

**EIR PROPOSAL FOR THE BIG WAVE OFFICE PARK
AND WELLNESS CENTER PROJECT**

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT & SCHEDULE

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

Because the Big Wave Office Park and Wellness Center EIR may be scrutinized by affected parties and local citizens, it is important that the potential environmental effects of the project be fully analyzed. Although any EIR can be challenged, a comprehensive approach using appropriately conservative assumptions is likely to withstand any legal challenge that might be raised. The EIR must respond directly to issues raised by citizens, responsible agencies and community organizations. An EIR that provides thoughtful and well-documented responses to issues raised during the environmental review process is the best means of allowing applicants to proceed with their projects in the most expeditious manner.

This EIR will be prepared based on the standards and requirements of CEQA, the State CEQA Guidelines, the Office of Planning and Research guidelines, State planning and zoning laws, and the County of San Mateo regulations. Mr. Geoff Reilly, EIR Project Manager, will serve as the day-to-day contact with the County of San Mateo and will be responsible with coordinating with all team members in the preparation of the EIR. These efforts include a master schedule for EIR preparation for all team members, assigned hours per task, monitoring of the project schedule and budget, maintaining the project library and files, and monthly status reports to the County. Mr. Reilly will also review all versions of the EIR prior to submittal to the County.

In addition to services provided by CAJA, various sections of the EIR will require technical information from other consultants. CAJA will provide management and oversight of all technical subconsultants. CAJA will implement the following procedures in order to ensure timely and efficient document preparation by subconsultants:

- Subcontract agreements to be negotiated with each subconsultant identifying their required scopes of work, work product deadlines, not-to-exceed cost, and payment schedule.
- Subconsultant schedule to precede master schedule by at least two weeks to ensure that the required scope of work is accomplished, and to allow for in-house revision and incorporation of work product.
- Payment of subcontract to be based upon delivery of products.
- Weekly telephone calls will be made to maintain focus, verify direction and assess status of work products.
- Written memos will be prepared regarding any changes to the scope, project description, schedule, etc.

- CAJA will carefully review and edit subconsultants’ products prior to submittal to the County.

SCHEDULE

CAJA proposes the following schedule to prepare the Big Wave Office Park and Wellness Center EIR (see Table 1).

- CAJA will submit five copies of the Administrative Draft EIR and the technical appendices to the County within ten to twelve weeks from authorization to proceed. It is anticipated that the County will require at least two weeks to review the Administrative Draft EIR.
- Upon receipt of County comments on the Administrative Draft EIR, CAJA will revise the document as necessary within two weeks and submit the revised Draft EIR to the County for review. Following approval by the County, CAJA will submit 50 copies of the Draft EIR and Technical Appendices.
- CAJA assumes a 45-day public review and comment period for the Draft EIR. Upon completion of the public review period, CAJA will prepare the responses to comments submitted on the Draft EIR within three weeks. It is anticipated that the County will require two weeks to review the responses to comments.
- Within three weeks of receipt of County comments on the Administrative Final EIR, CAJA will submit five copies of the Administrative Final EIR, which will include the Draft EIR, technical appendices, public comments, responses to comments, and mitigation monitoring and reporting program. Upon County approval of the Administrative Final EIR, CAJA will submit 50 copies of the Final EIR to the County.

**Table 1
Preparation of the Big Wave Office Park and Wellness Center EIR**

TASKS	TIME
1. Kickoff Meeting and Coordination with County Staff	Week 1
2. Review of Existing Information, Preparation of Preliminary Project Description, and Preparation of Administrative Initial Study/NOP	~Weeks 1-3
3. County Review of Initial Study/NOP and CAJA Preparation of Initial Study/NOP	~Weeks 4-5
4. County Review of Preliminary Project Description and CAJA Preparation of Final Project Description	~Week 4 or 5
5. Circulation of Initial Study/NOP (30 days)	~Weeks 6-10
6. Conduct Scoping Meeting	~Week 8
7. Prepare Administrative Draft EIR for Review by County	~Weeks 1-12
8. County Review of Administrative Draft EIR	~Weeks 13-14
9. CAJA Revisions to Administrative Draft EIR per County Comments	~Weeks 15-16
10. County Review of Screencheck Draft EIR	~Week 17
11. Publish and Circulate Draft EIR for Public Review (45 days)	~Weeks 18-25
12. Prepare Responses to Comments and Administrative Final EIR for Review by County	~Weeks 26-29
13. County Review of Administrative Final EIR	~Weeks 30-31
14. CAJA Revisions to Administrative Final EIR per County Comments	~Weeks 32-33
15. County Review of Screencheck Final EIR	~Week 34
16. Publish Final EIR	~Week 35-36

SCOPE OF WORK

UNDERSTANDING OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

EXISTING CONDITIONS

San Mateo County is located on the San Francisco Peninsula, bordered by San Francisco County to the north, Santa Cruz County to the south, the San Francisco Bay and Alameda County to the east, Santa Clara County to the southeast, and the Pacific Ocean to the west. The major roadways that traverse the County include Interstates 280 and 380, U.S. Highway 101, and State Highways 1, 92, and 84.

The proposed site is situated along the coast of the Pacific Ocean just north of Princeton by the Sea, approximately 25 miles south of San Francisco, 10 miles west of San Mateo, and 45 miles north of Santa Cruz. The proposed Big Wave Office Park and Wellness Center project site (APN: 047-311-060 and APN 047-312-040) is located on Airport Street, northwest of the Princeton/Pillar Point Harbor area in unincorporated San Mateo County. The project area is accessible via State Highway 1 and Airport Street; the project site can be directly accessed from the surrounding Capistrano Road, Prospect Way, and California and Cornell Avenues, located to the east and south of the site, respectively. Surrounding land uses include the Half Moon Bay Airport (east), the El Granada Mobile Home Park (north), the Pillar Point Marsh (west), and the Princeton/Pillar Point Harbor industrial/commercial area (south).

