

FORM APPROVED COUNTY COUNSEL 3/17/16
 BY: GREGORY P. PRIAMOS DATE

Departmental Concurrence

**SUBMITTAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
 COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

120



FROM: TLMA – Transportation Department

SUBMITTAL DATE:
 January 26, 2016

SUBJECT: Amendment No. 1 to the Environmental and Engineering Services Agreement between the County of Riverside and Jones & Stokes Associates, Inc., a Wholly Owned Subsidiary of ICF Consulting Group, Inc., for the Cajalco Road Widening Project. 1st District; [\$11,178,657]; Federal Funds 89%, Local Funds 11%

RECOMMENDED MOTION: That the Board of Supervisors:

1. Ratify and approve the attached Amendment No. 1 to the Environmental and Engineering Services Agreement between the County of Riverside (County) and Jones & Stokes Associates, Inc. for the Cajalco Road Widening Project; and
2. Authorize the Chairman of the Board to execute the same.

Patricia Romo
 Assistant Director of Transportation

Juan C. Perez
 Director of Transportation and Land Management

FINANCIAL DATA	Current Fiscal Year:	Next Fiscal Year:	Total Cost:	Ongoing Cost:	POLICY/CONSENT (Per Exec. Office)
COST	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 11,178,657	\$ 0	Consent <input type="checkbox"/> Policy <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
NET COUNTY COST	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	
SOURCE OF FUNDS: STP (89%), Measure A (11%) There are no General Funds used for this agreement.				Budget Adjustment: No	
				For Fiscal Year: 15/16 - 19/20	

C.E.O. RECOMMENDATION:

APPROVE

BY:
 Tina Grande

County Executive Office Signature

MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

On motion of Supervisor Jeffries, seconded by Supervisor Ashley and duly carried, IT WAS ORDERED that the above matter is approved as recommended.

Ayes: Jeffries, Tavaglione, Benoit and Ashley
Nays: None
Absent: Washington
Date: March 29, 2016
xc: Transp.

Kecia Harper-Ihem
 Clerk of the Board
 By:
 Deputy

Prev. Agn. Ref.: 12/14/10, Item 3-59 | **District:** 1 | **Agenda Number:**

3-31

- A-30
- Positions Added
- 4/5 Vote
- Change Order

SUBMITTAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FORM 11: Amendment No. 1 to the Environmental and Engineering Services Agreement between the County of Riverside and Jones & Stokes Associates, Inc., a Wholly Owned Subsidiary of ICF Consulting Group, Inc., for the Cajalco Road Widening Project. 1st District; [\$11,178,657]; Federal Funds 89%, Local Funds 11%

DATE: January 26, 2016

PAGE: 2 of 3

BACKGROUND:

Summary

Cajalco Road (Expressway) is one of the primary transportation corridors in Western Riverside County. It links Interstate 15 (I-15) to Interstate 215 (I-215), and connects to the Ramona Expressway easterly from that point to SR-79 and the San Jacinto Valley.

The County of Riverside Transportation Department (Transportation Department) has focused on making pavement and safety improvements to Cajalco Road over the years. However, there is a need to widen and to realign portions of this road to more safely accommodate existing traffic and provide for expected traffic growth into the future.

Improvements to Cajalco Road are essential to reduce congestion and maintain and enhance the quality of life in Western Riverside County. The Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) reaffirmed its commitment to a future east-west arterial corridor between I-15 and I-215 by supporting the County's planned improvements to Cajalco Road and prioritizing funding for the preparation of environmental documents by the County. The RCTC has authorized \$10 million in Federal funds towards the engineering and environmental studies for this project for consultant and staff support costs. The RCTC also stated that it would consider reinitiating the Mid-County Parkway (MCP) for this segment should the County not be successful in environmentally clearing Cajalco Road.

The Transportation Department is proceeding with the planned improvements to widen Cajalco Road between I-15 and I-215.

On December 14, 2010 (Agenda Item 3-59), the Board of Supervisors approved an Environmental and Engineering Services Agreement between the County and Jones & Stokes Associates, Inc. to prepare the environmental documentation and preliminary engineering design to obtain environmental clearance required for improvements along the Cajalco Road corridor.

Amendment No. 1 will modify the contract scope due to additional environmental and design requirements as described below:

- The scope, schedule, and fee in the original agreement assumed the environmental document would be a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Complex Environmental Assessment/Finding of No Significant Impact (EA/FONSI).
- During the preparation of the Preliminary Environmental Study (PES) for the project, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), the NEPA lead agency, determined that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was required pursuant to NEPA. This was an unexpected result, as the initial review of the project and findings did not point to a level of impact that would warrant a higher level NEPA document.
- The preparation of an EIS requires that all reasonable and feasible alternatives be evaluated in detail, including the evaluation of both a six lane ultimate condition and a four lane interim condition for the western portion of the project alignment between Temescal Canyon Road and Harley John Road.
- Extensive coordination is necessary with the Metropolitan Water District (MWD) and the Tribal Government with regard to the MWD Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) and cultural resources. The coordination with MWD revealed the need to include the analysis of the MWD HCP in the EIR/EIS and that the responsibility for processing the amendment to the MWD HCP would fall to the County.

As a result of the above factors and findings, the project will require substantial additional services in terms of converting the NEPA document from an EA/FONSI to an EIS, as well as the increase in the number of alternatives from two build alternatives to four build alternatives and two modified alternatives for a total of six alternatives.

SUBMITTAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FORM 11: Amendment No. 1 to the Environmental and Engineering Services Agreement between the County of Riverside and Jones & Stokes Associates, Inc., a Wholly Owned Subsidiary of ICF Consulting Group, Inc., for the Cajalco Road Widening Project. 1st District; [\$11,178,657]; Federal Funds 89%, Local Funds 11%

DATE: January 26, 2016

PAGE: 3 of 3

The project, as proposed, would consist of roadway widening improvements along the Cajalco Road corridor from I-215 to Temescal Canyon Road, providing four lanes throughout most of the alignment and six lanes between Harvill Avenue and the I-215 southbound ramps. The County's general plan reserves right-of-way to improve Cajalco Road (Expressway) as a six lane facility. All four alternatives would include the same alignment from Harley John Road to I-215, generally following the existing Cajalco Road alignment.

The Transportation Department and Jones & Stokes, Inc. staff developed a revised scope necessary to accommodate the additional requirements and obtain environmental clearance. The Transportation Department has negotiated an additional fee of \$5,634,447 with Jones & Stokes, Inc. to perform the services.

As part of the original agreement authorization, the Board of Supervisors delegated authorization to the Director of Transportation and Land Management to approve \$504,019 in additional budget for unforeseen services. Approval of this amendment is intended to retain that delegation.

The contract budget will be adjusted as follows:

Original Contract Budget	\$ 5,040,191
10% Director of Transportation Authorization	\$504,019
Amendment No. 1: Additional Scope for Widening Project	<u>\$5,634,447</u>
Total revised contract budget	\$ 11,178,657

Project Number: C0-0551

Impact on Residents and Businesses

Regional transportation facilities are essential to public health, safety, and welfare. Cajalco Road is a significant east-west regional arterial in the County. Extensive public outreach has taken place for the widening project via scoping meetings, Municipal Advisory Council briefings, community group meetings, and town hall meetings.

Input received has been incorporated into the Alternatives to be evaluated in the EIR/EIS. Additional public input will be solicited during review of the EIR/EIS to provide area residents and businesses the opportunity to evaluate and comment on the project.

SUPPLEMENTAL:

Additional Fiscal Information

RCTC took action on July 8, 2009, to focus and limit efforts of the MCP between the limits of I-215 and SR-79 and delay the segment between I-15 and I-215. As a result, RCTC allocated \$7,000,000 in Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds for the purpose of obtaining environmental clearance for improvements on Cajalco Road that are essential to reduce congestion and maintain and enhance the quality of life in western Riverside County. As a result in the additional services now required to obtain environmental clearance, RCTC has allocated supplementary STP funds in the amount of \$3,000,000, for a total of \$10,000,000 in funding. The remaining cost for this contract i.e. \$1,178,657 will be borne by Measure A.

Contract History and Price Reasonableness

As noted above, the revised scope of services requires the evaluation of six alternatives rather than two alternatives, as contemplated and scoped in the original Environmental and Engineering Services Agreement. This has resulted in a significant increase in the effort that is needed to obtain environmental clearance and an approximately doubling in budget. The billing rates have been negotiated with Jones & Stokes Associates, Inc., and are comparable with other consulting firms offering similar services.

ATTACHMENTS:

- Vicinity Map
- Amendment No. 1

Cajalco Road Location Map



LEGEND

- Cajalco Road Project Limits

Show

AMENDMENT 1

Amendment to Agreement Between

The County of Riverside and Jones & Stokes Associates, Inc.

THIS AMENDMENT (hereinafter the "Amendment 1") to an agreement is made and entered into as of this 29th day of March, 2016, by and between the County of Riverside, a political subdivision of the State of California (hereinafter the "COUNTY"), and Jones & Stokes Associates, Inc., a wholly owned subsidiary of ICF Consulting Group, Inc., (hereinafter "CONSULTANT").

RECITALS

- A. COUNTY and CONSULTANT have entered a consulting services agreement entitled "Environmental & Engineering Services Agreement for Cajalco Road Widening Project (hereinafter the "PROJECT") between County of Riverside • Transportation Department and Jones & Stokes Associates, Inc., A Wholly Owned Subsidiary of ICF Consulting Group, Inc." that is dated December 14, 2010 (County Supervisor Board Item 3.59) (hereinafter the "Agreement"). The Agreement provides the terms and conditions, scope of work, schedule and budget for the performance of professional and technical services related to preliminary engineering and environmental technical studies necessary to complete an environmental document and obtain environmental clearance for the PROJECT.
- B. The scope, schedule and fee in the original Agreement assumed the environmental document would be a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Complex Environmental Assessment/Finding of No Significant Impact (EA/FONSI). The PROJECT initially proceeded on this path and a CEQA Notice of Preparation was prepared and issued and public scoping meetings were conducted. During the preparation of the Preliminary Environmental Study (PES) for the PROJECT the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), the NEPA lead agency, determined that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was required pursuant to NEPA. This was an unexpected determination as the initial review of the PROJECT and findings did not point to there being a level of impact from the PROJECT that would warrant a higher level NEPA document, and Caltrans does very few EIS's statewide, particularly for existing facilities, which factored into the unanticipated decision. As the NEPA Lead Agency the ultimate determination of the NEPA level of documentation is up to Caltrans and their determination upon review and discussion was that an EIS was the appropriate level of document. Based on the change in NEPA

1 document the CONSULTANT prepared the NEPA Notice of Intent and conducted subsequent public
2 scoping meetings required for an EIS but not for an EA.

3 C. A key difference in the preparation of an EA versus an EIS is that all reasonable and feasible alternatives
4 must be evaluated (and evaluated at a similar level of detail) when preparing an EIS. As part of the
5 NEPA scoping process two additional alternatives (beyond the two assumed in the original contract) were
6 identified. It was determined that these two new alternatives fit the "reasonable and feasible" criteria and
7 would be carried forward through the EIR/EIS document. In addition, working in conjunction with County
8 Counsel, it was determined that the PROJECT should evaluate both a six-lane ultimate condition and a
9 four-lane interim condition for the western portion of the PROJECT alignment under Alternatives 1 and 2.
10 In addition to these activities, extensive coordination has been necessary with the Metropolitan Water
11 District (hereinafter "MWD") and area Tribes with regard to the MWD Habitat Conservation Plan and an
12 area of Tribal interest, respectively. The coordination with MWD revealed the need to include the
13 analysis of the MWD HCP in the EIR/EIS and that the responsibility for processing the amendment to the
14 MWD HCP would fall to the COUNTY. The concerns of the Tribe has required, and continues to require,
15 coordination to identify solutions to concerns related to potential impacts to sites of interest to the Tribe.

16 D. As a result of the above factors and findings, the PROJECT will require substantial additional services in
17 terms of converting the NEPA document from an EA/FONSI to an EIS as well as the increase in number
18 of alternatives from two build alternatives to four build alternatives and two modified alternatives, for a
19 total of six alternatives. The PROJECT will consist of roadway widening improvements along the Cajalco
20 Road corridor from Interstate 215 to Temescal Canyon Road providing 4 lanes throughout most of the
21 alignment and 6 lanes between Harvill Avenue and the I-215 southbound ramps. All four alternatives
22 would include the same alignment from Harley John Road to Interstate 215; generally following the
23 existing Cajalco Road alignment.

24 E. The parties desire to amend the Agreement to include the scope of work, schedule and budget needed to
25 perform the final design and construction support services for the PROJECT.

26 **AGREEMENT**

27 NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual covenants hereinafter contained, the parties agree as follows,
28 effective December 14, 2010:

29 1. Appendix A Scope of services "entitled "CAJALCO ROAD WIDENING – HARVILL AVENUE TO

TEMESCAL CANYON ROAD, SCOPE OF WORK – PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING/ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT” is amended to include the additional and modified services as described in the attached Scope of Services entitled “AMENDMENT 1 • APPENDIX A1 • SCOPE FOR ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES”. The limits of work are extended to the west of Harvill Avenue to Interstate 215 and now includes alternatives that involve the widening of El Sobrante Road.

2. Appendix B • Article B1• Introduction is amended to revise the completion date from December 30, 2016 to June 30, 2022. All covenants set forth in the original Agreement and as amended by this Amendment 1 are effective December 14, 2010 and shall be completed by June 30, 2022, unless extended by supplemental agreement.
3. Article VI (Compensation) and Appendix C • Article CV are amended by increasing the contract budget by \$5,634,447.55 for a total revised budget of \$10,674,638.43 as provided below and in accordance with the attached Fee Proposal entitled “AMENDMENT 1 • APPENDIX C:1 • PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING AND ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION FEE PROPOSAL WORKSHEETS”. Salary Rates and company payroll additives and overhead rates have been updated to current values. These changes in salary and company billing rates are hereby approved and effective upon execution of this agreement.

Cajalco Road Widening Project Fee Revision Summary

COMPANIES	TASK	ORIGINAL	AMENDMENT 1	TOTAL
WIDENING PROJECT				
ICF Jones & Stokes	Prime (Environmental)	\$ 2,594,213.45	\$ 2,864,069.80	\$ 5,458,283.25
AECOMILAN	Engineering/Design	\$ 1,541,420.41	\$ 1,600,117.96	\$ 3,141,538.39
Iteris	Traffic	\$ 346,162.66	\$ 409,641.75	\$ 755,804.41
URS	Water Quality, Hydraulics & Floodplain	\$ 173,999.36	\$ 119,334.44	\$ 293,333.80
Group Delta Consultants	Geotech	\$ 70,957.41	\$ 222,770.21	\$ 293,727.62
Epic Land Solutions	Relocation Analysis	\$ 121,454.34	\$ 42,698.53	\$ 164,152.87
Arellano and Associates	Public Outreach	\$ 112,000.06	\$ 83,704.11	\$ 195,704.17
VMS	Value Engineering	\$ 39,058.14	\$ 3,165.14	\$ 42,223.28
James Allen	Paleontology	\$ 40,925.05	\$ 25,744.35	\$ 66,669.40
Glen Lukos Associates	Vernal Pool, Watershed & Fairy Shrimp		\$ 62,044.39	\$ 62,044.39
SJM	Stephens Kangaroo Rat		\$ 108,085.15	\$ 108,085.15
Rahn Consulting	Wildlife Corridor Analysis		\$ 16,801.14	\$ 16,801.14
RBF Consulting	Biological Resources Oversight for ROE		\$ 10,057.78	\$ 10,057.78
Wicke Consulting	MWD Coordination/Outreach		\$ 66,212.80	\$ 66,212.80
SUB TOTAL		\$ 5,040,190.88	\$ 5,634,447.55	\$ 10,674,638.43

1 4. Except to the extent specifically modified or amended hereunder, all of the terms, covenants and
2 conditions of the Agreement shall remain in full force and effect between the parties hereto.

3 IN WITNESS HEREOF, the parties hereto have caused this Amendment 1 to the Agreement to be duly
4 executed this day and year first written above.

