findings also provide an excellent vehicle to further test the Draft PEIR analysis and make any final non-substantive changes to the final document.

Deliverables

1. Initial memorandum compiling comments received on the Draft PEIR during public review and recommending a response strategy.
2. Response to Comments documentation.
3. Findings of Fact and Statements of Overriding Considerations.
4. Printing and mailing of Response to Comments document by certified mail, return receipt.

TASK 8. Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program

The Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program (MMRP) will be adopted by the District and included in the Final PEIR. In order to facilitate a useful MMRP for District implementation, the mitigation measures contained in the PEIR will be sufficiently detailed and developed in consideration of future monitoring requirements.

Dudek will utilize a table format to present the potential significant impacts, applicable mitigation, specific monitoring activities and required frequency, the responsible agencies, and any sanctions for non-compliance. The District will adopt the MMRP in its capacity as the CEQA lead agency in accordance with the provisions of the CEQA (California Public Resources Code Section 21000, et seq.) and implementation guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations Section15000, et seq.).

Deliverables

1. Three copies and one CD of the MMRP.

TASK 9. Final PEIR

Dudek will provide a copy of the Response to Comments received on the Draft PEIR, the MMRP, and Findings of Fact to complete the Final PEIR documentation. Our cost estimate has been created assuming that the Final PEIR will include an

annotated version of the Draft PEIR, which was circulated for public review. The annotated version of the Draft PEIR will include any changes or deletions that were made to the Draft PEIR as a result of public comments received. Reproduction of the entire Draft PEIR and its appendices is not included in the Final PEIR.

Upon completion of the certification process, Dudek will prepare the Notice of Determination (NOD). Filing fees are assumed to be the responsibility of the District. The District, as lead agency, will present the Final PEIR to its Board of Supervisors for certification and approval of the MDP. Dudek has also included time to attend one City Council meeting at the City of Lake Elsinore and one City Council meeting at the City of Wildomar, since the MDP will affect each of these cities. A copy of the NOD will also be sent to the State Clearinghouse by Dudek on behalf of the District.

Dudek understands that the preparation of the Final PEIR administrative record for use by the District is not included in this scope of work; Dudek can prepare the administrative record under a separate agreement if the District chooses not to use its own staff for this work.

Deliverables

1. Staff support services as requested up to 20 hours.
2. Attendance at two Board of Supervisors meetings, and 2 City Council Meetings
3. One copy of the Annotated Draft PEIR, Responses to Comments document, Mitigation and Monitoring, and Findings of Fact document, which constitute the basic elements of a Final PEIR under CEQA.

TASK 10. Environmental Meetings

Dudek will attend bi-monthly (every other month) meetings with District staff to review and discuss the project progress, issues resolution, and technical feedback. Meeting and coordination time with the City of Lake Elsinore and Wildomar has also been included in this Task.

Deliverables

1. Attendance at bi-monthly project team meetings held at the District.

TASK 11. Change Order Scoping and Administration

Per the District's direction, this Task will be utilized to provide time for coordination and administration of any contract adjustments that may be needed at the request of the District. Under this Task, Dudek could develop change order scope, prepare cost estimates, schedules as well as time for administration and processing with the District. If the budget for this Task is exceeded, this contract may need to modified, or additional time can billed on a time and materials basis.