The project site comprises approximately 15 acres of relatively flat undeveloped topography and is currently in agricultural use. A natural drainage swale separates the two parcels and leads to the Pillar Point Marsh, a salt marsh habitat influenced by both tidal action and freshwater runoff from its tributary drainage area.

The San Mateo County General Plan Mid-Coast Area Land Use map designates both subject properties as General Industrial. The zoning designations for the properties are as follows:

APN 047-3 1 1-060: Light Industrial/Design Review (M-1DR)
Light Industrial/Airport Overlay/Design Review (M-11AODR)

APN 047-3 12-040: Waterfront/Design Review (WDR)
Waterfront/Airport Overlay/Design Review (WIAODR)
Resource Management-Coastal Zone/Design Review (RM-CZDR)

The proposed site is not zoned for residential use and a portion of the project includes new housing. The applicant is requesting approval of a series of actions from the County of San Mateo in order to construct the proposed project including:

- Major Development Pre-application Review, per County Zoning Regulations Section 6415.0, completed August, 2006.
- Coastal Development Permit, per County Zoning Regulations Section 6328.4.
- Use Permit, per Section 6500(d)3 for the residential component of the Wellness Center.

- Major Subdivision, per the County Subdivision Regulations, to subdivide the Office Park site into five lots, and to create condominium units for the Wellness Center.
- Grading Permit, per the County Grading Ordinance, for 12,600 cubic yards of grading (Office Park) and 15,000 cubic yards of grading (Wellness Center).

PROPOSED USES

The proposed Big Wave mixed-use development would include an office park consisting of four two-story office buildings (totaling 155,888 s.f.) to be located on the larger most northern parcel, and a Wellness Center for disabled adults consisting of 36 apartment and condominium housing units and community center, and approximately 13,141 s.f. of commercial space, including storage units and a bakery, to be located on the smaller most southern parcel. Parking for the proposed project would be provided on site.

EXISTING STUDIES

Based on CAJA's review of the project file maintained at the County, the applicant has prepared a geotechnical report and several biological resources analyses for the project site. Some of the biological resources studies have been updated based on comments from the County, California Department and Fish and Game, and California Coastal Commission. While the biological and geotechnical reports do not cover the entire project site, both will be used to the maximum extent feasible in the EIR, following a peer review.

KEY ISSUES

CAJA's review of the project file and research of the project history found that a considerable amount of controversy has been created by the proposed project, as evidenced by testimony provided at a pre-application workshop held on June 5, 2006 and from letters submitted to the County Planning and Building Division. Concerned parties include but are not necessarily limited to: California Coastal Commission, California Department of Fish and Game, U.S. Department of Interior (GGNRA), Community for Green Foothills, Pillar Ridge Homeowners Association, County of San Mateo Parks & Recreation, Sierra Club, and a former Half Moon Bay City Councilperson (Mike Ferreira).

Key issues raised at the workshop and in the letters include:

- Impacts to wetlands and previous disturbance to wetlands
- Water quality impacts to Pillar Point Marsh and species
- Drainage impacts on the Pillar Ridge community
- Land use compatibility with adjacent and nearby uses
- Inconsistency of the proposed residential use with current site zoning
- Consistency with Mid-Coast LCP
- Federal Aviation Administration setbacks in the airport zone
- Water and sewer availability
- New housing in a tsunami zone
- Visual impacts as viewed from Highway 1
- Alternative sites
- Loss of prime soils

In a letter dated January 1, 2006, the California Coastal Commission states: “To provide water service to site, the Coastal County Water District (CCWD) needs to construct additional facilities and increase its distribution capacity, if not water supply. The permit and LCP amendments required to allow an increase in CCWD water supply or distribution may only be approved, if adequate LOS on Hwy’s 1 and 92 have been achieved. Traffic congestion presently exceeds and will worsen.”

SCOPE OF WORK

Based on our review of the RFP and project file, consultation with the County of San Mateo’s Planning and Building Division, and survey of the project site, the following scope of work is proposed:

Task 1: Attend Kick-Off Meeting with County Staff

The proposed Project Manager, Geoff Reilly, and other members of the CAJA team (as needed) will attend a kick-off meeting with County staff (and project applicant if invited by the County). The purpose of the meeting is as follows:

- introduce the CAJA team to County staff;
- collect all relevant reports and drawings (or identify relevant documents for copying);
- discuss the desired format of the EIR;
- resolve issues regarding overall assumptions;
- identify other key contacts at the County; and
- discuss communications protocols.

Deliverables: CAJA will document the meetings with a memorandum that will be emailed to all team members.

Task 2. Review Existing Information & Conduct Peer Review¹

CAJA staff will review all available documentation related to the project. CAJA staff and the appropriate technical subconsultants will conduct a “pre-review” of reports to determine if: 1) the reports address the relevant CEQA issues, and 2) the reports provide the elementary information needed to complete the technical peer review. Pre-reviewing is an effective measure in the peer review process that often saves time and expense. It allows for the identification of potential elementary inadequacies, which affect the analysis and conclusions in technical reports and could result in extensive subsequent peer reviews. If the pre-review identifies inadequacies, CAJA will notify the County as soon as possible so that the applicant can have the opportunity to supplement the reports. Once it has been determined that the reports are adequate (on an elementary level), the appropriate subconsultant will conduct a comprehensive peer review of the reports to determine if the methodologies, analysis, conclusion, and recommendations in the reports are sound.

Deliverables: The results will be documented in a memorandum that will be submitted to the County for review and comment.

¹ Peer review tasks to be completed by the Project Team are incorporated into the specific scopes discussed later in this proposal.

Task 3. Prepare Preliminary Project Description

Because the project description is the basis for analyzing the environmental impacts of the proposed project and identifying appropriate mitigation measures, it is important to prepare the project description as early in the EIR process as possible. CAJA will review all relevant project description materials and will prepare a preliminary version of the project description that will be used in the EIR. The project description will include discussions of the following:

- project site's regional and local location;
- project objectives and goals;
- project characteristics, including but not limited to: description of the site plan; building design characteristics; landscaping; access circulation, and parking; utilities and infrastructure; stormwater management; grading and excavation; construction and construction schedule; and
- a list of required approvals.