5 [REMAINDER OF PAGE LEFT BLANK]
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

ARTICLE VIII • APPROVALS

COUNTY Approvals

RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL:

 Dated: 3/3/16

JUAN C. PEREZ


Director of Transportation and Land Management

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

GREGORY P. PRIAMOS, COUNTY COUNSEL

 Dated: 3/10/16
By Deputy


APPROVAL BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

 Dated: MAR 29 2016
JOHN J. BENOIT

PRINTED NAME

Chairman, Riverside County Board of Supervisors

ATTEST:

 Dated: MAR 29 2016

KECIA HARPER-IHEM

Clerk of the Board (SEAL)

CONSULTANT Approvals

CONSULTANT:

 Dated: 1/26/16

F. Michael Gray

PRINTED NAME

Vice President, Contracts

TITLE

CONSULTANT:

_____ Dated: _____

PRINTED NAME

TITLE

AMENDMENT 1 • APPENDIX A1 • ADDITIONAL SERVICES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1			
2			
3	ARTICLE AI • INTRODUCTION		1
4	A. BACKGROUND/JUSTIFICATION		1
5	B. DELIVERABLES		4
6	ARTICLE AII • TASKS		6
7	T1 MANAGEMENT, COORDINATION & MEETINGS		6
8	1.01 Project Management		6
9	1.02 Meetings		7
10	1.03 Schedule.....		7
11	T2 RESEARCH, DATA GATHERING & RIGHTS-OF-ENTRY.....		7
12	2.01 Rights-of-Entry Coordination		7
13	T3 ENVIRONMENTAL TASKS		8
14	3.01 Planning Study		8
15	3.02 Scoping & Coordination.....		9
16	3.03 Environmental Technical Studies		11
17	3.03.01 Historic Property Survey		11
18	3.03.02 Finding of Effect		15
19	3.03.03 Visual Impacts.....		16
20	3.03.04 Noise Study.....		16
21	3.03.05 Noise Abatement.....		17
22	3.03.06 Biological Resources.....		17
23	3.03.06 a Fed, State & MSHCP Jurisdictional Delineation		17
24	3.03.06 b Burrowing Owl		19
25	3.03.06 c Least Bell's Vireo & Southwestern Willow Flycatcher.....		20
26	3.03.06 d Vernal Pool, Watershed & Fairy Shrimp		21
27	3.03.06 e Habitat Evaluation & Rare Plants		22
28	3.03.06 f Bat Habitat		23
29	3.03.06 g Vegetation Mapping		24
	3.03.06 h Stake Holder Coordination.....		24
	3.03.06 i Core Wildlife Corridor Analysis		25
	3.03.06 j Mitigation Lands Evaluation		25
	3.03.06 k Mitigation Lands Focused SKR		26
	3.03.06 l RCHCA/MWD SKR Lands Focused Study.....		27
	3.03.06 m Natural Environment Study		27
	3.03.06 n Biological Equivalent or Superior Preservation.....		28
	3.03.06 o Equivalency Lands Analysis Report		28
	3.03.07 Paleontological Identification & Evaluation		28
	3.03.08 Paleontological Mitigation Plan		28
	3.03.09 Air Quality.....		28
	3.03.10 Air Quality Conformity Report & Checklist		30
	3.03.11 Relocation Impacts.....		30
	3.03.12 Water Quality Assessment Report.....		30
	3.03.13 Location Hydraulics & Floodplain Encroachment.....		31
	3.03.14 Community Impacts		32
	3.03.15 Initial Site Assessment		32
	3.03.16 Aerially Deposited Lead Screening.....		33
	3.03.17 Section 4(f) Analysis		35

1	3.04 Environmental Document EIR/EIS	35
	3.04.01 Draft Environmental Document	36
2	3.04.02 Cumulative Impacts.....	37
	3.04.03 Notice of Availability and Public Meetings.....	37
3	3.04.04 Response to Comments.....	38
	3.04.05 Final Environmental Document EIR/EIS	38
4	3.04.06 Environmental Commitments Record	39
	3.04.07 CEQA Findings	40
5	3.04.08 Notice of Determination.....	40
	3.04.09 Federal Register Notice	40
6	3.04.10 MWD Habitat Conservation Plan	40
	3.04.11 Record of Decision.....	41
7	3.04.12 Public Outreach.....	42
8	T4 PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING TASKS.....	42
	4.01 Review As-Built & Record Data	42
9	4.02 Traffic.....	43
	4.03 Existing Utilities Data.....	47
10	4.04 Survey Coordination with COUNTY	47
	4.05 Hydrology & Hydraulic Report	48
11	4.06 WQMP & BMP Feasibility Study.....	49
	4.07 Site Assessment & Identify Constraints.....	49
12	4.08 Planning Studies & Concept Alignment Alternatives	49
	4.09 Draft Preliminary Cost Estimates.....	50
13	4.10 Evaluate Concept Alignment Alternatives	50
	4.11 Prepare Conceptual Alignment Report.....	50
14	4.12 Develop Final Alternatives Alignment.....	51
	4.13 Structures Preliminary Geotechnical Reports.....	52
15	4.14 Structural Advance Planning Studies	54
	4.15 Staging & Constructability Review.....	54
16	4.16 Identify Utility Conflicts & Impacts	54
	4.17 Right-of-Way Requirements	55
17	4.18 Design Exceptions.....	55
	4.19 Final Preliminary Cost Estimates.....	55
18	4.20 Project Report Equivalent.....	56
	4.21 Value Engineering	56
19	4.22 Presentation Exhibits.....	57
	4.23 Video for Public Outreach.....	57
20	4.24 Coordinate & Review Development Projects.....	57
	4.25 Coordination Work with RCFC&WCD	58
21	4.26 Environmental Document Coordination.....	58
	4.27 Outreach & Coordination for EIS.....	58
22	4.28 NADR Engineering Support.....	58
	4.29 Provide Engineering Support for Section 4(f).....	59
23	4.30 Wildlife Crossing Assessment	59
	4.31 Wildlife Crossing Bridge Structures	59

24
25
26
27
28
29

AMENDMENT 1 • APPENDIX A1 • SCOPE FOR ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

ARTICLE AI • INTRODUCTION

A. BACKGROUND/JUSTIFICATION

On December 14, 2010, COUNTY and CONSULTANT entered into a “ENVIRONMENTAL & ENGINEERING SERVICES AGREEMENT” to provide preliminary engineering and environmental services necessary to obtain environmental clearance for a proposed regional traffic capacity enhancement and safety improvement project along the Cajalco Road Corridor located between Interstate 15 and Interstate 215 in unincorporated Riverside County. This amendment has been prepared to provide additional budget and time for supplementary consulting services that are now necessary to complete the project. The scope, schedule and fee in the original agreement assumed the environmental document would be a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Complex Environmental Assessment/Finding of No Significant Impact (EA/FONSI). The project initially proceeded on this path and a CEQA Notice of Preparation was prepared and issued and public scoping meetings were conducted. During the preparation of the Preliminary Environmental Study (PES) for the project the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), the NEPA lead agency, determined that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was required pursuant to NEPA. This was an unexpected result as the initial review of the project and findings did not point to there being a level of impact from the project that would warrant a higher level NEPA document. Furthermore, Caltrans does very few EIS’s statewide, particularly for existing facilities, so this factor also played into the unanticipated decision. Caltrans’ determination in their letter of March 7, 2012 was as follows,

“The proposed action is highly likely to affect unique characteristics of the geographic area, adversely affect sites or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or may cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources, adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat and impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse...The severity of the potential impacts in terms of the type, quality and sensitivity of the resources involved; the location of the proposed project; the duration of the effects and other consideration of context are potentially adverse. Based on the Caltrans’ reasoning above, an EIS level of environmental documentation will be provided for this project to adequately evaluate and document the potential impacts to the various resources affected by this project.”

1 Reasoning for the Complex EA as opposed to the EIS was provided by the CONSULTANT; however, the
2 team collectively determined that the best course of action would be to pursue the EIS. Part of this
3 determination by the team was made based on meetings with interested parties, which indicated that the
4 project may benefit from a higher level of environmental document that would be more defensible once
5 completed. In addition, as the NEPA Lead Agency the ultimate determination of the NEPA level of
6 documentation is up to Caltrans and their determination upon review and discussion was that an EIS was the
7 appropriate level of document. Based on the change in NEPA document the CONSULTANT prepared the
8 NEPA Notice of Intent and conducted subsequent public scoping meetings that are required for an EIS but
9 not for an EA.

10 A key difference in the preparation of an EA versus an EIS is that all reasonable and feasible alternatives
11 must be evaluated (and evaluated at a similar level of detail) when preparing an EIS. As part of the NEPA
12 scoping process two additional alternatives (beyond the two assumed in the original contract) were identified.
13 In consultation with County Counsel it was determined that these two new alternatives fit the "reasonable
14 and feasible" criteria and would be carried forward through the EIR/EIS document. In addition, working in
15 conjunction with County Counsel, it was determined that the project should evaluate both a six-lane ultimate
16 condition and a four-lane interim condition for the western portion of the project alignment under Alternatives
17 1 and 2. In addition to these activities, extensive coordination has been necessary with the Metropolitan
18 Water District (MWD) and area Tribes with regard to the MWD Habitat Conservation Plan and an area of
19 Tribal interest, respectively. The coordination with MWD revealed the need to include the analysis of the
20 MWD HCP in the EIR/EIS and that the responsibility for processing the amendment to the MWD HCP would
21 fall to the COUNTY. The concerns of the Tribe has required, and continues to require, coordination to identify
22 solutions to concerns related to potential impacts to sites of interest to the Tribe.

23 As a result, the project will require substantial additional services in terms of converting the NEPA document
24 from an EA/FONSI to an EIS as well as the increase in number of alternatives from two build alternatives to
25 four build alternatives and two modified alternatives, for a total of six alternatives.

26 The project will consist of roadway widening improvements along the Cajalco Road corridor from Interstate
27 215 to Temescal Canyon Road providing 4 lanes throughout most of the alignment and 6 lanes between
28 Harvill Avenue and the I-215 southbound ramps. All four alternatives would include the same alignment from
29 Harley John Road to Interstate 215; generally following the existing Cajalco Road alignment. These four

1 alternatives along the western portion of the project from Temescal Canyon Road to Harley John Road are:

2 **Original Alternatives**

- 3 1. Facility generally along the existing Cajalco Road alignment;
- 4 2. Facility that follows the General Plan alignment along the western portion of the project;

5 **New Alternatives**

- 6 3. Facility that follows El Sobrante Road to La Sierra Avenue and then travels west through
- 7 undeveloped lands before rejoining Cajalco Road just east of Temescal Canyon Road; and
- 8 4. Facility that follows El Sobrante Road to La Sierra Avenue, then travels south along La Sierra
- 9 Avenue, and then west along Cajalco Road.

10 In addition, the project will evaluate two other "ultimate" condition situations. One based on Alternative 1

11 that assumes Cajalco Road as a six-lane facility from Temescal Canyon Road to Harley John Road and

12 one based on Alternative 2 that assumes Cajalco Road as a six-lane facility from Temescal Canyon

13 Road to Harley John Road .

14 This results in a total of six (6) alternatives that will be evaluated.

15 Hours as shown in the Fee Proposal Worksheets (Appendix C1) have been adjusted assuming the six

16 identified alternatives above.

B. DELIVERABLES (● = COMPLETE, ◐ = IN PROGRESS, ○ = NOT STARTED, ⊗ = DELETED)

REFERENCE	DELIVERABLE	SCOPE	STATUS	FIRM
---	Quality Control Plan	Original	◐	ICF
---	Trail and Bikeway Crossing Technical Memorandum	Expanded	○	Iteris
2.02	Property ownership and map (within 500 feet of alignment)	Expanded	●	ICF
3.01	Preliminary Environmental Study	Original	●	ICF
3.02	Initial Study	Original	●	ICF
3.02	Notice of Preparation	Original	●	ICF
3.02	Notice of Intent	New	●	ICF
3.02	Coordination Plan	New	●	ICF
3.02	Cooperating and Participating Agency Letters	New	◐	ICF
3.02	Scoping Meetings (CEQA)	Original	●	ICF
3.02	Scoping Meetings (NEPA)	New	●	ICF
3.02	Summary of Scoping Meeting comments	Expanded	●	ICF
3.03.01	Historic Property Survey Report (including APE map, ASR, and HRER)	Expanded	◐	ICF
3.03.01	Extended Phase I Proposal	Expanded	○	ICF
3.03.01	Extended Phase I Report	New	○	ICF
3.03.01	Archaeological Evaluation Proposal	New	○	ICF
3.03.01	Archaeological Evaluation Report	New	○	ICF
3.03.01	Historic Landscape Evaluation Report	New	○	ICF
3.03.02	Finding of Effect	Expanded	○	ICF
3.03.03	Visual Impact Assessment	Expanded	○	URS
3.03.04	Noise Study Report	Expanded	◐	ICF
3.03.05	Noise Abatement Decision Report	Expanded	○	ICF
3.03.06 a	Jurisdictional Delineation Report	Expanded	◐	ICF
3.03.06 m	Natural Environment Study	Expanded	◐	ICF
3.03.07	Paleontological Identification Report/Paleontological Evaluation Report	Expanded	○	James Allen

Cajalco Road Widening • Interstate 215 to Temescal Canyon Road

1	3.03.08	Paleontological Mitigation Plan	Expanded	<input type="radio"/>	James Allen
2	3.03.09	Air Quality Report	Expanded	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	ICF
3	3.03.10	Air Quality Conformity Analysis Report and Checklist	Expanded	<input type="radio"/>	ICF
4	3.03.11	Relocation Impact Report	Expanded	<input type="radio"/>	Epic
5	3.03.12	Water Quality Assessment Report	Expanded	<input type="radio"/>	URS
6	3.03.13	Cajalco Creek Channelization Study Report	Expanded	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	AECOM
7	3.03.13	Location Hydraulic Study	Expanded	<input type="radio"/>	URS
8	3.03.13	Summary Floodplain Encroachment Report	Expanded	<input type="radio"/>	URS
9	3.03.14	Community Impact Assessment	Expanded	<input type="radio"/>	ICF
10	3.03.15	Initial Site Assessment	Expanded	<input type="radio"/>	Group Delta
11	3.03.16	Limited Aerially Deposited Lead Screening Study	New	<input type="radio"/>	Group Delta
12	3.04.01	Draft EIR/EA (Complex)/FONSI	Deleted	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	ICF
13	3.04.01	Draft EIR/EIS (Screencheck, Admin Draft, Draft Final (3) & Final	New	<input type="radio"/>	ICF
14	3.04.03	Notice of Availability	Original	<input type="radio"/>	ICF
15	3.04.04	Responses to Comments on the Draft ED	Expanded	<input type="radio"/>	ICF
16	3.04.05	Final EIR/EA (Complex)/FONSI	Deleted	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	ICF
17	3.04.05	Final EIR/EIS (Screencheck, Draft Final (3) & Final)	New	<input type="radio"/>	ICF
18	3.04.06	Environmental Commitments Record	Expanded	<input type="radio"/>	ICF
19	3.04.07	Findings of Fact (if necessary, a Statement of Overriding Considerations)	Expanded	<input type="radio"/>	ICF
20	3.04.08	Notice of Determination	Original	<input type="radio"/>	ICF
21	4.02.01	Traffic Methodology Memorandum	Original	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Iteris
22	4.02.01 c	Traffic Volume Forecast Development Report	Expanded	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Iteris
23	4.02.02	Speed/VMT Tables (in 5-mph Speed Bins)	Expanded	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Iteris
24	4.02.02 a	Alignment Screening Analysis Technical Memorandum	Expanded	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Iteris
25	4.02.07	Traffic Index Technical Memorandum	Expanded	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Iteris
26	4.02.09	Traffic Operations Analysis Report	Expanded	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Iteris
27	4.05	Hydrology and Hydraulics Analysis	Expanded	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	AECOM
28					
29					

1	4.05	Drainage Design Report	Expanded	●	AECOM
2	4.05	Bridge Hydraulic Analysis	Expanded	●	AECOM
3	4.06	Water Quality Management Plan	Expanded	●	AECOM
4	4.08	Alternatives Evaluation Report/Planning Report	Expanded	●	AECOM
5	4.08	Concept Alternatives Layouts	Expanded	●	AECOM
6	4.14	Structural Advance Planning Study (APS)	Expanded	●	AECOM
7	4.12	Plans and Profiles of the Final Alternatives	Expanded	●	AECOM
8	4.13	Structures Preliminary Geotechnical Report	Expanded	●	Group Delta
9	4.13	Preliminary Geotechnical Report	Expanded	●	Group Delta
10	4.20	Project Report Equivalent	Expanded	○	AECOM
11	4.21	Value Analysis Report	Expanded	○	VMS
12	4.22	Presentation Exhibits of Alternatives	Expanded	●	AECOM
13	4.23	3D Video	New	●	AECOM

ARTICLE AII • TASKS

T1 MANAGEMENT, COORDINATION & MEETINGS

Note: Cost shown on these tables do not include anticipated "Other Direct Costs"

	Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
ICF	\$631,910	\$278,396	44%	\$910,306
AECOM	\$105,835	\$73,138	69%	\$178,973
ITERIS	\$60,503	\$67,216	111%	\$127,719
EPIC	\$13,060	\$4,780	37%	\$17,840
WICKE	\$0	\$63,998	N/A	\$63,998
Total	\$811,308	\$487,528	60%	\$1,298,836

ICF, AECOM, ITERIS, Epic, Wicke
 Addition cost is needed for the extended duration needed for completion of PA/ED. These costs include project management, meetings, agency coordination and scheduling.