Deliverables

1. Potential Change Orders.

PART II: COST PROPOSAL FOR PROJECT/TASK ORDER

Alternative: Preferred Alternative

	Project Manager Stephanie Standerfer	Legal Review Aaron Gettis	Publications II	Admin II	Total Hours	Subs	Non-Labor/ Direct Costs	Total Cost
Rate ($/hr):	$200.00	$200.00	$85.00	$80.00				
TASKS	# of hrs	# of hrs	# of hrs	# of hrs	# of hrs	$	$	$
Task 0: Internal Scoping/Env. Constraints								
0A: Internal Scoping Meeting	3				6			$1,110.00
0B: Environmental Constraints Analysis	6		2	1	83		$100.00	$12,150.00
0C: 2nd Internal Scoping Meeting	4				12			$2,180.00
Task Subtotal	**13**	**0**	**2**	**1**	101	**$0.00**	**$100.00**	**$15,440.00**
Task 1: EIR Kick-Off Meeting								
1A Kick-off Meeting	4				16			$2,620.00
Task Subtotal	**4**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**16**	**$0.00**	**$0.00**	**$2,620.00**
Task 2: Initial Public Scoping								
2A Coordinate Scoping Meeting	4			2	14			$2,220.00
2B Attend Brlefing Meeting	2				4			$750.00
2C Attend Scoping Session	4				10			$1,710.00
Task Subtotal	**10**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**28**	**$0.00**	**$0.00**	**$4,680.00**
Task 3: Initial Study/Notice of Preparation (IS/NOP)								
3A Prepare Screencheck IS	2	1	2		51			$7,420.00
3B Prepare 2nd Screencheck IS	2	1	6		55			$7,690.00
3C Prepare NOP			6		12			$1,420.00
3D Prepare Distribution List/Coordinate with District				2	6			$790.00
3E Distribute IS/NOP	1		8	8	25		$1,200.00	$3,980.00
Task Subtotal	**5**	**2**	**22**	**10**	**149**	**$0.00**	**$1,200.00**	**$21,300.00**
Task 4: NOP/Scope Screencheck PEIR Comments								
4A Prepare Memo on NOP Comments	1	1	2		13			$1,865.00
4B Attend Team Meeting	1				1			$200.00
Task Subtotal	**2**	**1**	**2**	**0**	**14**	**$0.00**	**$0.00**	**$2,065.00**
Task 5: Administrative Draft PEIR								
5A Prepare 1st Screencheck Draft PEIR					0			$0.00
(1) Table of Contents			1		2			$225.00
(2) Executive Summary/Introduction	1		1		7			$1,020.00
(3) Project Description	1		1		7			$1,020.00
(4)Effects Found Not Significant	1		1		5			$740.00
(5) Environmental Impact Analysis					0			$0.00
Aesthetics	1	1	1		11			$1,675.00
Air Quality	1	1	1		83			$11,355.00
Biological Resources	1	1	1	2	75		$200.00	$11,195.00
Cultural Resources	1	1	1		45		$600.00	$7,315.00
Geology/Soils	1	1	1		13	$6,950.00		$8,905.00
Hazards/Hazardous Materials	1	1	1		38		$828.00	$5,938.00
Hydrology/Water Quality	1	1	1		43			$7,055.00
Land Use/Planning	1	1	1		11			$1,675.00
Noise	1	1	1		11			$1,675.00
Utilities/Service Systems	1	1	1		11			$1,675.00
(6) CEQA-Mandated Sections	1	1	1		10			$1,500.00
(7) Alternatives	1	1	1		12			$1,780.00
(8) Growth Inducement		1	1		5			$740.00
5B 2nd Screencheck Draft PEIR	4	4	1		35			$5,395.00
5C 3rd Screencheck Draft PEIR	2	2	1		22			$3,300.00
Task Subtotal	**21**	**19**	**19**	**2**	**446**	**$6,950.00**	**$1,628.00**	**$74,183.00**
Task 6: Draft PEIR								
6A Finalize Draft PEIR	1		20		46			$5,435.00
6B Prepare NOC		1	2	2	8			$985.00
6C Distribution of Draft PEIR for Public Review			4	8	15		$2,933.00	$4,368.00
Task Subtotal	**1**	**1**	**26**	**10**	**69**	**$0.00**	**$2,933.00**	**$10,788.00**
Task 7: Response to Comments on Draft PEIR								
7A Prepare Response to Comment Memo	6	2	4		45			$6,820.00
7B Finalize Resonse to Comments and Distribute		1	4	1	11			$1,355.00
7C Findings of Fact and SOC	1	24	2		27			$5,170.00
Task Subtotal	**7**	**27**	**10**	**1**	**83**	**$0.00**	**$0.00**	**$13,345.00**
Task 8: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP)								
8A Prepare MMRP	2		4		12			$1,650.00
Task Subtotal	**2**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**12**	**$0.00**	**$0.00**	**$1,650.00**
Task 9: Final PEIR								
9A Prepare NOD			1		3			$400.00
9B Prepare Final PEIR			4	2	10		$800.00	$1,930.00
9C BOS, CC Meetings and Staff Support	20	2			32			$6,150.00
Task Subtotal	**20**	**2**	**5**	**2**	**45**	**$0.00**	**$800.00**	**$8,480.00**
Task 10: Meetings - Environmental								
10A Attend Bi-Monthly Meetings with District	24				36			$6,900.00
Task Subtotal	**24**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**36**	**$0.00**	**$0.00**	**$6,900.00**
TOTAL HOURS:	109	52	**90**	**28**	**999**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**
TOTAL COST:	**$21,800.00**	$10,400.0	**$7,650.00**	**$2,240.00**	**N/A**	**$6,950.00**	**$6,661.00**	**$161,451.00**

Optional Tasks

Task 11: Change Order Administration	$10,000
Visual Impact Analysis per one basin, 2 views	$28,560.00
Each Additional Basin	$1,260.00
Additonal Response to Comment - per one response	$400.00