CAJA will submit the Preliminary Project Description to the County for review and comment.

Deliverables: One paper copy and one electronic copy of the Preliminary Project Description.

Task 4. Prepare Administrative Draft EIR (ADEIR)

CAJA will prepare a complete first draft of the EIR based on the CEQA Guidelines. The analysis of the specific environmental issues related to the proposed project will follow Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. The sections of the EIR and the environmental issues to be analyzed are described below.

Table of Contents: The Table of Contents will enumerate the sections and subsections of the EIR, the page number on which each of the sections begins, the page number on which each table and figure can be found, and a listing of the contents of the appendices.

Executive Summary: The Executive Summary will include an introduction to the EIR, identifying the project applicant, lead agency, and EIR consultant; briefly describing the NOP process; listing of the areas of controversy (i.e., issues raised by the public and agencies during the NOP circulation period); listing the environmental issues to be analyzed in the EIR; an outline of the organization of the EIR; a brief summary of the project and alternatives; and a table that summarizes the significant impacts of the project, required and/or recommended mitigation measures, and level of impact significance after mitigation.

Environmental Setting: This section will provide a general overview of the project site's regional and local setting. More detailed descriptions of the environmental setting as it relates to each of the environmental issues being analyzed in the EIR will be included in the environmental setting discussions contained in each of those subsections. Also included in this section will be a list of related projects that will be used as the bases for the analysis of cumulative impacts in each of the subsections.

Project Description: The Project Description prepared as part of Task 3 will be revised to respond to one round of County comments and incorporated in the ADEIR. If the County allows the project applicant to review the Preliminary Project Description (and we recommend that the

applicant be allowed to confirm the factual nature of the Project Description), it is expected that the applicant's comments will be submitted to us along with the County's comments.

Impacts Found to be Less Than Significant: This section will include a discussion of the issues and sub-issues that were focused out for further analysis in the Initial Study.

Environmental Impact Analysis: This section will include the analysis of the project's potential to result in impacts related to each of the environmental topics not focused out in the Initial Study. Each subsection will follow a master format designed to demonstrate CEQA compliance and increase the ability of the public to understand the information in the EIR and will include the following information:

1. A list of the technical reports used in the analysis.
2. A discussion of the environmental setting as it applies to the particular issue being analyzed. Where applicable, this discussion will incorporate information from a technical report.
3. A list of the thresholds of significance and possible further explanation of the thresholds (if appropriate).
4. A discussion of the sub-issues that will not be discussed further in the EIR because these sub-issues were either focused out in the Initial Study or because information presented in the environmental setting demonstrates that the project would not have the potential to result in any significant impacts related to the sub-issues.
5. An analysis of project-specific impacts that will consider the significance thresholds and any existing regulatory requirements or project design characteristics that will "pre-mitigate" potential impacts of the project. The analysis will end with a statement regarding the significance of the project's impacts relative to the sub-issue before consideration of mitigation measures. Where applicable, this analysis will incorporate information from a technical report.
6. Identification of required mitigation measures for each significant impact identified (and possibly, identification of recommended measures to further reduce less-than-significant impacts) and an indication of the effectiveness of the measures. Where applicable, mitigation measures/recommendations will be incorporated from a technical report.
7. An analysis of cumulative impacts and the identification of the need for additional mitigation measures (if applicable).
8. A statement regarding the level of impact significance after mitigation.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES TO BE ANALYZED IN THE EIR

Based on our review of the RFP and previously prepared studies, survey of the project area, and consultation with the County of San Mateo Planning and Building Division, CAJA proposes to analyze the following environmental issues in the Big Wave EIR:

- Aesthetics (Visual Resources)
- Agricultural Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources (Vegetation and Wildlife)
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials (Optional Task)
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Consistency with Plans, Policies and Regulations
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Traffic, Circulation, Transportation, and Parking
- Utilities

The following pages provide a summary of the content and technical approach for each environmental impact category to be analyzed in detail in the Big Wave EIR:

Aesthetics (CAJA)

The majority of the site has been used for agricultural purposes, supporting mainly non-native or cultivated annual vegetation. Native wetland and riparian vegetation occurs along the drainage separating the two project parcels and along the western and southern parcel boundaries near the Marsh. The project site is visible in panoramic views from several viewpoints within the areas surrounding the site. Implementation of the proposed project could result in significant impacts related to: 1) scenic vistas; 2) scenic resources; and 3) visual character; and 3) light and glare.

Approach:

Simulations (Optional)

1. **Data Review and Site Photography:** CAJA staff will coordinate with County staff regarding any specific views of the project site that the staff is particularly concerned about. CAJA staff will collect and review pertinent information including current project maps and drawings and aerial photography. CAJA staff will visit the project site, important vantage points from off-site locations, and acquire data using a high-resolution digital camera. CAJA will provide a photographic record from each location, and the photos linked to survey data. Photo locations will be documented using a photo log and base map annotation.
2. **Produce Visual Simulations:** Once all the photography has been taken, CAJA staff will present the photos to County staff to determine which views should be simulated. Using information created from this data, CAJA will produce computer-generated visual simulations to portray representative "before" and "after" visual conditions at the project site. The simulations will illustrate the mass, design, and viewshed impact of the proposed project in order to portray the impacts to the viewing locations, and the aesthetic integration with the existing urban environment.

CAJA will produce visual simulations from three representative vantage points. At a minimum, a set of three draft and four final simulation images will be submitted in 8.5-inch by 11-inch color format (one "before" and one "after" image per viewpoint) for review. A set of final high-resolution digital files will also be submitted upon request. Our cost estimate includes one review/revision cycle. The visual simulations will be produced based on project information provided to CAJA.