1.01 Project Management

To date CONSULTANT has managed the project for forty-five (45) months versus an original assumption of forty-two (42) months.

1.02 Meetings

To date CONSULTANT has attended a total of approximately seventy-nine (79) project related meetings versus an original assumption of eighty-three (83) meetings. This task also includes the additional coordination and effort that is anticipated related to MWD based on the increase in document type and the number of alternatives that cross MWD property.

1.03 Schedule

Extended schedule updates are consistent with the extension of the Project Management activities.

The scope of work for task T1 remains the same with the following exceptions.

- Based on changes to the project and the revised project schedule, an additional forty-eight (48) months of project management has been assumed.
- Based on changes to the project and the revised project schedule, attendance at ninety-six (96) additional project related meetings by CONSULTANT Project Manager and environmental lead have been assumed; along with other team members, as needed.

T2 RESEARCH, DATA GATHERING & RIGHTS-OF-ENTRY

	Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
ICF	\$74,492	\$43,395	58%	\$117,887
EPIC	\$34,928	\$0	0%	\$34,928
Total	\$109,420	\$43,395	40%	\$152,815

ICF, Epic
 Data Gathering has been completed. Additional cost incurred for providing information for rights-of-entry related to new environmental survey areas. Cost to complete assumes additional rights-of-entry support to the COUNTY by the CONSULTANT.

This task originally included research and data gathering along with rights-of-entry coordination. To date CONSULTANT has performed the necessary data collection and has supported the COUNTY in obtaining rights-of-entry, including for survey areas that were not assumed under the original scope of work.

2.01 Rights-of-Entry Coordination

CONSULTANT shall assist the COUNTY in obtaining rights-of-entry (renewing existing and obtaining new) for the four Build Alternative alignments. It is assumed that the COUNTY will continue to be responsible for obtaining the rights-of-entry and that CONSULTANT will provide the list of parcels that require rights-of-entry.

Any advanced acquisition work previously included has been removed and no appraisals are assumed or included. If the COUNTY desires any advance acquisition work be done then that will be addressed and an amendment provided to the COUNTY for this work. At this time the right-of-way items to be prepared/provided are the rights-of-entry support and a right-of-way requirements listing along with a general right-of-way cost for each alternative (no detailed appraisal or costing information is assumed to be generated during this phase of the project).

Deliverable: • *Property ownership and map (within 500 feet of alignment)*

T3 ENVIRONMENTAL TASKS

The following assumptions have been updated in this amendment. Other assumptions included in the original scope of work remain valid.

- The NEPA document will be an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) rather than a Complex Environmental Assessment (EA)
- A combined CEQA/NEPA document following the CALTRANS EIR/EIS rather than the EIR/EA annotated outline will be prepared
- Four Build Alternatives (as previously described under Project Description), along with two modified alternatives (for a total of six build alternatives), will be evaluated

3.01 Planning Study

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$176,609	\$78,945	45%	\$255,554

ICF (Includes Item 3.02) (See Also Item 4.08)
 Costs include the Planning Study, Initial Study/Notice of Preparation, Scoping, and Preliminary Environmental Study. All related subtasks that follow with the exception of the Planning Study itself and updating agency lists and the Cooperating Agency Plan have been completed. With the rescoping of the project and the higher level NEPA document several additional tasks have been included and completed including the preparation of a Notice of Intent, Coordination Plan, Cooperating and Participating Agencies coordination and documentation, and an additional round of scoping meetings.

It is assumed that all tasks related to the alternatives planning study have been completed with the exception of the preparation of the report documenting the results/findings. The results will be documented in the Draft and Final Alternatives Evaluation Report/Planning Report identified in the Original contract.

Deliverable: • *Alternatives Evaluation Report/Planning Report*

1 **3.02 Scoping & Coordination** (included in 3.01)

2 Several tasks have been completed under this item and several new tasks have been added.

3 Initial Study: This task was completed by CONSULTANT and no effort is assumed or included in this
4 amendment related to this task.

5 Notice of Preparation: This task was completed by CONSULTANT and no effort is assumed or included in
6 this amendment related to this task.

7 Notice of Intent: This is a new task based on the change in the environmental document type and has been
8 completed by CONSULTANT as directed by the COUNTY. CONSULTANT prepared and distributed a
9 Notice of Intent (NOI) for the proposed project under NEPA. CONSULTANT prepared the NOI based on
10 CALTRANS annotated NOI outline. In accordance with NEPA regulations, the NOI was submitted by
11 CALTRANS to FHWA for publication in the Federal Register. Publication of the NOI in the Federal Register
12 began the formal scoping process under NEPA. The scoping process was seeking input on the project
13 purpose and need, identify the range of alternatives and impacts, and the significant issues to be addressed
14 in the EIS. The NOI acted as the Scoping notice and provided the date, time, and location of the Scoping
15 Meetings. The NOI was distributed to the elected officials, affected agencies, interested groups, and property
16 owners as defined for the NOP distribution that was previously performed. The NOI served as the
17 notification of initiation of the environmental review process and that no separate initiation letter/document
18 will be required.

- 19 *Deliverable:*
- *Draft/Final NOI (5 copies each and electronic file) - COMPLETE*
 - *NOI for CALTRANS to forward to FHWA and for Distribution (500 copies, 20 pages and electronic file) - COMPLETE*
 - *Initial Study - COMPLETE*
 - *Notice of Preparation - COMPLETE*
 - *Cooperating and Participating Agency Letters - COMPLETE*
 - *Summary of Scoping Meeting comments - COMPLETE*

26 Coordination Plan and Cooperating and Participating Agencies: This is a new task based on the change in
27 the environmental document type and has been completed by CONSULTANT as directed by the COUNTY;
28 with the exception of the ongoing updates to the Plan throughout the life of the project. CONSULTANT
29 prepared the Coordination Plan to be used throughout the project. The Coordination Plan was prepared

1 based on the template available on the CALTRANS Standard Environmental Reference (SER) and included
2 a schedule for key project activities/coordination points. CONSULTANT prepared the Cooperating and
3 Participating Agency Letters in accordance with MAP-21 through CALTRANS. The Cooperating and
4 Participating Agencies letters were prepared based on the template available on the CALTRANS SER. This
5 Plan shall be maintained throughout the life of the project.

- 6 *Deliverable:*
- 7 • *Draft/Final Coordination Plan (5 copies each and electronic file) – ON-GOING*
 - 8 • *Draft and Final Cooperating and Participating Agency letters - COMPLETE*
 - 9 • *Distribution of Cooperating and Participating Agency letters (assumes 40 total for
10 distribution) - COMPLETE*

11 Scoping Meetings: The original scope of work included two public scoping meetings related to CEQA that
12 have been completed. This Scoping Meetings task subsequently required additional meetings based on the
13 change in the NEPA environmental document type. These additional meetings have also been completed.
14 CONSULTANT worked closely with the COUNTY and CALTRANS to facilitate two public scoping meeting to
15 gather public input on the scope of the EIS. One meeting was conducted for the eastern end of the project
16 and one for the western end at the same locations where the previous CEQA meetings were conducted.
17 CONSULTANT coordinated the details of the approach to the meeting with the COUNTY and CALTRANS to
18 ensure that activities were in accordance with COUNTY and CALTRANS' desires and within an approved
19 format. CONSULTANT project manager, environmental lead, engineering lead, and outreach consultant
20 attended one meeting with the COUNTY and CALTRANS to discuss the scoping meetings. Materials
21 provided by CONSULTANT included sign-in sheets, comment cards, and graphic boards depicting the
22 proposed project layout and features. CONSULTANT also prepared a meeting notice for publication in the
23 local newspaper (both English and Spanish). COUNTY secured a meeting location, CONSULTANT
24 facilitated the meeting, and CONSULTANT project manager, environmental lead, and one environmental
25 staff member, along with the lead engineer, one engineering staff member, and the outreach consultant
26 attended to assist the COUNTY at the meetings. COUNTY was responsible for placing the notice in a local
27 newspaper. A Summary Scoping Report will be prepared and provided to the COUNTY and CALTRANS.

- 27 *Deliverable:*
- 28 • *Conduct scoping meeting (CEQA & NEPA) - COMPLETE*
 - 29 • *Scoping meeting materials (fact sheet, sign-in sheets, comment cards, graphic
boards, meeting notice) - COMPLETE*

- Summary of Scoping Meeting Comments - COMPLETE
- Draft and Final Summary Scoping Report - COMPLETE

Preliminary Environmental Study: This task was completed by CONSULANT and no effort is assumed or included in this amendment related to this task. It is assumed the PES will not have to be updated to reflect the new alternatives.

3.03 Environmental Technical Studies

Deliverables identified in the Original contract are assumed to remain the same except as identified in the following descriptions. All studies now assume that four Build Alternatives will be addressed. The following identifies work conducted to date and out of scope items required for the project. The original scope for each technical report remains the same unless otherwise noted.

3.03.01 Historic Property Survey

	Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
HPSR	\$136,408	\$120,020	88%	\$256,428
PHASE II	\$0	\$207,036	N/A	\$207,036
LANDSCAPE	\$0	\$74,682	N/A	\$74,682
Total	\$136,408	\$401,738	295%	\$538,146

ICF

Additional cost has been incurred for survey work and coordination that was not originally assumed. Budget has been added for addressing further Tribal coordination and addressing the additional alternatives; this includes the assumption of additional sites that will require evaluation. Tribal monitoring during EXI excavations has been included for an estimated 10 day period. Phase II testing for three sites has been added. In addition, a Historic Landscape Evaluation has also been added.

Work to date has included survey work that was required on Metropolitan Water District property to support some biological fieldwork, preparation and attendance at 106 Coordination meetings, and associated research on cultural sites related to previously proposed project alignments. It is assumed that coordination with Native American Tribes beyond that identified in the original scope of work will be required based on information that has been identified for the proposed project alignment. It has been assumed that this work will require 100 hours of time for the cultural lead and archaeologist. If additional time is required then this will be communicated to the COUNTY so that a scope and cost for any additional effort can be provided. It is also assumed that the project area will not have to be evaluated as a District. Based on the new project

1 alternatives this scope of work assumes that up to a total of twenty-five (25) archaeological sites (increased
2 from the fifteen [15] included in the original scope) will not be exempt under the PA and will require
3 evaluation on California historic resource inventory forms (series DPR 523). It is assumed that ten (10) small
4 sites (i.e., milling sites, small lithic scatters, etc.) (up from five [5] included in the original scope of work) will
5 require shovel testing (Extended Phase I). It is assumed that no sites will require Phase II evaluation as
6 defined by CALTRANS. It is further assumed that a village/regional evaluation of cultural sites will not be
7 required.

8 Archaeological Survey Report: CONSULTANT archeologists will conduct an updated records search at the
9 Eastern Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System, encompassing the
10 new alignments and updating previous site records as needed, within the proposed project area and within a
11 1.0 mile radius, per CALTRANS guidelines. Historic maps and photographs shall also be reviewed, if
12 available. CONSULTANT will also request a search of the Sacred Lands File from the Native American
13 Heritage Commission and will contact Native American groups by letter and telephone to request information
14 regarding the types of potential cultural resources in the study area. Consultation will be conducted under
15 the direction of CALTRANS staff and the COUNTY. CONSULTANT archaeologists will also attend up to five
16 (5) field meetings and meetings with Native American representatives, as requested by COUNTY or
17 CALTRANS.

18 CONSULTANT will establish an Area of Potential Effect (APE) map in consultation with the COUNTY and
19 CALTRANS for CALTRANS approval. The map shall provide the survey boundaries for cultural resources to
20 be evaluated during project studies. The APE map shall be based on the total anticipated disturbance
21 footprint associated with project activities (e.g., road widening/interchange construction, staging areas,
22 drainage facilities, street improvements, and parcels containing impacted structures, if any).

23 Following completion of the record search/review, CONSULTANT shall conduct a field survey of the new
24 APE areas for archaeological resources. An Archaeological Survey Report will be prepared.

25 Extended Phase I (XPI). For the assumed ten (10) small sites (i.e., milling sites, small lithic scatters, etc.) it is
26 anticipated that shovel testing (Extended Phase I) will be required. This will require preparation of an
27 Extended Phase I Proposal, for review and approval by CALTRANS. Once approved by CALTRANS, with
28 permission obtained from landowners by the COUNTY, if any is needed, field excavations will take place. It
29 is assumed that this fieldwork will take no more than five (5) days, with a crew of two archaeologists. It is

1 assumed one (1) Native American monitor will be required during this fieldwork. This monitoring has been
2 included in the budget, covering a period of 10 days. It is assumed that the COUNTY will, as has thus far
3 been true for this Project, not require Native American monitoring of additional cultural resources activity.
4 Recovered cultural materials will be processed, analyzed, and curated as defined in the SER, Volume 2. For
5 purposes of this scope, it is assumed that no more than 100 small prehistoric or historic artifacts—lithic
6 flakes, tools, manos, metates, glass fragments or ceramic ware for example—will be recovered and will
7 required laboratory processing. An Extended Phase I Report (XPI) and updated sites forms will be prepared,
8 documenting the purpose, scope, and results of work at these ten sites.

9 Phase II Evaluation: It is assumed that three (3) small prehistoric archaeological sites (i.e., lithic scatters with
10 depth, small habitation areas) will require Phase II evaluation as defined by CALTRANS. A Phase II study is
11 undertaken to evaluate a site and to assess potential project effects. A Phase II study may consist of test
12 excavations and other work for these objectives, including laboratory analysis of recovered cultural materials.
13 An Archaeological Evaluation Proposal (AEP), also referred to as a “Phase II Proposal,” is prepared and
14 approved by CALTRANS prior to excavations. The proposal should state the goals of the study, and clearly
15 link the anticipated field and laboratory work to those goals. The results of the Phase II study are presented
16 in an Archaeological Evaluation Report (AER) as outlined in the CALTRANS SER. The Phase II study
17 should focus on the portions of the site that would be *directly* affected by the undertaking (i.e., portions within
18 the direct APE).

19 ICF archeologists will prepare the AEP for up to three sites, for this project. Once approved by Caltrans, with
20 permission obtained from landowners, if any is needed, field excavations will take place. It is assumed that
21 this field work will take no more than seventeen (17) days, with a crew of six excavators and one field
22 director. It is assumed one (1) Native American monitor will be required during this field work.

23 The level of effort for Phase II testing includes excavation of 12 one meter by one meter square test units
24 (TEUs) to a depth of one meter, in ten centimeter levels, for a total excavated volume of 12 meters. This
25 type of careful excavation, including mapping and forms, will require excavation of 1.5 levels per day per
26 person. In addition, 30 shovel test probes (STP) will be excavated spread as needed over the three sites
27 being evaluated. Site mapping will also be required.

28 Recovered cultural materials will be processed, analyzed, and curated as defined in the SER, Volume 2. For
29 purposes of this scope, it is assumed that no more than 10,000 small prehistoric or historic artifacts—lithic

1 flakes, tools, manos, metates, etc, for example—will be recovered and will required laboratory processing.
2 Special sample analysis, such as radiocarbon dates or obsidian hydration, may be required; for purposes of
3 this scope these samples are estimated to be no more than ten (10). Curation of the recovered materials
4 may be required (or they may be acquired by local Native Americans, if Caltrans so directs). For purposes of
5 this scope, it is estimated that recovered materials can be curated in no more than twenty (20) curation
6 boxes, at a cost of \$1,200.00 per box.

7 An Archaeological Evaluation Report (AER) and updated sites forms will be prepared, documenting the
8 purpose, scope, and results of work at these three sites. ICF will make any necessary revisions to AER and
9 associated attachments and assumes a maximum of three rounds of review from either client or Caltrans.

10 Landscape Evaluation: It is assumed that ICF archaeologists will prepare a Historic Landscape Evaluation to
11 CALTRANS standards (February 1999), for site P-33-13791, which includes Locus 33-818 within the APE as
12 part of a larger prehistoric cultural site .

13 This extensive village site and prehistoric landscape area will be described and evaluated for National
14 Register of Historic Places eligibility. Because portions of this site are located on private land, it is assumed
15 that no further survey will take place within the areas of site P-33-13791 that are not within the Project APE,
16 nor will subsurface testing take place in site areas not within the Project APE.

17 Native American parties and interested individuals will be consulted for this study, limited to 40 hours of
18 meetings, discussion and contact. An ethnographer will be retained as a subconsultant for this project.

19 Information will be updated regarding:

- 20 • Land use activities
- 21 • Spatial patterns
- 22 • Response to the natural environment
- 23 • Cultural traditions
- 24 • Topography
- 25 • Vegetation
- 26 • Circulation
- 27 • Water features
- 28 • Outcrops and objects
- 29 • Visual character and intangible qualities

The information as presently known about the several sites encompassed within this larger site will be incorporated into single document, a District Form, and a standard report prepared following the CALTRANS format. ICF will make any necessary revisions to AER.

Historical Resources Evaluation Report: It is assumed that CONSULTANT architectural historians will complete up to 15 additional DPR 523a and 523b forms for properties over 50 years old in the new alignments. Up to two update DPRs will be completed for DPR forms completed by LSA Associates in 2010 for resources in the Draft APE also present in their Mid-County technical studies. CONSULTANT architectural historians will need to complete the HRER and HPSR report and their attachments including all DPRs, APE maps, and interested parties letters. For the HRER report itself, CONSULTANT will incorporate any applicable historic information completed by CONSULTANT as part of a recent study of the Mockingbird Canyon area.

- Deliverable:*
- *Historic Property Survey Report (including APE map, ASR, and HRER)*
 - *Extended Phase I Proposal*
 - *Extended Phase I Report*
 - *Archaeological Evaluation Proposal*
 - *Archaeological Evaluation Report*
 - *Historic Landscape Evaluation Report*

3.03.02 Finding of Effect

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$28,806	\$44,263	154%	\$73,069
ICF This task has been modified to address up to three properties in the Finding of Effect; the original contract scope of work included one property.			

The original scope of work assumed that up to one property would be evaluated in the Finding of Effect (FOE). This has been increased to up to three properties. It continues to be assumed that a Finding of No Adverse Effect will result.

- Deliverable:*
- *Finding of Effect*

1 **3.03.03 Visual Impacts**

2

	Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
3 ICF	\$12,277	\$5,966	49%	\$18,243
4 URS	\$31,371	\$70,037	223%	\$101,408
5 Total	\$43,648	\$76,003	174%	\$119,651

6 ICF, URS
7 Additional cost has been added to address the additional project alternatives. In addition the number of
8 visual simulations has been increased from four to eight.

9 Under this task the number of visual simulations has been increased from four (4) to eight (8). Based on the
10 approved PES a Moderate VIA is assumed. If a higher level VIA is required then a scope and cost for this
11 additional effort will be provided.

12 *Deliverable:* • *Visual Impact Assessment*

13 **3.03.04 Noise Study**

14

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
15 \$111,259	\$124,432	112%	\$235,691

16 ICF
17 Additional cost has been included to address new requirements under the 2011 Protocol (2006 Protocol
18 was in place when original contract was executed) and to address the new project alternatives, which
19 expands the number of measurements sites and the amount of modeling that is required.

20 Work conducted to date has included field visits to identify sensitive noise receptors, coordination with the
21 team preparing the traffic study, and initial efforts to establish the existing conditions noise model. A new
22 noise Protocol was issued by CALTRANS in 2011. In the new Protocol there are two items that are now
23 required that were not considered in the Original contract. First, every type of use, even undeveloped land,
24 must now be evaluated in some way and not just locations with noise sensitive receptors. This expands the
25 area that must be evaluated in the noise analysis and modeling. Second, property owners and renters that
26 are benefitted by a sound wall must be surveyed. It is assumed that no more than ten walls will require
27 surveys. In addition, it is assumed that a Noise Work Plan will now be prepared for approval by CALTRANS
28 prior to conducting the noise analyses. The original scope identified that short-term (10 to 15 minutes
29 duration) sound-level data would be collected at up to twenty (20) representative noise-sensitive locations

throughout the area and that 24-hour measurements would be conducted at up to five (5) locations. This has now been increased to forty-five (45) and ten (10) locations, respectively.

Deliverable: • Noise Study Report

3.03.05 Noise Abatement

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$32,216	\$27,351	85%	\$59,567
ICF, AECOM This task has been expanded to include evaluation of up to 10 sound walls; the original contract included 5 sound walls.			

Under this task the number of walls to be evaluated has been increased from five (5) to ten (10).

Deliverable: • Noise Abatement Decision Report

3.03.06 Biological Resources

The following addresses out of scope and/or additional tasks that have been determined to be needed for the project.

3.03.06 a Fed, State & MSHCP Jurisdictional Delineation

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$16,572	\$130,233	786%	\$146,805
ICF The original budget included in the Jurisdictional Delineation with the NES (3.03.06m) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mid County Parkway delineation data could not be utilized to the extent anticipated • The inclusion of the La Sierra Avenue Extension (addition) • The inclusion of Lake Mathews Drive Connector • The inclusion of the I-215 Interchange (addition) • Addition of Alternatives 3 and 4 (rugged terrain/access) • Field work at level of Approved JD (change from Preliminary JD) • Separate JD document per current Corps requirements (change) 			

This scope supersedes the prior scope pertaining to delineation of federal and state water resources for this project. In 2012, a team of delineators performed a delineation (in support of an Approved Jurisdictional Determination) of the extent of potentially jurisdictional waters under both state and federal regulations within all areas of the March 2012 Alternatives 1 and 2 and a 200-foot buffer. This work also included the La Sierra

1 Avenue extension, the Lake Mathews connector, and the Interstate 215 interchange. Thus, there were four
2 scope changes in relationship to the original contracted scope (La Sierra Avenue Extension, Lake Mathews
3 Drive Connector, I-215 interchange, and no use of MCP delineation data). 2012 delineation work has been
4 error checked and is ready for reporting. The cost of this 2012 delineation work was taken from the original
5 approved budget for biological resources.

6 Since the 2012 delineation work was performed, there have been revisions to Alternative 1 at the west end,
7 revisions to Alternative 2 for cultural and burrowing owl resources, as well as inclusion of the proposed
8 roadbed removal which will include areas adjacent to the road that were not addressed in 2012. Additionally,
9 there is now Alternatives 3 and 4. Much of the revisions to Alternatives 1 and 2 were included in the 200-foot
10 study area buffer studied in 2012, but there are 16 locations that fall outside of the study area and thus need
11 field review and potentially, delineation. The majority of Alternative 3 from El Sobrante Road westward,
12 occurs outside of the 2012 delineation study area; the Alternative 4 alignment overlaps with portions of
13 Alternative 1 and Alternative 3. For Alternatives 3 and 4 we have assumed a 250-foot buffer on each side of
14 the August 2013 draft alignment is planned. This is intended to cover LOD development and any
15 adjustments to the alignment that may occur during its finalization. Evaluation for federal wetlands will follow
16 the applicable methods in the 1987 manual from the Corps of Engineers and 2006 Arid West supplement
17 from the Corps of Engineers, along with subsequent supporting materials and applicable regulations, policy,
18 and case law. Mapping will be performed to reflect the delineated boundaries of any jurisdictional waters
19 and wetlands present. Photographs representative of relevant site conditions will be taken. The additional
20 delineation data will be error-checked and processed for inclusion in the delineation report.

21 As part of this task a separate jurisdictional delineation report will be prepared that includes background
22 information, delineation methods, and the results of this delineation in text, tabular, and graphical formats.
23 The original scope included the reporting within the NES and that is no longer an approved approach by
24 Caltrans. The report will meet the standard requirements for a delineation report in the applicable regions of
25 the Corps of Engineers, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and Regional Water Quality Control
26 Board. The field determination with the Corps of Engineers and Department of Fish and Game is included.
27 Agency coordination will occur soon after the initial fieldwork has been conducted to ensure that all agency
28 concerns are addressed. Attendance at up to two (2) meetings by the ICF Project Manager and project
29 delineator with resource agencies related to jurisdictional determinations is assumed. It is assumed that

impacts to Waters of the U.S. will be greater than 0.5 acres and thus an Individual Permit will be necessary.

This scope does not include permitting services.

Deliverable: • *Jurisdictional Delineation Report*

3.03.06 b Burrowing Owl

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$58,850	\$34,398	58%	\$93,248
ICF <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The inclusion of La Sierra Extension (addition) • The inclusion of Lake Mathews Drive Connector (addition) • The 2012 footprint changes (267.1 acres); survey area was distributed sporadically across the entire alignment with some areas having difficult access due to terrain (e.g., west end of GP alignment) • Addition of Alternatives 3 and 4 (rugged terrain/access) 			

The contracted burrowing owl work occurred within the 2011 study area (May 2011 LOD + 300-foot buffer) and was completed in summer 2011. The 2011 burrowing owl work encompassed roughly 2,000 acres of land. In 2012, additional burrowing owl surveys were performed to cover new lands proposed for impact by the revisions made to Alternatives 1 and 2. With the 2012 revised footprint (+ 300-foot buffer), La Sierra Avenue extension, Lake Mathews Drive connector, and the I-215 interchange, there was 392.8 acres of land that have not been surveyed for burrowing owl in 2011. The additional 2012 work was performed under the original biological resources budget.

Currently, many of the revisions made to Alternatives 1 and 2 were covered in the 2011 and 2012 study area buffers, but two areas at the connection of the La Sierra Avenue extension and Alternative 2 that were not and need to be surveyed in 2014. In addition, portions of Alternatives 3 and 4 that do not overlap with the combined study area of 2011/2012 also need to be surveyed. This is roughly an additional 840 acres of potential habitat. The survey will consist of a burrow survey followed by four (4) visits to each area of potential habitat. The additional survey work requires GIS data processing as burrows and sign of the species are mapped. This scope includes incorporation of the results of this work into the NES.

3.03.06 c Least Bell's Vireo & Southwestern Willow Flycatcher

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$23,554	\$39,328	167%	\$62,882
ICF <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lake Mathews Drive connector and La Sierra Avenue Extension (additions) • 2012 Alt 1 & 2 realignments (change) • Addition of Alternatives 3 and 4 			

In 2011, focused surveys for both species were performed for Alternatives 1 and 2 as stated in the original scope of work. In 2012, additional survey work was performed due to footprint revisions for the Lake Mathews Drive connector and La Sierra Avenue Extension as well as many other smaller portions along the Alternative 1 alignment. This was done using the existing biological resources budget.

Potential habitat for both species is present along Alternative 3 and 4 that was not surveyed in 2011 and 2012. The study area for this task is the alignments for Alternatives 3 and 4 and a 300-foot buffer on either side. Based on MCP reporting, there is potential habitat for both species along Alternatives 3 and 4 alignments. An experienced biologist will perform a focused survey for least Bell's vireo following current USFWS survey guidelines for the species. The work will involve eight (8) visits to all potential habitats with at least ten (10) days between visits. The survey must occur within the designated survey window for the species, April 10 through July 31. The survey will map potential habitat surveyed and least Bell's vireo and brown-headed cowbird sightings. For southwestern willow flycatcher, the survey will follow the 2011 USFWS protocol for the species with a total of five (5) visits occurring within three designated survey windows. This work will be performed at the same time as the vireo work. Results of the work will be provided to USFWS (per the biologist's permit conditions) in the format of a 45-day report and annual report. This scope includes incorporation of the results of this work into the NES.

3.03.06 d Vernal Pool, Watershed & Fairy Shrimp

	Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
ICF	\$10,559	\$13,580	129%	\$24,139
GLA	\$0	\$58,557	N/A	\$58,557
TOTAL	\$10,559	\$72,137	683%	\$82,696

ICF, GLA

- Original scope of work included an assessment to determine if vernal pools are present. These were identified so the vernal pool evaluation and watershed mapping and fairy shrimp surveys are all new tasks.
- Due to drought in 2012-13 no watershed mapping performed
- La Sierra Ave extension found to have vernal pool and additional pools needed sampling for fairy shrimp
- Only partial wet season survey completed in 2012/13 and 2013/14
- Scope includes past and future work for the fairy shrimp sampling (since 2012).
- Alternatives 3 and 4 added

Vernal Pool Evaluation & Watershed Mapping

This task was not in the original scope of work. The original scope of work was for a fairy shrimp and vernal pool habitat assessment with no quantitative sampling included for the sum of \$10,599. CONSULTANT will coordinate and oversee the vernal pool evaluation and watershed mapping to assess the function and value of each the vernal pool(s) and its extent. CONSULTANT will identify vernal pools and map the watershed for up to ten (10) vernal pools. This work will entail an initial site reconnaissance to establish areas that exhibit potential for ponding and that also have suitable soils. Once vernal pools are identified, CONSULTANT will work with the COUNTY project engineer/land surveyor (assumed to be provided/performed by COUNTY) to survey the pools and associated watershed at elevation increments of 0.1 foot. Once the survey data is collected and plotted on maps overlaying the vernal pools and project limits, the potential impacts to vernal pools can be assessed. This scope includes incorporation of the results of this work into the NES.

Fairy Shrimp Focused Survey

This task was not in the original scope of work. The original scope of work was for a fairy shrimp and vernal pool habitat assessment with no quantitative sampling included for the sum of \$10,599. A wet season focused survey for fairy shrimp was performed in 2012 but due to drought conditions only two areas ponded long enough for sampling. Dry conditions in 2013 also negated the potential for wet season surveys. This scope includes both a wet and a dry season survey in up to twenty (20) pools/ponds. CONSULTANT

biologist holding the appropriate federal permit will perform this work. CONSULTANT will provide field support to check for ponded features suitable for surveying following rainfall. This scope includes the time for the multiple sampling visits as well as the 45-day reporting required by the federal permit. Results of this work will be integrated into the NES. It is assumed that no sensitive fairy shrimp species will be identified.

3.03.06 e Habitat Evaluation & Rare Plants

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$26,962	\$46,521	173%	\$73,483
ICF <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2012 for Alternative 1 and 2 realignments (change) • Lake Mathews and La Sierra extensions (additions) • I-215 Interchange (addition) • Addition of Alternatives 3 and 4 			

This task augments the original scope of services for special status (rare plants). Habitat evaluations and focused surveys for rare plants were performed in the summer of 2010 on conserved lands only (i.e., MWD, RCHCA, and RCA lands) under a separate contract and using the General Plan alignment. The study area for this work was all lands within a 200-foot buffer applied to both sides of Cajalco Road and the original General Plan (GP) alignment, not proposed LODs. In March 2011, access to some private properties was granted. Access to most private parcels did not occur until late April 2011. The study area for plants was revised March 2011 based on project LODs and again in May 2011. Further refinements occurred to the east end in June 2011 and others including the shifting of the General Plan alignment north to avoid Bureau of Land Management lands and the east (including of I-215 interchange). In the fall of 2011, the La Sierra Avenue extension and the Lake Mathews Drive connector road were added. A review of the March 2012 LOD and a 200-foot buffer (2012 study area) indicated there were lands throughout that fell outside of what was surveyed in 2010 and/or 2011. Thus, in 2012 a rare plant survey was performed on an additional 770 acres to support revisions to Alternatives 1 and 2, the La Sierra Avenue extension, the Lake Mathews connector road, and inclusion of the Interstate 215 interchange.

This scope covers a 2014 rare plant survey to be performed for the two areas at the connection of the La Sierra Avenue extension and Alternative 2 that were not surveyed in 2011 or 2012 and portions of Alternatives 3 and 4 that do not overlap with the combined study area of 2011/2012. This is roughly an additional 640 acres of potential habitat. The study area for plant surveys is the limits of disturbance (LOD)

and a 200-foot buffer, except for Alternatives 3 and 4 in which a 300-foot buffer will be applied on either side of the alignment (total width of 600 feet). Results of this work will be incorporated directly into the NES.

3.03.06 f Bat Habitat

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$0	\$28,924	N/A	\$26,924
ICF <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New task added for all Alternatives. 			

This work was not included in the original scope of work. There are several substantial rock outcroppings that are potential habitat for bat roosts and nurseries. These are located in the western third of the project alignment and encompass Alternatives 1 and 2. The project has potential to directly and indirectly impact these rock outcroppings. It is anticipated there may be several areas along Alternatives 3 and 4 that may have potential for bat roosts. A habitat evaluation (for Alts. 3 and 4) and a focused survey for the presence of bat roosts will be performed using a combination of Anabat bat detectors, the unaided ear, and visual techniques on two (2) different dates at each potential roost location. There is an estimated eight (8) locations. It is already known that bats forage over Lake Mathews, and it is important to identify any important bat roosts that may be present within the project footprint or in the near vicinity. Roost surveys must be conducted cautiously as many bat species are very sensitive to disturbance at roost sites, therefore only passive techniques are proposed to be used. The study area for this work is the proposed project footprint plus a 300-foot buffer (400-foot for Alts. 3 and 4). The results of the work will be provided in a letter-format report and incorporated into the NES. No special-status bats are covered under the WRC MSHCP and as such the potential for impacts under CEQA to bats is present. In addition, as of June 2013, a species of bat has become a candidate for state listing under CESA.