3. **Produce Viewpoint Location Map:** CAJA staff will delineate the location of the visual simulation vantage points on a map of the site and surrounding area. The viewpoint location map will be produced in black and white at 8.5-inch by 11-inch format.

EIR Section

1. Describe the regional and local context relative to aesthetics.
2. Describe the existing visual character of the project site, focusing on site features such as topography, vegetation, existing structures and uses, and the site's relationship to nearby uses.
3. Describe views from the project site.
4. Describe the views of the project site, including those views chosen for simulation and focusing on character-defining features of the view and the project site's relationship to the entire field of view.
5. Using the information in the County's General Plan, recent County EIRs, various area plans, and in consultation with County staff, define scenic vistas. Based on this definition, reconnaissance of the project site and surrounding area, and consultation with County staff, note the vantage points from which scenic vistas are available. Generally describe the scenic vistas available from these vantage points. Note whether the project site is visible and/or how much of the project site is visible within these views.
6. Using the information in the County's General Plan, recent County EIRs, various area plans, and in consultation with County staff, define scenic resources. Based on this definition, reconnaissance of the project site and surrounding area, and consultation with County staff, note whether any scenic resources are located on the site or surrounding area. If any are identified, describe the location of the resource in relation to the project site.
7. Describe the overall visual character of the project site and areas surrounding the site.
8. Describe sources of light and glare that are found on the project site and in the surrounding area.
9. If the project site is visible in any of the scenic vistas previously identified, describe how these views might change due to the proposed project. Based on this discussion, determine whether the alteration or obstruction of the view would constitute a significant impact under CEQA. If the project site is not visible, note that the project site is not visible in any identified scenic vista, and thus, would not result in any significant impacts related to scenic vistas.

10. If scenic resources are found on the project site and/or surrounding area, describe how the resource would be affected by the project. Based on this discussion, determine whether the removal or alteration of this scenic resource would constitute a significant impact under CEQA. If no scenic resources would be affected by the project, note that the project site would not result in any significant impacts to scenic resources.
11. Based on the simulations of the project (optional task), describe how the project would alter the existing visual character of the site and surrounding area, focusing on how the project would change the character-defining features described previously. Based on this discussion, determine whether the proposed project would adversely change the existing character of the site and/or surrounding area, resulting in a significant impact under CEQA.
12. Cross-referencing the Project Description, describe the types and relative amounts of light and glare that would be associated with the proposed project. Describe how these sources might affect the surrounding area. Based on this discussion, determine whether the proposed project would result in significant light and glare impacts.
13. Describe the impacts of the proposed project to the identified views from the vantage points, focusing on changes to existing site features and the extent to which the views are obstructed or altered. Focus on objective indicators such as removal of vegetation and trees, changes to topography, proposed building height and mass, and building clustering.
14. Determine whether any cumulative development: a) would be within the same viewshed or same general area as the proposed project; or b) would affect any of the same scenic resources as would the project. Based on this discussion, determine whether the project in conjunction with cumulative development would result in cumulative
15. For each of the sub issues analyzed in the Aesthetics section, identify mitigation measures to reduce or avoid significant visual impacts, if any significant impacts are identified.

Agricultural Resources (CAJA)

Approach:

CAJA will prepare a Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) agricultural impact analysis via the CEQA process in order to determine if the project would result in significant impacts to agricultural resources. Should the LESA analysis determine that impacts would be significant, mitigation measures would be required. As the site is not under contract with the County under the provisions of a Williamson Act contract, CAJA will evaluate the proposed project's impacts to agricultural resources based on the LESA analysis in order to determine if the project would convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use.

Air Quality (CAJA)

During the construction phase of the proposed project, on-site stationary sources, heavy-duty construction vehicles, construction worker vehicles, and energy use would generate emissions. In addition to construction vehicle emissions, fugitive dust would also be generated during grading and construction activities. Although much of this airborne dust would settle out on or

near the project site, smaller particles would remain in the atmosphere, increasing existing particulate levels within the surrounding area. Operational emissions associated with the ultimate development and operation of the proposed project would result primarily from increased vehicular trips to and from the residential development. However, the emissions associated with the plant would be subject to permit requirements. Other sources of emissions associated with the project would include area source emissions, such as the use of natural gas for water heaters and cooking appliances. The proposed project could result in emissions that are in excess of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) thresholds for pollutant emissions.

Approach:

1. Describe baseline air quality information, including the pollutants of concern in the Bay Area, the agencies responsible for improving air quality in the Bay Area, and the existing air quality conditions in the county and local vicinity. Existing regional emissions for the past three years will be identified using information obtained from the California Air Resources Board. Existing localized emissions of carbon monoxide will be calculated using data from the project traffic report. Any emissions that may be associated with the existing conditions at the project site will also be discussed.
2. Identify the thresholds of significance recommended by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) as presented in the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines and used by the County to evaluate air quality impacts under CEQA.
3. Construction-related activities are generally short-term in duration, and the BAAQMD does not recommend any thresholds of significance for their associated emissions. Instead, the BAAQMD bases the determination of significance on a consideration of the control measures to be implemented. Therefore, the EIR will discuss the potential impacts that would occur during construction and recommend the appropriate measures that would reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels.
4. Calculate operational mobile and area source emissions for reactive organic gases, nitrogen oxides, and particulates using the URBEMIS model recommended for use by the BAAQMD. Calculations will be based on the trip generation factors provided in the project traffic study. The predicted emissions will be compared to the thresholds of significance recommended by the BAAQMD.
5. Calculate future localized carbon monoxide concentrations at intersections in the project vicinity that would be most affected by project-generated traffic. These emissions will be calculated using data from the project traffic report. The resulting emissions will be compared to state and national ambient air quality standards.
6. Discuss the consistency of the project with the current Clean Air Plan for the Bay Area.
7. Generally characterize the types of emissions, including toxic air contaminant emissions, associated with the wastewater treatment plant. Qualitatively discuss potential health risks associated with siting new residences in proximity to these stationary sources.