3.03.06 g Vegetation Mapping

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
Under NES	\$10,181	N/A	\$10,181
ICF (Original budget included under NES item 3.03.06m) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Realignments of Alternatives 1 and 2 in 2012 (change) • La Sierra and Lake Mathews extensions (additions) • Addition of Alternatives 3 and 4 added 			

Since the original scope, additional vegetation mapping was performed in 2012 due to footprint revisions. This task augments the scope to provide vegetation mapping for areas along Alternatives 3 and 4 that were not included in 2011 and 2012 vegetation mapping. The study area for task assumes the proposed Alternative 3 and 4 alignments and a 600-foot buffer on either side to accommodate the LOD as it is developed. Approximately 900 acres of land will be vegetation mapped. This task involves field and office work. Also, the additional field effort and survey work requires GIS data processing as well as pre-field mapping using aerials.

3.03.06 h Stake Holder Coordination

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
Under NES Budget	\$53,874	N/A	\$53,874
ICF (Original budget included under NES item 3.03.06m) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meetings with RCA, MWD, County Counsel, environmental advocacy groups, etc. • Amount of outreach to resource groups/stake holders much expanded than what was anticipated 			

This task accommodates additional coordination with the wildlife and water resource agencies, RCA, RCHCA, MWD, and Special Interest Groups given the complexity of the project. This task includes preparation and meeting time. We have assumed six (6) hours per meeting for a total of 12 meetings. We have also included GIS time for exhibit preparation at three (3) hours per meeting.

3.03.06 i Core Wildlife Corridor Analysis

	Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
ICF	\$27,678	\$17,220	62%	\$44,898
RAHN	\$0	\$16,801	N/A	\$16,801
TOTAL	\$27,678	\$34,021	123%	\$61,699

ICF, Rahn

- Corridor analysis performed for Alternatives 1 & 2 and additional realignments (change)
- La Sierra Extension (addition)
- Addition of Alternatives 3 and 4
- Field analysis of potential use of two overcrossings for Alternative 1
- Rahn has been added for technical support in wildlife corridor analysis.

The original contract currently supports qualitative corridor analysis (MSHCP Linkage/Core Corridor Evaluation) but does not include the La Sierra Avenue Extension, Lake Mathews Drive, or the number of footprint revisions to date. Additional field and office effort was required to incorporate the necessary elements into the project design. To date, an estimated 30 (field, office including GIS) hours have been incurred from the addition of the extension and connector elements and an additional 40 hours (field and office including GIS) for footprint revisions and fine-tuning. This work was performed under the existing biological resources budget. This scope now includes Alternatives 3 and 4 and qualitative input and review will be necessary. In addition, this scope add quantitative study of up to three potential Alternative 1 overpasses including the use of thermal imaging, camera stations, and scent lure.

3.03.06 j Mitigation Lands Evaluation

	Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
ICF	Under NES Budget	\$31,837	N/A	\$31,837
RBF	\$0	\$9,832	N/A	\$9,832
TOTAL	\$0	\$41,669	N/A	\$41,669

ICF (Original budget included under NES item 3.03.06m)

An extensive number of parcel evaluations have been required and additional evaluations may be required as the project moves forward. RBF has also been added for land access.

The original contract supports evaluation of potential mitigation lands. To date we have performed field evaluations and reporting on 32 parcels equaling 408 acres which was partially covered under the original

contract. We know that additional parcels will need field evaluations (not including focused surveys). This scope covers field evaluation and reporting for additional parcels for a total of 400 acres and with the work performed in up to two sets. It is required to have RBF as a field work escort for two landowners so they have been added to this effort.

3.03.06 k Mitigation Lands Focused SKR

	Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
ICF	\$0	\$5,957	N/A	\$5,957
SJM	\$0	\$31,447	N/A	\$31,447
TOTAL	\$0	\$37,404	N/A	\$37,404
ICF, SJM Required based on discussions and coordination with RCHCA.				

The original contract supports analysis of mitigation lands and a public/quasi-public mitigation lands equivalency analysis for the WRC MSHCP. To date we have performed preliminary field studies and reporting on 32 parcels equaling over 400 acres. There are additional lands under analysis and it is anticipated that focused studies including trapping for Stephens' kangaroo rat will be required at a minimum for those lands that are to serve as mitigation for RCHCA lands occupied by SKR and proposed for impact by the project.

It is not known at this point in the project what parcels will ultimately be chosen for acquisition but we do know that RCHCA will require that SKR trapping be performed on proposed mitigation lands to confirm occupation of the mitigation lands by SKR. CONSULTANT has made the following assumptions for SKR trapping on lands not yet determined.

- Trapping will consist of up to five trapping sessions.
- A trapping survey (per protocol) requires trapping for five (5) consecutive nights.

3.03.06 I RCHCA/MWD SKR Lands Focused Study

	Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
ICF	\$0	\$9,060	N/A	\$9,060
SJM	\$0	\$60,709	N/A	\$60,709
TOTAL	\$0	\$69,769	N/A	\$69,769
ICF, SJM Required based on discussions and coordination with RCHCA.				

Based on coordination with the RCHCA, trapping studies will be needed on existing RCHCA lands to confirm presence or absence of SKR on lands proposed for impact by the project. This scope provides a focused habitat evaluation and trapping performed by a recognized SKR expert. In 2012, the field work for this focused habitat evaluation was performed on all RCHCA lands within a 500-foot buffer of the 2012 LODs for Alternatives 1 and 2 using the existing biological resources budget. This scope provides a focused habitat evaluation (field portion) for MWD lands, reporting of results of the habitat evaluation for both RCHCA and MWD lands, and up to four (4) meetings with stakeholders (RCHCA, MWD, wildlife agencies). Once the wildlife agencies are in agreement on the sampling approach, a trapping study will be performed on RCHCA and MWD lands. Reporting is included. The results of this task will be summarized in the NES.

3.03.06 m Natural Environment Study

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$207,467	\$109,453	53%	\$316,920
ICF The additional effort spent to date covered the additional fieldwork performed for rare plants, burrowing owl, jurisdictional delineation, vegetation mapping, and wildlife corridor work. The NES has been started twice in an attempt to move forward with summarizing species information, existing conditions, etc. Includes addition of Alternatives 3 and 4 as well as inclusion of the LMMSHCP evaluation requirements.			

The existing scope of work includes an NES. Because effort has been expended on other forms of work under the existing budget and the addition of Alternatives 3 and 4, additional funding to provide a final NES is necessary.

Deliverable: • *Natural Environment Study*

3.03.06 n Biological Equivalent or Superior Preservation

No additional budget being requested.

3.03.06 o Equivalency Lands Analysis Report

No additional budget being requested. The current budget has been reviewed and is sufficient for the project as currently defined.

3.03.07 Paleontological Identification & Evaluation

	Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
ICF	\$32,506	\$13,789	42%	\$46,295
JAMES ALLEN	\$38,325	\$23,144	60%	\$61,469
TOTAL	\$70,831	\$36,933	52%	\$107,764
ICF, James Allen Additional cost has been included to address the additional alternatives that have been added.				

No effort has been expended to date related to this task.

Deliverable: • Paleontological Identification Report/Paleontological Evaluation Report

3.03.08 Paleontological Mitigation Plan

Budget Included under Item 3.03.07.

No effort has been expended to date related to this task.

Deliverable: • Paleontological Mitigation Plan

3.03.09 Air Quality

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$94,530	\$47,827	51%	\$142,357
ICF Baseline information has been collected. Additional cost has been included to prepare a Health Risk Assessment based on comments received during the scoping period and to for legal defensibility, and to address the additional alternatives that have been added. Also includes preparation of traffic information for expanded greenhouse gas/climate change analysis.			

Work to date has included collecting baseline air quality information and coordination with the traffic team. Based on comments received during the scoping process and in consultation with the COUNTY it has been determined that a Health Risk Assessment may be appropriate and it has been added to the scope. CONSULTANT will analyze potential health risk impacts to nearby sensitive receptors (e.g., residential uses)

1 from potential Cajalco Road mobile-source air toxics (MSAT) emissions. The following steps for evaluating
2 toxic air contaminant impacts on sensitive receptors will be used:

- 3 • Source Identification—CONSULTANT will review traffic data projections to ascertain the appropriate
4 vehicle mix (e.g., light-duty automobile, heavy-duty truck), by roadway segment, for which project
5 MSAT emissions will be developed.
- 6 • Source Characterization—CONSULTANT will use a combination of EMFAC2011, CT-EMFAC and/or
7 MOVES2010 to generate vehicle emissions factors. South Coast Air Quality Management District
8 (SCAQMD), CALTRANS and/or FHWA staff will be consulted during the development of key
9 assumptions (i.e., vehicle class, vehicle speed, emissions model) used to develop MSAT emissions
10 factors.
- 11 • Exposure Quantification—CONSULTANT will assess the impact of emitted compounds from the
12 roadway alignment using either the AERMOD model or the CAL3QHCR model. Both models are
13 Gaussian plume dispersion models approved by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and
14 SCAQMD for estimating ground level impacts from emissions sources in simple and complex
15 terrain. Final model selection will be made in consultation with SCAQMD, CALTRANS and/or FHWA
16 staff.
- 17 • Risk Characterization—The SCAQMD has established a maximum individual cancer risk
18 significance threshold of 10 in one million (10×10^{-6}) or a Hazard Index of 1.0 for noncarcinogens
19 and recommends that Lead Agencies use these significance thresholds when approving permits for
20 new or modified stationary sources. Therefore, for purposes of this assessment the SCAQMD
21 recommended thresholds will be used for evaluating potentially significant incremental impacts to off-
22 site receptors.

23 CONSULTANT will provide a stand-alone technical report that fully explains the HRA process, document all
24 modeling input assumptions, and include all emissions factor and dispersion modeling outputs.

- 25 *Deliverable:*
- *Air Quality Report*
 - *Health Risk Assessment*

3.03.10 Air Quality Conformity Report & Checklist

Included under Task 3.03.09

No effort has been expended to date related to this task.

Deliverable: • *Air Quality Conformity Analysis Report and Checklist*

3.03.11 Relocation Impacts

	Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
ICF	\$12,436	\$2,770	22%	\$15,206
EPIC	\$73,467	\$33,158	45%	\$106,625
TOTAL	\$85,903	\$35,928	42%	\$121,831
ICF, Epic Effort expanded to address additional Alternatives				

No effort has been expended to date related to this task. The assumed number of relocations related to the proposed project remains as shown in the original scope of work. If Caltrans requires additional parcels (or all parcels) to be evaluated then a scope and cost for this effort will be provided for approval.

Deliverable: • *Relocation Impact Report*

3.03.12 Water Quality Assessment Report

	Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
ICF	\$11,322	\$4,012	35%	\$15,334
URS	\$56,122	\$15,353	27%	\$71,475
TOTAL	\$67,444	\$19,365	29%	\$86,809
ICF, URS Effort expanded to address additional Alternatives				

No effort has been expended to date related to this task.

Deliverable: • *Water Quality Assessment Report*

3.03.13 Location Hydraulics & Floodplain Encroachment

	Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
ICF	\$11,322	\$4,012	35%	\$15,334
URS	\$29,484	\$28,510	97%	\$57,994
TOTAL	\$40,806	\$32,522	80%	\$73,328
ICF, URS Effort expanded to address additional Alternatives				

No effort has been expended to date related to this task. The Location Hydraulic Study (LHS) will assess project-specific design issues by modeling the channel flow upstream and through the proposed and existing bridge crossing at Temescal Wash, as well as any encroachments upon the floodplain associated with Cajalco Creek, as these are the drainages within the project area that have FEMA-designated 100-year (1-percent annual chance) floodplains. Changes in the flood flow with the proposed project will be evaluated using the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) HEC-RAS computer model in accordance with CALTRANS guidelines for preparation of the LHS. The model will be developed from cross sectional data provided by the COUNTY and peak channel flows provided by the ACOE, FEMA, Riverside County Water Conservation and Flood Control District, or other local data. If no hydrologic data is available, regression equations from the United States Geologic Survey (USGS) will be applied to compute approximate peak discharges. It is assumed that the proposed project will not result in a significant encroachment, as set forth at 23 CFR 650.105, on any 100-year floodplain. Therefore, this scope of work assumes preparation of Summary Floodplain Encroachment Report (SFER). Pursuant to requirements set forth at CALTRANS' SER, Volume 1, Chapter 17 (Floodplains), the COUNTY Engineer will sign the SFER, and ultimately approved (signed) by the CALTRANS District Local Assistance Engineer.

- Deliverable:*
- *Cajalco Creek Channelization Study Report*
 - *Location Hydraulic Study*
 - *Summary Floodplain Encroachment Report*

3.03.14 Community Impacts

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$52,600	\$26,713	51%	\$79,313
ICF Effort expanded to address additional Alternatives and new annotated outline			

Based on the increase in document type it is assumed that additional detail related to community impacts will be required in addition to addressing the additional alternatives and variations. It is assumed that no farmlands will be affected by the proposed project and that a farmland evaluation will not be required. No effort has been expended to date related to this task.

Deliverable: • *Community Impact Assessment*

3.03.15 Initial Site Assessment

	Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
ICF	\$12,065	\$4,012	33%	\$16,077
GROUP DELTA	\$33,423	\$20,800	62%	\$54,223
TOTAL	\$45,488	\$24,812	55%	\$70,300
ICF, Group Delta Site reconnaissance has been performed for Alternatives 1 and 2, as accessible. Effort expanded to address additional Alternatives.				

Site reconnaissance was completed where accessible for Alternatives 1 and 2. In addition, an EDR search was conducted for Alternatives 1 and 2. Additional reconnaissance and EDR search will be conducted for the project. CONSULTANT will prepare an Initial Site Assessment (ISA) report for the proposed project and will include project screening and completion of the ISA Checklist. The ISA will be prepared in accordance with CALTRANS and ASTM requirements. The following are the tasks to be completed.

- A review of available Site information;
- Site reconnaissance to look for indicators of potential hazardous materials releases to soil and/or groundwater;
- Review of the updated EDR database search;
- Review of available hazardous waste spill or storage files for various agencies such as Regional Water Quality Control Board, Department of Health Services and other City/County agencies and others;

- 1 • Review of selected historical aerial photos, natural gas and oil and topographic maps;
- 2 • Prepare the ISA report and summarize findings and recommendations;
- 3 • Completion of the ISA checklist, and;

4 No sampling and laboratory testing or additional effort is included in this scope of work.

5 *Deliverable:* • Initial Site Assessment

6 **3.03.16 Aerially Deposited Lead Screening**

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$0	\$21,223	N/A	\$21,223
9 Group Delta 10 New task that is now assumed based on project experience in District 8. Effort includes addressing all 11 Alternatives.			

12 Based on current experience in Caltrans' District 8, an aerially deposited lead analysis has been added. The
 13 scope for this work is presented below.

14 CONSULTANT work includes providing environmental recommendations for the design of the project and
 15 will consist of pre-field activities, field exploration, laboratory testing, environmental analyses and report
 16 preparation. Our work will be performed in accordance with the latest Caltrans ADL Guidance and design
 17 criteria.

18 The scope of work includes collection of soil samples from the unpaved areas along the project alignments at
 19 intervals of approximately one mile, testing the samples for ADL contamination, and presenting the findings
 20 in a report.

21 Pre-Field Activities: CONSULTANT will utilize our in-house Health and Safety Plan and submit a Work Plan
 22 for field activities. The Health and Safety Plan includes guidelines for the use of personal protective
 23 equipment and sampling procedures. The work plan addresses procedures of sampling and laboratory
 24 analysis.

25 Soil Sampling: CONSULTANT shall sample up to 37 locations at approximately one mile intervals along
 26 the project alignment including each proposed alternative. The sampling locations shall be dependent on
 27 surface conditions and potential interference with subsurface utilities. Hand augers will be used to advance
 28 borings and a slide-hammer sampling device will be used to collect samples. Samples will be collected a
 29 depths of approximately 6, 12, and 24 inches below the ground surface. Collected samples shall be placed

1 in a chilled cooler pending transportation to the analytical laboratory under chain of custody protocols.