8. Discuss the potential for the project to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in emissions. The BAAQMD recommends that projects that generate project-specific emissions that exceed their recommended thresholds of significance also be considered to cause a significant cumulative air quality impact.
9. Identify mitigation measures as necessary to reduce or avoid any potential project-specific or cumulative impacts to air quality, and quantify their effectiveness based on methodologies available from BAAQMD and other sources.

Biological Resources (CAJA)

Approach:

The proposed Big Wave project site consists of two parcels located just north of Half Moon Bay, between the Half Moon Bay Airport and Pillar Point Marsh. The majority of the site has been used for agricultural purposes and supports mainly non-native or cultivated annual vegetation; however, native wetland and riparian vegetation occurs along the drainage separating the two project parcels and along the western and southern parcel boundaries near the Marsh. Several sensitive plant and wildlife species have been documented in and around Pillar Point Marsh, including the federally threatened California red-legged frog (CRLF).

Several biological resource studies have been conducted since 2001, including wildlife assessments, rare plant surveys and wetlands delineations; however, a cursory review of existing documents indicates that such studies may have only been conducted for the northern parcel. During these previous studies, no rare plants were found on-site, and several special status wildlife species were found (white-tailed kite) or were assumed present (CRLF, San Francisco garter snake [SFGS]). Several resource agencies, including the California Coastal Commission and the California Department of Fish and Game, have also provided comments regarding the project including concerns about potential impacts to CRLF, SFGS, wetlands, and raptors. A peer review of all existing biological resources reports prepared for the project site, as well as a review of all comments received from resource agencies, will be a primary task in completing the Biological Resources section of the EIR. However, additional surveys are recommended for the southern parcel (if they have not yet been conducted) in order to ensure that the information is consistent for the entire project site and that potential impacts are adequately assessed. These surveys include a wetlands delineation and a special status plant species survey, and are included in this scope of work as Optional Tasks; additional wildlife surveys are not anticipated for the southern portion at this time, as it is in close enough proximity to the northern parcel and exhibits similar habitat such that conclusions from the northern parcel studies can likely be extrapolated over the entire site.

Hydrologic analyses prepared for the EIR by Schaaf & Wheeler regarding potential impacts that the Big Wave project may have on the hydrological function of Pillar Point Marsh will also be reviewed to assess any potential impacts to biological resources that are closely associated with the Marsh and its particular hydrologic conditions.

The biological studies and tasks included in the following scope of work would allow for a complete and comprehensive analysis of potential impacts to sensitive biological resources from the proposed project in the EIR. The additional studies are proposed as separate Optional Tasks below (Optional Tasks A and B) so that they may be easily omitted from the proposed scope and

budget in case (1) the EIR preparation schedule does not allow for the studies to be completed (i.e. rare plant surveys must occur in the spring) or (2) the Applicant's consultant has already completed (or will be completing) these studies.

Biological Studies – Project Tasks

Task 1 – Peer Review Existing Biological Resources Reports for the Project Site

- a) **Review Existing Information:** The existing biological resources reports for the project site prepared by WRA, Inc., as well as any information contained in available regulatory permit applications, will be peer reviewed by CAJA biologists. This review will include evaluating the methods used and the conclusions, such as potential for certain special status species to occur, the presence and extent of wetlands or other habitats, and potential project impacts and mitigation measures. Peer review methods will include reviewing current records of special-status species and sensitive natural community occurrences maintained by the California Department of Fish and Game's Natural Diversity Data Base, the California Native Plant Society's Electronic Inventory, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Comments provided by regulatory agencies for the project will also be reviewed to determine whether the existing reports have addressed the issues raised. Other resources including topographic maps, aerial photographs, soil survey maps, and other regional studies may also be consulted as available and appropriate.
- b) **Conduct a Field Reconnaissance Survey:** A field reconnaissance survey will be conducted which will include observing the habitat types and conditions, plant species, and other physical site features present on-site. This survey will serve to confirm the conclusions in the existing reports regarding existing vegetation and wildlife habitat on the property, and the location and extent of wetlands and waters.
- c) **Prepare Summary Letter Report:** Based on the results of the peer review, including database research and the site visit, a brief letter report will be prepared assessing the accuracy and validity of the existing reports as they pertain to the current proposed project on the northern parcel. Additional, focused surveys may be recommended as a result of the peer review for any additional sensitive resources not addressed in the previous report (aside from Tasks 2 and 3 below) which would be addressed as out-of-scope tasks.

Task 2 –Pillar Point Marsh Study (Review other studies and hydrology studies, site visit)

- a) In addition to the existing reports, permit applications, and resource agency letters for the project site, other studies will be reviewed (as available) in order to assess the potential project impact to biological resources within the Pillar Point Marsh immediately south and downstream of the site. These studies may include any academic studies prepared for the County or for other research purposes, agency documents, or consultation with local experts to gain a full understanding of the existing conditions of the Marsh. In addition, the hydrological assessment prepared by Schaaf & Wheeler for the EIR under this proposal will be reviewed to assess the project's potential impacts to the Marsh's hydrology and to associated biological resources within the Marsh. The Marsh will also be visited to assess existing conditions.

Task 3 – Prepare Biological Resources Sections for IS and EIR

- a) Prepare Initial Study Section: The existing biological resource studies prepared for the project by WRA, Inc., as well as any regulatory permit applications and regulatory agency comments, will be used to prepare the biological resources section of the Initial Study. Using the Initial Study checklist, potential project impacts to biological resources will be identified and those which may result in a significant impact shall be analyzed further in the EIR.
- b) Prepare ADEIR Section: The Administrative Draft EIR Biological Resources section will be prepared based on the results of the Biological Studies Tasks 1-4 above, including the on-site location and extent of sensitive biological resources, potential impacts to these resources from the proposed project (construction and post-construction operations), and measures to mitigate for significant impacts as feasible. *NOTE: It is assumed that the existing biology report will contain an analysis of potential impacts to sensitive biological resources from the proposed project, and recommended mitigation measures to minimize, avoid, or compensate for any significant adverse impacts.* Impacts and mitigation measures included in the existing biological resource reports will be evaluated for accuracy and adequacy, and included in the EIR section as appropriate. The ADEIR will include maps produced in GIS depicting the location of plant communities and any sensitive biological resources found on-site during the Biological Site Studies described above (such as wetlands) including an overlay of the proposed project, including the building envelopes and their connections to the street; the assessment and quantification of potential project impacts will utilize these ArcView GIS overlay analyses where appropriate (assuming that GIS shapefiles from the existing studies are made available during EIR preparation). The EIR will also contain maps showing the project site in relation to other natural resources in the vicinity, including Pillar Point Marsh. All maps and acreage impact analyses will utilize information prepared for the existing biological resource reports, as feasible and following peer review. Preparation of the ADEIR will also include an evaluation of potential biological resources impacts from project alternatives.
- c) Prepare DEIR Section: The Draft EIR Biological Resources section will consist of the ADEIR section revised to incorporate comments by the County and other project team members.
- d) Prepare Responses to Comments: Following public review of the DEIR, responses will be prepared regarding biological resource issues; the level of effort anticipated to respond to comments on the Draft EIR is limited to a total of 6 hours. Any additional study or substantial effort in responding to comments beyond this amount would require an expanded scope and cost.
- e) Prepare FEIR Section: Following final review of the DEIR and responses to public comment, the Final EIR Biological Resources section will be prepared.

NOTE: Attendance at public hearings or other project-related meetings are not proposed as part of the Biological Resources scope of work.

Biological Resources – Optional Tasks

Optional Task A: Rare Plant Surveys – Southern Parcel

- a) **Conduct Site Surveys:** Based on the results of the peer review conducted under Task 1, surveys will be scheduled for the special status plant species considered to have a moderate or high potential to occur on-site, particularly along the less disturbed edges of the parcel along the creek and southern and western boundaries; surveys will be scheduled to coincide with the reported blooming periods of these species. This scope assumes that at least three surveys will be scheduled in the spring between March and June; if the peer review identifies any additional sensitive plants that have the potential to occur on-site with blooming periods occurring outside of the proposed survey timeframe, then these surveys will be noted in the Task 1 Letter Summary Report and will be addressed outside of this current scope of work. Each survey will be conducted within the boundaries of the southern parcel according to methods recommended by the California Department of Fish and Game, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and California Native Plant Society. These methods include recording all plant species observed as identified to the level necessary to determine their sensitivity status, and completing a California Native Species Field Survey Form for any sensitive plants or communities identified during the surveys. Any special status plant species observed on-site during surveys will be photographed, mapped using GPS, and information will be recorded including estimated population size and extent, associated plant species and other site conditions.
- b) **Prepare Report and Maps:** Following the completion of all special status plant surveys within the southern parcel, a report will be prepared that will summarize the survey methods and results, including the locations, extents, and population sizes of any sensitive plant species observed. The report will also include a map depicting any sensitive plant species observed as mapped in the field, photographs of any sensitive plants observed, and a complete floristic list of all plant species observed during the surveys.

Optional Task B: Wetlands and Waters Jurisdictional Delineation – Southern Parcel

- a) **Review Existing Information and Conduct Field Survey:** CAJA wetland delineators will review pertinent background information on the property in order to identify areas that have the potential to support jurisdictional features, including:
 - Previous Biological Resources Assessment Report prepared by WRA, Inc. for the northern parcel;
 - USGS topographic quadrangle maps;
 - National Wetland Inventory maps;
 - USDA NRCS soil survey information;
 - Available aerial photographs, topographic maps and project design drawings as publicly available or provided by the project proponent; and
 - The national and local lists of hydric soils.

CAJA jurisdictional delineators will conduct field work throughout the southern parcel to locate features that have the potential to be considered jurisdictional, such as drainages, creeks, ponded areas, or wetlands; these features are most likely to be present in the less disturbed areas along the northern, southern and western parcel boundaries. Data will be recorded for each such

feature observed, including as dominant vegetation, indicators of wetland hydrology or ordinary high water mark, soil information, dimensions, and other physical or biological characteristics to determine whether the feature may be considered jurisdictional. All features that meet the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), CDFG or California Coastal Act (CCA) definitions of potentially jurisdictional wetlands or waters will be photographed and mapped using Global Positioning Satellite (GPS) units and/or recorded on available aerial photographs, topographic maps or project maps. Delineation methods will follow Corps and CDFG methods and guidelines.

b) Prepare Report and Map of Potentially Jurisdictional Features: Following the survey, CAJA will synthesize field maps and data and prepare a delineation report and preliminary map of potentially jurisdictional wetlands and waters within the Study Area. The report will follow the Corps' guidance for preliminary delineations and will include:

- The acreages of wetlands and/or waters on the parcel that are potentially subject to the jurisdiction of the Corps as well as the State (by the RWQCB, CDFG and/or California Coastal Commission [CCC]), and potential project impacts to jurisdictional areas using GIS analysis;
- A statement that the delineation was conducted in accordance with the 1987 Corps manual;
- Justification for wetland/waters boundaries and/or ordinary high water mark;
- Existing field conditions (e.g., observed seasonal variations due to drought, heavy rain, etc);
- A discussion of they hydrologic source for the parcel;
- Directions to the site;
- Contact information identifying the applicant and the owners of the property;
- A discussion of the plant communities and other habitat types present and a list of scientific and common names, and indicator status of plants;
- Soil descriptions, soil maps, and a list of hydric soils at the site;
- Any observed interstate or foreign commerce connection;
- Representative photographs of the site and jurisdictional features; and
- Maps created in ArcView GIS, including:
 - o A site location map (on a USGS 7.5-minute topographic base map);
 - o A project layout/design map;
 - o Soil series map (if necessary); and
 - o A map depicting features potentially jurisdictional under the Corps, CDFG, RWQCB and/or CCC.