2 Laboratory Analysis: ADL testing will be performed in order to support reuse under a Department of Toxic
3 Substances Control (DTSC) variance. A brief description of the analytical process is provided as follows:

- 4 • All soil samples shall be analyzed for total lead using USEPA Method 6010B.
- 5 • Samples that contain greater or equal to 50 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg) total lead shall be
6 analyzed for soluble lead using Waste Extraction Test (Citric acid extraction) and EPA Method
7 6010B for extractable lead.
- 8 • Samples that contain greater than or equal to 5 milligrams per liter (mg/l) of extractable lead using
9 WET (citric acid), shall be analyzed using WET (De-ionized [DI] extraction) and EPA Method 6010B
10 for DI extractable lead.
- 11 • Samples that contain greater than or equal to 1000 mg/kg of total lead, or greater than or equal to 5
12 mg/l of extractable lead using WET (Citric acid), shall be analyzed using the EPA Toxic
13 Characteristic Leaching Procedure (TCLP) and EPA Method 6010B for leachable lead.
- 14 • Ten percent of the samples shall be analyzed for pH by EPA Method 9045C.

15 Because this is a screening investigation CONSULTANT shall only analyze samples collected from two feet
16 below ground surface if either the 6-inch or 1-foot sample exceeds hazardous criteria.

17 Report Preparation: After the data has been gathered, it will be evaluated for technical accuracy and
18 uncertainty (data validation). A report will be prepared to summarize the survey findings. The report will
19 include:

- 20 • A description of field activities, observations, and protocols.
- 21 • Figures showing the sample collection locations.
- 22 • Tabulated results of soil sample analyses, with copies of certified analytical reports.
- 23 • Description and documentation of QA/QC procedures employed for field and laboratory work.
- 24 • Findings, conclusions, opinions, and comments.
- 25 • Recommendations for further investigation.

26 *Deliverable:* • *Limited Aerially Deposited Lead Screening Study*

1 **3.03.17 Section 4(f) Analysis**

2

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$18,800	\$158,531	843%	\$177,331

3

4 ICF

5 Effort expanded to increase number of anticipated Section 4(f) resources from one to three and now

6 assumes that an Individual rather than a *de minimis* 4(f) will be required. Original budget was for URS.

7 Section 4(f) is now under ICF and budget will be transferred as shown. If only the MWD site were to be

8 addressed and any additional sites were identified as being appropriately covered with a *de minimis* Section 4(f) then the total labor cost for this effort would be reduced from \$177,331 to \$78,750.

9 In the original contract it was assumed that one potential Section 4(f) resource would need to be addressed—

10 the Estelle Mountain Lake Mathews Reserve (Reserve) and that a *de minimis* impact finding would be

11 appropriate for this resource. Based on coordination on the project to date it is assumed that three Section

12 4(f) resources will be affected; the Reserve and two cultural resources sites. Furthermore, it is assumed

13 that a *de minimis* finding will not be appropriate for these three sites and that an Individual Section 4(f)

14 evaluation will be required to address each site. The requisite Section 4(f) analysis reporting for this project

15 would adhere to guidelines pursuant to 23 Code of Federal Regulations 771.135, as well as the reporting

16 requirements set forth in CALTRANS' Standard Environmental Reference, Volume 1, Chapter 20 [Section

17 4(f) and Related Requirements]. No effort has been expended to date related to this task.

18 **3.04 Environmental Document EIR/EIS**

19 In the original contract it was assumed that an Environmental Assessment (Complex) would be the

20 appropriate NEPA document. The type of NEPA document has now changed to an Environmental Impact

21 Statement (EIS). Therefore, the EIR/EIS format to be used will follow the annotated outline for combined

22 EIR/EISs included on CALTRANS SER at the time that the EIR/EIS document is initiated.

23 The submittals and deliverables identified in the Original contract remain the same with the exception of the

24 NEPA document being an EIS and one additional review cycle being added.

3.04.01 Draft Environmental Document

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$318,956	\$432,866	136%	\$751,822

ICF (Includes Item 3.04.10)
 Effort expanded to address additional Alternatives. Also, document has been revised from an EIR/EA to an EIR/EIS. The NEPA document revision was based on direction from CALTRANS (NEPA lead agency).

The following submittals are assumed.

3.04.01 a Screencheck Draft EIR/EIS (for County Review)

3.04.01 b Revised Screencheck Draft EIR/EIS (to COUNTY and CALTRANS for review)

3.04.01 c Administrative Draft EIR/EIS (to COUNTY and CALTRANS for review)

3.04.01 d Draft EIR/EIS

- Submittal (1) to COUNTY and CALTRANS
- Submittal (2) to COUNTY and CALTRANS (including CALTRANS NEPA Quality Control review)
- Submittal (3) to COUNTY and CALTRANS (including CALTRANS HQ and Legal reviews)

3.04.01 e Final Draft EIR/EIS (to COUNTY and CALTRANS for review/concurrence)

Additional revisions and submittals of Draft EIR/EIS beyond those identified above would be considered out of scope. In this situation a scope and cost will be submitted to the COUNTY for approval. If the revisions were required due to the quality of the submittal made by CONSULTANT then these revisions would not be considered out of scope.

No effort has been expended to date related to this task.

- Deliverable:*
- *Screencheck Draft EIR/EIS (4 copies to the COUNTY)*
 - *Revised Screencheck Draft EIR/EIS, Comment/Response Matrix, External QC Form, Environmental Document Review Checklist (8 copies to CALTRANS and 2 copies to the COUNTY)*
 - *Administrative Draft EIR/EIS, Comment/Response Matrix, External QC Form, Environmental Document Review Checklist (8 copies to CALTRANS and 2 copies to the COUNTY)*
 - *Draft EIR/EIS (1), Comment/Response Matrix, External QC Form, Environmental Document Review Checklist (8 copies to CALTRANS and 2 copies to the COUNTY)*

- Draft EIR/EIS (2), Comment/Response Matrix, External QC Form, Environmental Document Review Checklist (8 copies to CALTRANS and 2 copies to the COUNTY)
- Draft EIR/EIS (3), Comment/Response Matrix, External QC Form, Environmental Document Review Checklist (8 copies to CALTRANS and 2 copies to the COUNTY)
- Final Draft EIR/EIS Comment/Response Matrix, External QC Form, Environmental Document Review Checklist (8 copies to CALTRANS and 2 copies to the COUNTY)

3.04.02 Cumulative Impacts

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$15,338	\$0	N/A	N/A
ICF This was a separate task previously. It has not been incorporated under the Environmental Document task.			

No additional budget requested. This information was previously being prepared by URS and is now under the environmental document tasks.

3.04.03 Notice of Availability and Public Meetings

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$30,559	\$23,249	76%	\$53,808
ICF Previously identified public meetings have been changed to public hearings based on document type and include the added Alternatives.			

The scope of work from the original contract remains the same with the exception of a Notice of Availability/Notice of Public Hearing being prepared for publication in the newspaper and a Notice of Availability being prepared for publication in the Federal Register by FHWA (transmitted by CALTRANS to FHWA). In addition, the two public information meetings that were previously identified will be public hearings. No effort has been expended to date related to this task.

Deliverable: • Notice of Availability

3.04.04 Response to Comments

	Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
ICF	\$28,024	\$66,449	237%	\$94,473
ITERIS	\$10,803	\$5,792	54%	\$16,595
TOTAL	\$38,827	\$72,241	186%	\$111,068

ICF, Iteris

Effort expanded to address anticipated additional comments based on increased document level and the inclusion of additional alternatives.

No effort has been expended to date related to this task.

Deliverable: • Responses to Comments on the Draft ED

3.04.05 Final Environmental Document EIR/EIS

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$159,375	\$243,807	153%	\$403,182

ICF (Includes Item 3.04.10)

Effort expanded to address increased document type and additional Alternatives.

The submittals and deliverables identified in the original contract remain the same with the exception of the NEPA document being an EIS and one additional review being added. The following submittals are assumed.

3.04.05 a Screencheck Final EIR/EIS (for County Review)

3.04.05 b Administrative Draft Final EIR/EIS (to COUNTY and CALTRANS for review)

3.04.05 c Draft Final EIR/EIS

- Submittal (1) to COUNTY and CALTRANS
- Submittal (2) to COUNTY and CALTRANS (including CALTRANS NEPA Quality Control review)
- Submittal (3) to COUNTY and CALTRANS (including CALTRANS HQ and Legal reviews)

3.04.05 d Final EIR/EIS (to COUNTY and CALTRANS for review/concurrence)

Additional revisions and submittals of Final EIR/EIS beyond those identified above would be considered out of scope. In this situation a scope and cost will be submitted to the COUNTY for approval. If the revisions were required due to the quality of the submittal made by CONSULTANT then these revisions would not be considered out of scope.

No effort has been expended to date related to this task.

- Deliverable:**
- Screencheck Final EIR/EIS (4 copies to the COUNTY)
 - Administrative Final EIR/EIS, Comment/Response Matrix, External QC Form, Environmental Document Review Checklist (8 copies to CALTRANS and 2 copies to the COUNTY)
 - Draft Final EIR/EIS (1), Comment/Response Matrix, External QC Form, Environmental Document Review Checklist (8 copies to CALTRANS and 2 copies to the COUNTY)
 - Draft Final EIR/EIS (2), Comment/Response Matrix, External QC Form, Environmental Document Review Checklist (8 copies to CALTRANS and 2 copies to the COUNTY)
 - Draft Final EIR/EIS (3), Comment/Response Matrix, External QC Form, Environmental Document Review Checklist (8 copies to CALTRANS and 2 copies to the COUNTY)
 - Final Draft EIR/EIS Comment/Response Matrix, External QC Form, Environmental Document Review Checklist (8 copies to CALTRANS and 2 copies to the COUNTY)

3.04.06 Environmental Commitments Record

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$4,144	\$4,053	98%	\$8,197
ICF Effort expanded to address additional Alternatives and anticipated increase in measures based on revised environmental document type.			

No effort has been expended to date related to this task.

- Deliverable:**
- Environmental Commitments Record

3.04.07 CEQA Findings

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$11,382	\$8,825	78%	\$20,207
ICF Effort expanded to address additional Alternatives.			

No effort has been expended to date related to this task.

Deliverable: • Findings of Fact (if necessary, a Statement of Overriding Considerations)

3.04.08 Notice of Determination

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$749	None	None	\$749
ICF No change to this item.			

No effort has been expended to date related to this task and no augment is requested.

Deliverable: • Notice of Determination

3.04.09 Federal Register Notice

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$1,588	Deleted	Deleted	Deleted
ICF With change to an EIS this task has been superseded by the Record of Decision.			

This task is replaced by the Record of Decision Task. No effort has been expended to date related to this task and no effort is included.

Deliverable: • Federal Register Notice (for statute of limitations)

3.04.10 MWD Habitat Conservation Plan

Budget included under Items 3.04.01 and 3.04.05

Based on coordination to date with MWD, the Metropolitan Water District Habitat Conservation Plan (MWD HCP) will require modification and this effort has been identified as needing to be included in the EIR/EIS.

The reopening and addressing of the MWD HCP as it relates to the proposed project will be addressed within the environmental document for the Cajalco Road project. It is assumed that modifications to the MWD HCP will strictly be to address the Cajalco Road project and will not address other areas in the HCP. It

is also assumed that the understanding of the species will still be consistent with what is associated with the Plan. It is assumed that MWD will be responsible for modifying the HCP. The NEPA/CEQA documentation related to the MWD HCP will primarily focus on the biological resources related to the HCP. It is assumed that the MWD HCP will be updated in a timely manner by MWD so that it does not hold up the Cajalco Road EIR/EIS schedule. No specific deliverables are included as all information will be included in the Draft and Final EIR/EIS. This is a new task that was not included in the original contract. Coordination and evaluation of options for addressing the MWD HCP have been conducted by CONSULTANT including attendance at meetings with County Counsel. It is assumed that up to five additional meetings with MWD will be attended by the CONSULTANT project manager, environmental lead, lead biologist, and engineering lead. These hours for the meetings are included under the "Meetings" task and are in addition to meetings identified under that task.

3.04.11 Record of Decision

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$0	\$32,492	N/A	\$32,492
ICF A ROD is now required due to the change in NEPA document type.			

CONSULTANT will prepare a Record of Decision (ROD) that will include, as appropriate, identification of the selected alternative, the alternatives considered, the rationale for identification of the selected alternative, summary of beneficial environmental impacts, summary of adverse environmental impacts and mitigation, monitoring and enforcement program, and response to comments on the final EIS. The ROD will be submitted to CALTRANS for review and for publication in the Federal Register by FHWA (to be transmitted by CALTRANS). A statute of limitations notification as previously included in the Original contract will no longer be prepared. This is a new task that was not included in the Original contract.

Deliverable: • *Draft and Final Record of Decision*

3.04.12 Public Outreach

	Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
ICF	\$33,571	\$15,704	47%	\$49,275
ARELLANO	\$112,000	\$57,190	51%	\$169,190
TOTAL	\$145,571	\$72,894	50%	\$218,465

ICF, Arellano

Effort expanded to address additional public outreach that has been required for the project due to additional stakeholder and scoping meetings, and for anticipated additional coordination that will be required.

CONSULTANT will provide public outreach subconsultant services on a time and materials basis as directed by the COUNTY. If effort is required beyond the approved budget amount then a scope and fee will be submitted to the COUNTY for approval prior to conducting this additional effort. The amount presented in the above summary includes public outreach effort for CONSULTANT team. To date approximately 75 percent of the original budget for this task has been expended.

T4 PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING TASKS

4.01 Review As-Built & Record Data

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$12,404	\$5,728	46%	\$18,132

AECOM

Original scope for Alternative 1 and 2 plus additional effort on preliminary assessment of El Sobrante Road alignment completed to date. Effort expanded to address additional alternatives.

CONSULTANT completed the original scope of this task for Alternative 1 and 2. In addition, the COUNTY requested a preliminary assessment of a conceptual alignment along El Sobrante Road from Cajalco Road to west of La Sierra Avenue. CONSULTANT developed a conceptual alignment that generally followed El Sobrante Road. CONSULTANT obtained and reviewed as-built and record data of the existing road, Lake Mathews dam, Metropolitan Water District (MWD) feeder lines, water outlet works, and nearby developments. Since existing topo was not available, CONSULTANT obtained topographic mapping and digitized in the contours to develop the necessary surfaces to assess the grading footprints. CONSULTANT identified critical constraints that determined that the El Sobrante alignment was not feasible and did not

1 need to be considered as a viable alternative.

2 Effort has been added to address the additional project Alternatives.

3 **4.02 Traffic**

4 **4.02.01 Data Collection, Existing LOS & Future Volumes**

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$60,679	\$87,969	145%	\$148,648

7 Iteris

8 To date data has been collected for an additional 35 intersections (compared to original assumption of
9 15). Additional effort is assumed for inclusion of additional alternatives.

10 Traffic Methodology Memorandum: A traffic methodology memo was prepared and submitted to the
11 COUNTY for approval. Several cycles of revisions were made to the memorandum based on the comments
12 from the COUNTY and due to the expansion of the project study area. A revised Traffic Methodology
13 Memorandum was submitted to CALTRANS and was approved on August 1, 2012. It is assumed that the
14 Traffic Methodology Memorandum will not need to be revised and no effort related to this task is assumed or
15 included.

16 *Deliverable:* • Traffic Methodology Memorandum

17 **4.02.01 a Data Collection**

18 In consultation with the COUNTY, CONSULTANT has conducted intersection turning movement counts at 50
19 locations; an increase of 35 locations over the original scope. It is assumed that data will need to be
20 collected at up to four (4) additional intersections.

21 **4.02.01 b Existing LOS**

22 In consultation with the COUNTY, CONSULTANT has evaluated existing AM and PM peak hour LOS at an
23 additional 32 intersections, and an additional 90 additional freeway/roadway segments including ramp
24 merge/diverge analyses and freeway basic and weaving analyses. It is assumed that operational analysis
25 will need to be conducted at up to four (4) additional intersections.

26 **4.02.01 c Future Traffic Volumes**

27 CONSULTANT developed traffic forecasts for two project design alternatives (Alternative 1 and Alternative 2)
28 and a no-project alternative for project opening year (2018), and design year (2038) scenarios. The traffic
29 forecasts were developed for the expanded study area. The number of study intersections and

freeway/roadway segments were expanded by 32 and 90 locations, respectively, beyond the original scope of work. A draft traffic volume development report was submitted, which included the above expanded level of effort, to CALTRANS for review and comment. CALTRANS' completed their review and provided comments.

CONSULTANT will develop traffic forecasts for the two new project alternatives (Alternative 3 and Alternative 4) and two alternatives with ultimate configuration on Cajalco Road (6-lanes), and revise the traffic forecasts for the three original alternatives (No-Project, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2). CONSULTANT will post-process the raw model volumes to develop refined future traffic volumes. CONSULTANT will revise the Traffic Volume Development Report to address the additional 58 study intersections and freeway/roadway segments and re-submit the report for review after incorporating the comments from CALTRANS.