The maps will include title block information (e.g., the delineator's names, survey dates, revision dates, etc.) as stipulated in the Corps' guidance. The County will be given an opportunity to review the draft report and map prior to submittal to the Corps for verification.

c) Attend Site Verification Meeting with Corps: If requested by the Corps, the CAJA delineator will attend a brief site visit with the Corps to verify the delineation. CAJA will inform the County and Project Applicant regarding the date and time of the verification so they may attend if desired. During the verification visit, CAJA will answer technical questions on delineation methods or results to facilitate Corps verification. If necessary, the

draft delineation report will be revised, and a final (Corps-verified) delineation report prepared. This scope assumes only minor report revisions will be required.

NOTE: This task does not include preparation of regulatory permits associated with project impacts to potentially jurisdictional features. Preparation of Corps, CDFG, RWQCB and/or CCC permit applications, if required and requested, would be addressed outside of this scope.

Cultural Resources (Tom Origer & Associates)

Tom Origer & Associates will complete a Phase I cultural resources study for preparation of an EIR for the Big Wave mixed-use development project in unincorporated San Mateo County, and will provide cultural resources services, designed to satisfy CEQA requirements, including the following:

Approach:

1. Archival research and review of documents on file at the Northwest Information Center at Sonoma State University, the offices of Tom Origer & Associates, and other offices/facilities, as needed;
2. Contact with the Native American Heritage Commission and local Native American communities;
3. Completion of an intensive field inspection of the archaeological site location to assess the current condition of the resource. Cultural properties within the project location will be recorded on appropriate DPR 523 forms. No formal evaluation of cultural resources is proposed at this time;
4. Preparation and submittal of a standard written report with DPR forms appended; and
5. CAJA staff will incorporate the results of the report into the Cultural Resources EIR section.

Origer & Associates will be available to attend meetings as necessary on a time-and-expense basis.

Geology & Soils (Treadwell & Rollo, Inc.)

Treadwell & Rollo, will provide geotechnical and geological peer review services for the proposed Big Wave project in unincorporated San Mateo County, California. The geotechnical/geological peer review will consist of:

Approach:

1. Reviewing available geotechnical and geological information submitted by the project applicant;
2. Compiling and reviewing published and unpublished geologic, geotechnical, and seismicity data for the site vicinity;

3. Performing a site reconnaissance to observe site surface conditions for evidence of geotechnical, geological, and unstable site conditions; and
4. Preparing a letter summarizing our findings and assisting during the preparation of the Geology, Soils, and Seismicity sections of the proposed EIR.
5. CAJA staff will incorporate the results of the report into the Geology and Soils EIR section.

Treadwell & Rollo's scope of services does not include drilling borings, performing laboratory testing, or performing any type of subsurface exploration. Treadwell & Rollo will be available to attend meetings as necessary on a time-and-expense basis.

Hazards & Hazardous Materials (Treadwell & Rollo, Inc.) (Optional Task)

As an optional task, Treadwell & Rollo will complete the Phase I ESA in general conformance with ASTM standard E1527-05 Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process. The Phase I ESA will review past and present land use practices, site conditions, and neighboring property land uses to evaluate the potential presence of pesticides, fertilizers, petroleum hydrocarbons and hazardous substances in the site soil and/or groundwater. Following is Treadwell & Rollo's proposed scope of services for the Phase I ESA:

Approach:

1. Review historical aerial photographs, historical Sanborn Fire Insurance maps and/or United States Geological Survey (USGS) historical topographic maps for the site, as appropriate;
2. Perform a reconnaissance survey of the site and interview the current site owner/tenant or representative, and observe the adjacent properties, as accessible, to make visual observations of existing site conditions, activities, types of land use, and businesses within the search area;
3. Review relevant documents and maps regarding local geologic and hydrogeologic conditions;
4. Review local, state, and federal records provided by a commercial database search firm for government databases pertinent to a Phase I ESA, and
5. Conduct inquiries by telephone, during a visit, and/or by written correspondence to the county environmental management and fire departments regarding environmental permits, environmental violations, incidents and/or status of enforcement actions at the subject site.

Results of the above scope of services will be presented in a report that includes Treadwell & Rollo's opinion regarding the possible presence of petroleum hydrocarbon, pesticides, herbicides, and/or hazardous materials releases to the site, and recommendations for additional investigations, if necessary.

Hydrology & Water Quality (Schaaf & Wheeler Consulting Civil Engineers)

The proposed Big Wave development lies between Airport Street and the coastal bluff, between the El Granada Mobile Home Park to the north and the Princeton/Pillar Point Harbor industrial/commercial area to the south. The area drains through a natural swale to the Pillar Point Marsh, which is a salt marsh habitat influence by both tidal action and freshwater runoff from its tributary drainage area.

Schaaf & Wheeler will evaluate potential hydrology and water quality impacts due to the proposed project and prepare the hydrology/water quality section for the EIR. Hydrology or water quality impacts are considered significant if the plan would:

- Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements;
- Degrade or deplete groundwater resources or interfere with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table;
- Alter existing drainage patterns, including streams and rivers, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding inside or outside of the plan area;
- Alter existing drainage patterns, including streams and rivers in a manner that would result in significant erosion inside or outside of the plan area;
- Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality;
- Place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area that impede or redirect flood flows;
- Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam; or
- Expose people or structures to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

Approach:

As part of its analysis Schaaf & Wheeler will:

1. Delineate the watershed tributary to the mouth of Pillar Mount Marsh.
2. Estimate peak flows and runoff volumes from an appropriate range of storm events with and without proposed Big Wave development.
3. Evaluate the adequacy of proposed facilities to safely carry storm runoff generated by the development without increasing the risk of flooding to other properties.
4. Evaluate potential impacts to water quality and the condition of Pillar Point Marsh.
5. Evaluate permanent storm water management BMPs for efficacy and regulatory compliance.
6. Establish the base flood elevation as required to evaluate project impacts. We note that the currently effective FIRM (7/05/84) shows potential SFHAs at the project site, but they are based on approximate methods only.