Deliverable: • Traffic Volume Forecast Development Report

4.02.02 Screening Analysis & Alternative Evaluation

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$27,445	\$38,274	139%	\$65,719
Iteris Effort to date has included additional evaluations of scenarios. Effort is included to address the additional Alternatives that have been added. Initial scope included two alignments and six alignments/scenarios have been evaluated to date.			

Deliverable: • Speed/VMT Tables (in 5-mph Speed Bins)

4.02.02 a Screen Analysis

CONSULTANT conducted preliminary model runs and generated ADT volume plots for six alignment alternatives for screening analysis. These six alternatives included: 2035 No Build, 2035 No Build Test (with El Sobrante at current configuration), 2035 Alternative 1, 2035 Alternative 1 Test (with El Sobrante at current configuration), 2035 Alternative 3, and 2035 Alternative 4. CONSULTANT also generated ADT plots for an additional modeling scenario (General Plan Buildout). In addition to the ADT volume plots, CONSULTANT also developed PM peak hour and daily Volume-to-Capacity ratio (V/C) plots for all scenarios. CONSULTANT also generated Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), Vehicle Hours Traveled (VHT), Average Speed, and Travel Time data for all six alternatives. CONSULTANT documented the results of the analysis in a Technical Memorandum and also made two sets of revisions to the memorandum based on the

1 comments from the Project Team. It is not anticipated that any revisions to the Screening Analysis Technical
 2 Memorandum will be required and no effort is assumed or included.

3 *Deliverable:* • Alignment Screening Analysis Technical Memorandum

4 **4.02.02 b Alternative Evaluation**

5 Original contract scope of work identified the evaluation of advantages and disadvantages for traffic
 6 operations of a maximum of two alignment alternatives. CONSULTANT has evaluated the advantages and
 7 disadvantages of traffic operations of six alignment alternatives (four additional alternatives beyond the
 8 Original contract) using various area-wide and corridor-wide performance indicators. These included, VMT,
 9 VHT, average speeds and travel times, which were developed based on running the modeling scenarios.
 10 The results of these analyses were included in the screening analysis technical memorandum. It is not
 11 anticipated that any additional work on this task will be required and no effort is assumed or included.

12 **4.02.03 Operations**

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$21,334	\$122,038	572%	\$143,372
15 Iteris 16 Effort expanded to address additional Alternatives and increase of intersections from 32 to 90.			

17 **4.02.03 a Open Year Operations**

18 No work has been conducted to date related to this subtask. The number of study intersections and
 19 freeway/roadway segments were expanded by 32 and 90, respectively, beyond the original scope of work
 20 and the project alternatives were expanded to six build alternatives. This is assumed in this scope of work.

21 **4.02.03 b Interim Year Operations**

22 No work has been conducted to date on Interim Year (2028) operations.

23 **4.02.03 c Design Year Operations**

24 CONSULTANT has performed preliminary operations analysis for intersections along Cajalco Road to help
 25 determine the need for left-turn lanes and queue storage lengths as input to the design team. The number of
 26 study intersections and freeway/roadway segments were expanded by 32 and 90, respectively, beyond the
 27 original scope of work and the project alternatives were expanded to six build alternatives. This is assumed
 28 in this scope of work.
 29

4.02.03 d Impact Analysis

No work has been conducted to date related to this subtask. The number of study intersections and freeway/roadway segments were expanded by 32 and 90, respectively, beyond the original scope of work and the project alternatives were expanded to six build alternatives. This is assumed in this scope of work.

4.02.04 Mitigation Measures

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$23,684	\$28,979	122%	\$52,663
Iteris Effort expanded to address additional Alternatives and increase of intersections from 32 to 90.			

No work has been conducted to date related to this subtask. The number of study intersections and freeway/roadway segments were expanded by 32 and 90, respectively, beyond the original scope of work and the project alternatives were expanded to six build alternatives. This is assumed in this scope of work.

4.02.05 Traffic Index Technical Memorandum

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$5,432	\$7,613	140%	\$13,045
Iteris Effort expanded to address additional Alternatives.			

No work has been conducted to date related to this subtask. The number of project alternatives has been expanded to six build alternatives. This is assumed in this scope of work.

Deliverable: • Traffic Index Technical Memorandum

4.02.06 Draft Traffic Study

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$29,737	\$31,557	106%	\$61,294
Iteris Effort expanded to address increased study area and additional alternatives.			

Iteris has done technical analysis on intersections and segments for scenarios based on preliminary forecasts that have been developed. No work has been conducted to date related to drafting of the report

4.02.07 Final Traffic Study

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$16,779	\$14,753	88%	\$31,532
Iteris Effort expanded to address additional Alternatives and increase of intersections from 32 to 90.			

No work has been conducted to date related to this subtask. The number of study intersections and freeway/roadway segments were expanded by 32 and 90, respectively, beyond the original scope of work and the project alternatives were expanded to six build alternatives. This is assumed in this scope of work.

Deliverable: • Traffic Operations Analysis Report

4.03 Existing Utilities Data

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$24,249	\$5,220	22%	\$29,469
AECOM Original scope for Alternative 1 and 2 plus additional effort on preliminary assessment of El Sobrante Road alignment completed to date. Effort expanded to address additional alternatives.			

CONSULTANT completed the original scope of this task for Alternative 1 and 2 plus the preliminary assessment of a conceptual alignment along El Sobrante Road as described in item 43.

Effort has been added to address the additional project Alternatives.

4.04 Survey Coordination with COUNTY

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$7,058	\$2,306	33%	\$9,364
AECOM Original scope for Alternative 1 and 2 plus additional effort on preliminary assessment of El Sobrante Road alignment completed to date. Effort expanded to address additional alternatives.			

CONSULTANT completed the original scope of this task for Alternative 1 and 2 plus the preliminary assessment of a conceptual alignment along El Sobrante Road as described in Item 43.

Effort has been added to address the additional project Alternatives.

4.05 Hydrology & Hydraulic Report

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$89,393	\$58,290	65%	\$147,683
AECOM Analysis for original alternatives is approximately 90 percent complete; additional budget is needed for effort related to the additional alternatives that have been added			

The hydrology/hydraulic/drainage analyses have been approximately 90 percent completed for Alternatives 1 and 2. CONSULTANT has also performed the following additional drainage related tasks outside the original scope as required by the COUNTY:

- Preliminary investigations at Brown Street. The efforts included a field meeting and developing preliminary concept alternatives for addressing a street flooding problem
- A request was made by the COUNTY regarding a property owner inquiry about the drainage and grading condition near the Alexander Street and Cajalco Road intersection where an interim traffic signal improvement is proposed. CONSULTANT reviewed the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFC&WCD) master drainage plan, drainage tributary areas, and potential discharge points. CONSULTANT identified some possible alternatives for ultimate disposition of the drainage. The ultimate disposition of the drainage along Cajalco Road in this portion of the project is beyond the scope of the initial phase improvements in this section of Cajalco Road.
- Review flooding issue at Decker Road

The project has been expanded to include additional alignment study for Alternatives that have been added; hence additional drainage analyses are needed.

- Deliverable:*
- *Hydrology and Hydraulics Analysis*
 - *Drainage Design Report*
 - *Bridge Hydraulic Analysis*

4.06 WQMP & BMP Feasibility Study

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$67,170	\$34,140	51%	\$101,310
AECOM BMP feasibility study/WQMP for Alternatives 1 and 2 is approximately 90 percent complete; additional budget is needed for effort related to the additional alternatives that have been added.			

The BMP feasibility study and WQMP have been approximately 90 percent completed for Alternative 1 and 2. The project has been expanded to include additional alignment study for new Alternative 3 and 4; hence additional BMP feasibility studies and WQMP are needed.

Deliverable: • Water Quality Management Plan

4.07 Site Assessment & Identify Constraints

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$26,756	\$10,825	40%	\$37,581
AECOM Original scope for Alternative 1 and 2 plus additional effort on preliminary assessment of El Sobrante Road alignment completed to date. Effort expanded to address additional alternatives.			

CONSULTANT completed the original scope of this task for Alternative 1 and 2 plus the preliminary assessment of a conceptual alignment along El Sobrante Road as described in item 43.

Effort has been added to address the additional project Alternatives.

4.08 Planning Studies & Concept Alignment Alternatives

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$365,246	\$587,074	161%	\$952,320
AECOM (See also Item 3.01) Original scope for Alternative 1 and 2 completed. Effort expanded to address additional alternatives.			

CONSULTANT completed the original scope of this task for Alternatives 1 and 2 plus additional effort on potential alignment tweak for Alternative 1 and 2 for avoidance of cultural sites; and initial feasibility study of Alternative 3 and 4 alignments. In the cost estimate the cost of the overlapping area between the Alternative 3 and Alternative 4 alignments has been included under Alternative 3. Therefore, the cost for Alternative 3 is proportionally higher than for Alternative 4. The project has been expanded to include the additional project

1 Alternatives. The alternatives included in the CONSULTANT cost for this task are as follows.

- 2 • Alternatives for avoidance of MWD & cultural sites
- 3 • Additional alignment study - Alt 3
- 4 • Additional alignment study - Alt 4
- 5 • Additional study - Alt 1 ultimate 6-lane condition
- 6 • Additional study - Alt 2 ultimate 6-lane condition

- 7 *Deliverable:*
- 8 • Alternatives Evaluation Report/Planning Report
 - 9 • Concept Alternatives Layouts

9 **4.09 Draft Preliminary Cost Estimates**

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$42,656	\$19,589	46%	\$62,245
AECOM Original scope for Alternative 1 and 2 completed. Effort expanded to address additional alternatives.			

14 CONSULTANT completed the original scope of this task for Alternative 1 and 2.

15 Effort has been added to address the additional project Alternatives.

16 **4.10 Evaluate Concept Alignment Alternatives**

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$44,470	\$10,476	24%	\$54,946
AECOM Original scope for Alternative 1 and 2 completed. Effort expanded to address additional alternatives.			

21 CONSULTANT completed the original scope of this task for Alternative 1 and 2.

22 Effort has been added to address the additional project Alternatives.

23 **4.11 Prepare Conceptual Alignment Report**

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$39,209	\$28,595	73%	\$67,804
AECOM Conceptual alignment report for the original Alternative 1 and 2 partially completed. Remaining effort to complete the report for Alternative 1 and 2 and additional effort to address additional alternatives needed.			

29 CONSULTANT has partially completed the conceptual alignment report for Alternative 1 and 2.

In addition to the remaining effort to complete the report for Alternative 1 and 2, effort has been added to address the additional project Alternatives.

4.12 Develop Final Alternatives Alignment

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$308,850	\$161,626	52%	\$470,476

AECOM

The alignments for Alternative 1 and 2 have been developed based on the original alignment concepts but have since evolved as a result of new topo mapping; extensions of project limits; addition of road linkages due to community outreach comments; and revelation of cultural sites within the original alignment corridors. Effort expanded to address additional alternatives.

CONSULTANT has developed the alignments for Alternative 1 and 2 based on the original alignment concepts but the alignment designs have since evolved as a result of the following events:

- Due to unavailability of the new topo when the project first started, the project concept alignments were developed by converting the metric topo from the Mid-County Parkway (MCP) project into imperial units. The old topo was from several years ago and there have been new improvements since the old topo was flown. In addition, the new topo will be on a new datum. CONSULTANT recreated the alignments onto the new topo, reran earthwork quantities, and made adjustments based on the newer topo.
- The easterly project limit was extended from Harvill Street to the railroad bridge adjacent to the I-215/Ramona Expressway interchange. Roadway layouts and profiles were developed for the extended project limits. A structures Advanced Planning Study (APS) was prepared for the proposed bridge widening over the railroad right-of-way. Cost estimates of the proposed improvements were prepared. Typical sections and exhibits were updated to reflect the revised project limits.
- In response to community outreach comments, it was requested that an alignment be developed for the extension of La Sierra Avenue south to the Alternative 2 alignment. Alignments and exhibits were prepared and/or revised to reflect the extended alignment. Assessments of impact acreage, impact footprint, and wildlife crossings were performed. Cost estimates of the proposed extension improvements were prepared.
- In response to community comments and the input gathered from local residents, additional secondary emergency access (Lake Mathews Dr connection) was developed to address the fire safety concern of the community at Hollis Lane.

- Due to the revelation of cultural sites, the alignment designs were adjusted to avoid or accommodate some of the significant cultural features.

Effort has been added to address the additional project Alternatives.

Deliverable: • Plans and Profiles of the Final Alternatives

4.13 Structures Preliminary Geotechnical Reports

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$28,377	\$166,065	585%	\$194,442
Group Delta Additional bridges and retaining walls beyond those included in the original scope have been evaluated and more will be required for evaluation with the additional alternatives.			

It has been identified that a number of additional bridges beyond those assumed in the original contract, along with a number of mechanically stabilized earth (MSE) and other retaining walls, will require Planning Studies and cost estimates to be prepared. These items require Structures Preliminary Geotechnical Reports (SPGRs) in support of the Advance Planning Studies and cost estimates for the additional structures. The original scope of work included one roadway Preliminary Geotechnical Report and one SPGR for the Temescal Wash Bridge. There are now additional bridges along with retaining walls that require SPGRs as identified below.

Alternative 3

- A brand new bridge over Temescal Wash at the new Alternative 3 alignment as it branches out from existing Cajalco Rd – 400’ L x 40’ H potentially
- The existing bridge over Temescal Wash at the old two-lane Cajalco Rd may still need to be replaced
- A new bridge over a creek at the northern portion (which could potentially serve as large wildlife crossing – 50’ L x 15’ H potentially)

Alternative 4

- A new bridge over Lake Mathews spillway channel – 100’ L x 50’ H potentially
- A new bridge over MWD maintenance access area (which could potentially serve as large wildlife crossing - 800’ L x 100’ H potentially)
- Additional bridge on realigned La Sierra Avenue between El Sobrante and Cajalco

1 Common for Alternatives 3 and 4

- 2 • A new bridge near Cajalco/Smith intersection –

3 Common for all alternatives

- 4 • Barton St Bridge
- 5 • Bridge No. 268 (Alt 1) – single span creek crossing at Sta 269
- 6 • Bridge No. 161 (Alt 2) –3-span at Sta 154
- 7 • Bridge No. 314 (Alt 2) – single span creek crossing at Sta 307
- 8 • Bridge No. 73 (Alt 2) – 3-span canyon crossing at Sta 75

9 Additional bridges for wildlife crossing

- 10 • Alt 1 – multiuse overpass at Sta 96
- 11 • Alt 1 - multiuse overpass at Sta 240
- 12 • Alt 2 - multiuse overpass at Sta 94
- 13 • Alt 2 - multiuse overpass at Sta 123
- 14 • Alt 2 - multiuse overpass at Sta 132
- 15 • Alt 2 - multiuse overpass at Sta 177
- 16 • Alt 2 - multiuse overpass at Sta 197

17 East End (Alternatives 1 and 2)

- 18 • Ramona Expressway Overhead (Widen) – 3-span Railroad Bridge
- 19 • Bridge Number 614 – single span creek crossing at Harley John Rd and Cajalco Rd
- 20 • Bridge Number 740 – single span creek crossing at Sta. 740 of Cajalco

- 21 *Deliverable:* • Structures Preliminary Geotechnical Report
- 22 • Preliminary Geotechnical Report

23 Additional Deliverables:

- 24 • 22 additional SPGRs, one for each bridge structure
- 25 • 1 additional SPGR covering all retaining walls in one report
- 26 • 1 Roadway Geotechnical Report to cover the entire alignment and various alternatives
- 27
- 28
- 29

4.14 Structural Advance Planning Studies

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$127,992	\$63,821	50%	\$191,813
AECOM APS for bridges and retaining walls originally identified for Alternative 1 and 2 completed. Effort expanded to address additional alternatives.			

CONSULTANT has completed the APS for bridges and retaining walls originally identified for Alternative 1 and 2.

Effort has been added to address the additional project Alternatives.

Deliverables:

- *Advanced Planning Studies*

4.15 Staging & Constructability Review

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$38,650	\$19,864	51%	\$58,514
AECOM Effort expanded to address additional alternatives.			

No effort has been expended to date related to this task.

Effort has been added to address the additional project Alternatives.

4.16 Identify Utility Conflicts & Impacts

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$10,775	\$5,793	54%	\$16,568
AECOM Additional effort to address additional alternatives needed.			

No effort has been expended to date related to this task.

Effort has been added to address the additional project Alternatives.

4.17 Right-of-Way Requirements

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$20,623	\$9,845	48%	\$30,468
AECOM Additional effort to address additional alternatives needed.			

No effort has been expended to date related to this task.

In addition to the original scope for Alternative 1 and 2, effort has been added to address the additional project Alternatives.

4.18 Design Exceptions

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$12,596	\$6,248	50%	\$18,844
AECOM Effort expanded to address additional alternatives.			

No effort has been expended to date related to this task.

In addition to the original scope for Alternative 1 and 2, effort has been added to address the additional project Alternatives.

4.19 Final Preliminary Cost Estimates

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$53,548	\$34,862	65%	\$88,410
AECOM Effort expanded to address additional alternatives.			

No effort has been expended to date related to this task.

In addition to the original scope for Alternative 1 and 2, effort has been added to address the additional project Alternatives.

4.20 Project Report Equivalent

	Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
ICF	\$40,632	\$4,895	12%	\$45,527
AECOM	\$60,609	\$79,804	132%	\$140,413
TOTAL	\$101,241	\$84,699	84%	\$185,940
ICF, AECOM Effort expanded to address additional alternatives.				

No effort has been expended to date related to this task.

In addition to the original scope for Alternative 1 and 2, effort has been added to address the additional project Alternatives.

Deliverable: • *Project Report Equivalent*

4.21 Value Engineering

	Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
ICF	\$17,198	\$1,786	10%	\$18,984
VMS	\$34,689	\$3,165	9%	\$37,854
TOTAL	\$51,887	\$4,951	10%	\$56,838
ICF, VMS Effort expanded to address additional Alternatives.				

No work has been conducted to date related to this task.

Deliverable: • *Value Analysis Report*

4.22 Presentation Exhibits

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$53,548	\$3,603	7%	\$57,151
AECOM Effort expanded to address additional alternatives.			

No effort has been expended to date related to this task.

In addition to the original scope for Alternative 1 and 2, effort has been added to address the additional project Alternatives.

Deliverable: • *Presentation Exhibits of Alternatives*

4.23 Video for Public Outreach

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$0	\$15,895	N/A	\$15,895
AECOM New task performed for Alternative 1 and 2 and additional effort anticipated for additional alternatives.			

CONSULTANT prepared a 3D video of the Project for the public outreach meetings and the project website, as required by the COUNTY.

Additional effort is anticipated for this task for the new project alternatives.

Deliverable: • *3D Video*

4.24 Coordinate & Review Development Projects

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$0	\$32,373	N/A	\$32,373
AECOM New task performed for new development project adjacent to Cajalco Road. Additional effort anticipated for future developments (up to 4 projects).			

CONSULTANT has performed plan review and coordination on the following development project adjacent to Cajalco Rd:

- Proposed gas station development near Brown Street

Additional effort is anticipated for this task for future developments, consisting of either developer or interim County projects (assumed up to four [4] projects total).

4.25 Coordination Work with RCFC&WCD

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$0	\$80,703	N/A	\$80,703
AECOM Additional coordination effort with RCFC&WCD on Cajalco Creek crossings			

Additional coordination work with RCFC&WCD is needed to resolve the design and implementation issues on Cajalco Creek crossings.

4.26 Environmental Document Coordination

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$31,175	\$27,263	87%	\$58,438
AECOM No effort has been expended to date related to this task.			

No effort has been expended to date related to this task.

4.27 Outreach & Coordination for EIS

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$0	\$35,099	N/A	\$35,099
AECOM New task performed and anticipated due to the change in the environmental document type (EIS)			

In April 2012, CALTRANS directed that the environmental document be revised to an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The additional efforts have included extra public outreach meetings, additional adjustments of current alignment alternatives, and additional engineering support for the environmental document.

Additional effort is anticipated for this task for the remainder of the project.

4.28 NADR Engineering Support

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$0	23,255	N/A	\$23,255
AECOM New task to provide engineering support for Noise Abatement Decision Report (see also Task 3.03.05)			

This new task is to provide engineering support for Noise Abatement Decision Report.

4.29 Provide Engineering Support for Section 4(f)

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$0	\$23,704	N/A	\$23,704
AECOM New task to provide support for Section 4(f) alternatives analysis.			

This new task is for the assessment and engineering support for Section 4(f) alternatives analysis.

4.30 Wildlife Crossing Assessment

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$0	\$35,171	N/A	\$35,171
AECOM New task performed and anticipated for wildlife crossing assessment and engineering support			

This new task is for the assessment and engineering support for potential wildlife crossings identified by the environmental study.

Additional effort is anticipated for this task for the remainder of the original alternatives (Alternatives 2 and 3). Effort has also been added to address the additional project Alternatives.

4.31 Wildlife Crossing Bridge Structures

Original Budget:	Add Proposed:	% Increase:	Total at Completion:
\$0	\$67,048	N/A	\$67,048
AECOM New task anticipated for wildlife crossing bridge structures APS			

This new task is for the Advanced Planning Study for wildlife crossing overpass structures (scope assumes five [5] overcrossing structures will be evaluated).

**AMENDMENT 1 • APPENDIX C1 • PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING AND ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION
FEE PROPOSAL WORKSHEETS**

Cajalco Road Widening Project Fee Proposal Summary

July 31, 2014

COMPANIES	ORIGINAL	AMENDMENT 1	% INCREASE	TOTAL
ICF Jones & Stokes Prime	\$ 2,594,213.45	\$ 2,864,069.80	110%	\$ 5,458,283.25
AECOM/LAN Engineering/Design	\$ 1,541,420.41	\$ 1,600,117.96	104%	\$ 3,141,538.37
Iteris Traffic	\$ 346,162.66	\$ 409,641.75	118%	\$ 755,804.41
URS Water Quality, Hydraulics & Floodplain	\$ 173,999.36	\$ 119,334.44	69%	\$ 293,333.80
Group Delta Consultants Geotech	\$ 70,957.41	\$ 222,770.21	314%	\$ 293,727.62
Epic Land Solutions Relocation Analysis	\$ 121,454.34	\$ 42,698.53	35%	\$ 164,152.87
Arellano and Associates Public Outreach	\$ 112,000.06	\$ 83,704.11	75%	\$ 195,704.17
VMS Value Engineering	\$ 39,058.14	\$ 3,165.14	8%	\$ 42,223.28
James Allen Paleontology	\$ 40,925.05	\$ 25,744.35	63%	\$ 66,669.40
Glen Lukos Associates Vernal Pool, Watershed & Fairy Shrimp		\$ 62,044.39	N/A	\$ 62,044.39
SJM Stephens Kangaroo Rat		\$ 108,085.15	N/A	\$ 108,085.15
Rahn Consulting Wildlife Corridor Analysis		\$ 16,801.14	N/A	\$ 16,801.14
RBF Consulting Biological Resources Oversight for ROE		\$ 10,057.78	N/A	\$ 10,057.78
Wicke Consulting MWD Coordination/Outreach		\$ 66,212.80	N/A	\$ 66,212.80
TOTAL	\$ 5,040,190.88	\$ 5,634,447.55		\$ 10,674,638.43

FEE PROPOSAL WORKSHEET

COMPANY: ICF Jones & Stokes	SCOPE OF WORK: Environmental Services - Prime	PHASE: Phase I
PROJECT: Cajalco Road Widening Project		DATE: July 31, 2014

DIRECT LABOR

PERSONNEL	POSITION	HOURS		RATE	AMOUNT	
Calvert, Brian	Proj Dir (PM)	1,401	@	\$73.93	\$103,575.93	
Anderson, Keturah	Sr Consult I (Env Lead)	3,317	@	\$44.43	\$147,374.31	
Sanaryan, Daniela	Sr Consult II (NEPA/CEQA - Asst Env Lead)	352	@	\$50.00	\$17,600.00	
Cooper, Keith	Sr Tech Analyst (Air Quality)	114	@	\$57.52	\$6,557.28	
Buehler, David	Proj Dir (Noise)	68	@	\$71.91	\$4,889.88	
Campbell, Patricia	Mng Consult (Biology)	1,472	@	\$52.88	\$77,839.36	
Robinson, Mark	Sr Tech Analyst (Archaeology)	944	@	\$53.86	\$50,843.84	
Anderson, Carson	Sr Consult I (Visual)	12	@	\$43.58	\$522.96	
Trisal, Shilpa	Sr Consult I (CIA, Growth, and NEPA/CEQA)	650	@	\$46.67	\$30,335.50	
Hardie, Jon	Assoc Consult III (Noise)	762	@	\$40.87	\$31,142.94	
Starzak, Richard	Proj Dir (Historic)	24	@	\$84.72	\$2,033.28	
Swiontek, Soraya	Assoc Consult III (GIS)	1,660	@	\$29.54	\$49,036.40	
Paul, Daniel	Assoc Consult II (Historic)	272	@	\$39.60	\$10,771.20	
McFalls, Mathew	Sr Consult I (Air Quality)	282	@	\$35.28	\$9,948.96	
Anaya, Mario	Sr Consult II (CIA and NEPA/CEQA)	688	@	\$30.94	\$21,286.72	
Flores, Marisa	Assoc Consult II (Biology)	786	@	\$28.77	\$22,613.22	
Schwartz, Paul	Sr Consult I (Biology)	532	@	\$36.47	\$19,402.04	
Kohn, William	Sr Consult I (Biology)	208	@	\$36.74	\$7,641.92	
Richards, Michael	Assoc Consult I (Archaeology)	424	@	\$29.93	\$12,690.32	
Long, Michelle	Sr Consult I (Archaeology)	950	@	\$27.86	\$26,467.00	
Hilton, Elizabeth	Assoc Consult II (Historic)	48	@	\$31.95	\$1,533.60	
West, Zackry	Sr Consult II (Regulatory)	376	@	\$41.19	\$15,487.44	
Buscombe Brittany	Mng Consult (Noise)	454	@	\$38.00	\$17,252.00	
Romich, Michael	Sr Consult II (Biology)	556	@	\$47.14	\$26,209.84	
Kessans, Lexi	Sr Consult III (Regulatory)	36	@	\$43.79	\$1,576.44	
Cain, Ian	Assoc Consult I (Biology)	228	@	\$24.14	\$5,503.92	
Rivisplata, Antero	Tech Dir (Counsel)	48	@	\$57.57	\$2,763.36	
Fleury, Scott	Proj Dir (NEPA/CEQA-MWD Plan)	604	@	\$65.63	\$39,640.52	
Jones, Tanya	Assoc Consult III (NEPA/CEQA)	290	@	\$28.75	\$8,337.50	
Irvin, Elizabeth	Asst Consult (Editor)	988	@	\$33.88	\$33,473.44	
Mountain-Castro, Jenelle	Asst Consult (Admin)	704	@	\$26.00	\$18,304.00	
Shook, Jill	Admin Tech (Proj Admin)	236	@	\$25.44	\$6,003.84	
Shattuck, Paul	Assoc Consult III (Archaeology)	120	@	\$23.17	\$2,780.40	
Archaeological Technician I	Arch Tech I (Archaeology)	470	@	\$22.19	\$10,429.30	
Archaeological Technician II	Arch Tech II (Archaeology)	470	@	\$28.81	\$13,540.70	
Chimel, Carolina	Assoc Consult III (Archaeology)	380	@	\$29.03	\$11,031.40	
Yates, Tim	Sr Consult I (Cultural Resources)	136	@	\$35.84	\$4,874.24	
		TOTAL HOURS		21,062	TOTAL DIRECT LABOR	\$871,315.00

MULTIPLIERS

OVERHEAD & PAYROLL ADDITIVES @	174.49%	(of Direct Labor + Escalation)	\$1,520,357.54
PROFIT (FIXED FEE) @	10.0%	(of Direct Labor + Escalation + Overhead + Payroll Additives)	\$239,167.25
TOTAL MULTIPLIERS			\$1,759,524.80

OTHER DIRECT COSTS

*** Billed at Actual Cost ***

ITEM	QUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT COST	AMOUNT
Reprographics	1	Actual Cost	@ \$94,680.00	\$94,680.00
Mileage (including rental car)	1	Actual Cost	@ \$28,960.00	\$28,960.00
Project supplies	1	Actual Cost	@ \$4,800.00	\$4,800.00
Postage/delivery	1	Actual Cost	@ \$14,870.00	\$14,870.00
Filing Fee	1	Actual Cost	@ \$3,500.00	\$3,500.00
Native American Monitor	27	Day	@ \$900.00	\$24,300.00
Ethnographer	1	Actual Cost	@ \$25,000.00	\$25,000.00
Lodging/Meals	112	Person/Day	@ \$85.00	\$9,520.00
Sample Processing Fees	6	Sample	@ \$600.00	\$3,600.00
Curation Boxes	20	Box	@ \$1,200.00	\$24,000.00
TOTAL ODC'S				\$233,230.00

SUB CONSULTANT SERVICES

COMPANY	LABOR	MULTIPLIERS	ODC'S	TOTAL
AECOM/LAN (Engineering/Design)	\$560,148.51	\$1,001,209.45	\$38,760.00	\$1,600,117.96
Iteris (Traffic)	\$135,264.88	\$268,926.87	\$5,450.00	\$409,641.75
URS (Water Quality, Hydraulics & Floodplain)	\$38,616.00	\$75,283.44	\$5,435.00	\$119,334.44
Group Delta Consultants (Geotech)	\$72,813.95	\$135,273.76	\$14,682.50	\$222,770.21
Epic Land Solutions (Relocation Analysis)	\$13,354.56	\$24,583.88	\$4,760.09	\$42,698.53
Arellano and Associates (Public Outreach)	\$29,916.00	\$27,274.12	\$26,513.99	\$83,704.11
VMS (Value Engineering)	\$1,036.08	\$2,129.06		\$3,165.14
James Allen (Paleontology)	\$21,040.32	\$2,104.03	\$2,600.00	\$25,744.35
Glen Lukos Associates (Vernal Pool, Watershed & Fairy Shrimp)	\$53,233.85	\$5,323.39	\$3,487.15	\$62,044.39
SJM (Stephens' Kangaroo Rat)	\$83,778.90	\$8,377.89	\$15,928.36	\$108,085.15
Rahn Consulting (Wildlife Corridor Analysis)	\$15,273.76	\$1,527.38		\$16,801.14
RBF Consulting	\$3,202.20	\$8,629.58	\$226.00	\$10,057.78
Wicke Consulting	\$58,180.00	\$5,818.00	\$2,214.80	\$66,212.80
TOTAL SUBCONSULTANT SERVICES				\$2,770,377.72

TOTAL \$5,634,447.52

MANHOURLY WORKSHEET

COMPANY: ICF Jones & Stokes
 SCOPE OF WORK: Environmental Services - Prime

PHASE: Phase I
 DATE: July 31, 2014

PROJECT: Cajalco Road Widening Project

TASK	16	50	8	12	16	16	36	8	16	16	18	32	32	6	6	50	44	30	12	12	192	\$ 23,249	
3.04.03 Notice of Availability and Public Meetings	48	72	8	86	16	16	36														450	\$ 66,449	
3.04.04 Response to Comments																							
3.04.05 Final Environmental Document EIR/EIS																							
3.04.05 a Screenshot Final EIR/EIS	42	98	10	32	12	12	36	8	12	12	24	12	12	6	6	32	16	36	36	36	456	\$ 61,910	
3.04.05 b Administrative Draft Final EIR/EIS	16	54	6	28	8	8	32	12	8	8	12	6	6	28	28	28	16	36	36	36	324	\$ 41,979	
3.04.05 c Draft Final EIR/EIS (1)	26	74	8	22	8	8	32	8	8	20	20	12	12	28	28	34	34	36	36	36	394	\$ 50,516	
3.04.05 d Draft Final EIR/EIS (2)	22	90	8	22	4	4	32	16	4	40	40	10	10	32	16	68	68	36	36	36	404	\$ 51,593	
3.04.06 Environmental Commitments Record	16	64	6	16	4	4	24	12	4	4	18	4	4	16	22	22	60	36	36	36	306	\$ 37,810	
3.04.07 CEQA Findings	6	12															8	4			30	\$ 4,053	
3.04.08 Notice of Determination	4	32	12				8									4	4				64	\$ 8,825	
3.04.09 Federal Register Notice																							
3.04.10 MMD Habitat Conservation Plan																							
3.04.11 Record of Decision	24	88	48				16										28	24	12	12	240	\$ 32,492	
3.04.12 Public Outreach	16	36		16				24	4	8		8	8								120	\$ 15,704	
T4 PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING TASKS																							
4.20 Project Report Equivalent	4	16																12	8	8	40	\$ 4,895	
4.22 Value Analysis	8																				8	\$ 1,786	