7. Research and evaluate potential hydrologic hazards including wind-wave generation, tsunamis and runoff-induced mudflows.

Hydrologic analyses and impact evaluation will be based upon the best published data, geographic information, and regulatory conditions available at the time of analysis.

Land Use & Planning (CAJA)

The project site is situated within the coastal zone. The San Mateo County General Plan Mid-Coast Area Land Use map designates both subject properties as General Industrial. The zoning designations for the properties are as follows:

- APN 047-3 1 1-060: Light Industrial/Design Review (M-1DR)
Light Industrial/Airport Overlay/Design Review (M-11AODR)
- APN 047-3 12-040: Waterfront/Design Review (WDR)
Waterfront/Airport Overlay/Design Review (WIAODR)
Resource Management-Coastal Zone/Design Review(RM-CZDR)

Approach:

1. Discuss existing land uses and features of the project site. Describe existing land uses in the vicinity, based on aerial photographs provided by the County or applicant (if available), and a windshield survey.
2. Discuss and prepare exhibits showing existing General Plan Land Use Map designations and Zoning Map districts for the site and vicinity.
3. Evaluate the proposed project's consistency with relevant plans, policies, and regulations. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15125(b), the analysis will include applicable general plans and regional plans. Plans and policies that will be evaluated include (among others):
 - a. San Mateo County General Plan
 - b. Mid-Coast LCP
 - c. Montara/Moss Beach/El Granada Community Plan
 - d. LAFCO (regarding water service from CCWD)
 - e. Half Moon Bay Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan
 - f. Existing County ordinances and regulations
4. The General Plan consistency analysis will be presented in a tabular format. County staff will be consulted to determine other relevant plans, if any. Where appropriate, the evaluation will cross-reference other sections, such as Biological Resources or Transportation/Traffic.
5. Discuss potential impacts relating to policy inconsistency and land use compatibility. Typically, this discussion will cross-reference the analyses of other impacts in the EIR.

Noise (CAJA)

Construction of the proposed project would require grading and excavation, installation of utilities and roadways, and construction and finishing of the proposed houses and wastewater treatment plant. These activities typically involve the use of heavy equipment such as tractors, loaders, pavers, and concrete mixers. Trucks would be used to deliver equipment and building materials and to haul away waste materials. Smaller equipment, such as jack hammers, pneumatic tools, saws, and hammers, would also be used throughout the site during the construction phase. This equipment would generate both temporary steady state and episodic noise that would be heard both on and off the project site. Typically, increases in noise levels created by a new development are associated with the traffic generated by the development. Most affected by these increases in noise levels are land uses located along roadways used by the traffic; however, the project is proposed near the Half Moon Bay Airport. The proposed project could result in temporary and permanent increases in ambient noise levels that are in excess of applicable noise standards.

Approach:

1. Define and describe the fundamentals of sound and environmental noise, and groundborne vibration.
2. Discuss relevant noise policies, regulations and standards, including the relevant State noise guidelines and noise/land use compatibility standards used by San Mateo County.
3. Identify noise-sensitive land uses or activities in the vicinity of the project site or along roads providing access to the site.
4. Briefly describe existing major noise sources in the project vicinity, based on a review of available documents and a site visit. Conduct up to four short-term noise measurements on the project site and along roadways most affected by increases in project traffic.
5. Calculate existing noise levels for the roadway segments in the project vicinity that would be affected by project-generated traffic. These noise levels will be calculated using the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) Noise Prediction Model and data from the project traffic report.
6. Discuss existing groundborne vibrations levels at the project site and local vicinity.
7. Identify significance thresholds based on these standards and consultation with San Mateo County.
8. Describe characteristics of the proposed project that are relevant to the analysis of noise, based on the project site plan, the conceptual grading plan, and trip generation estimates from the project traffic study.
9. Discuss construction noise impacts, based on proposed construction activities and scheduling information provided by the project developer. Noise impacts from construction will be evaluated based on the duration, nature, phasing, and level of various construction activities.

10. Describe typical noise generated by various elements of the project, including project-generated motor vehicle traffic.
11. Calculate the expected increases in noise levels at noise sensitive locations along roadways most affected by project traffic using the FHWA Noise Prediction Model and data from the project traffic report.
12. Discuss the potential for noise from the project or related activities to adversely affect sensitive land uses or activities, or to conflict with established noise compatibility guidelines.
13. Discuss the potential for noise from the Half Moon Bay Airport to affect project site residents.
14. Evaluate the compatibility of the proposed land uses with the existing and future noise environment at the site.
15. Identify mitigation measures as necessary to avoid or reduce significant noise impacts, and evaluate their effectiveness based on published technical documents.

Population and Housing (CAJA)

Implementation of the proposed project could result in an increase in the amount of population and employment within the County. CAJA will assess potential impacts from the project on the location, distribution, density, growth rate or growth policies of the population and housing planned for the area as specified in any applicable County plans, regional growth plan and/or other officially adopted plan for the area in which the proposed project will be located.

Public Services (CAJA)

Implementation of the proposed project would create new households that could increase the number of new permanent residents in the unincorporated County. This increase in residential population as well as the additional employees and customers to the site could result in an increased demand for fire, police, school, and recreational services. It is possible that the demand created by the project could require the expansion of existing public facilities and/or the construction of new facilities, which in turn could result in physical impacts to the environment.

Approach:

1. Document existing conditions in the County and project area, as appropriate. Contact the Fire Department, Police Department, Parks and Recreation Department, and School District by telephone or letter to obtain information on existing conditions, assess the potential impacts of the proposed project and cumulative development, and provide input on appropriate mitigation measures.
2. Based on population per household ratios provided by the County and/or the service providers (such as the Department of Finance), calculate the number of residents that would be accommodated by the proposed project.

3. Discuss the provisions and criteria of SB 50 and the School District's eligibility to levy alternate developer fees.
4. Based on County park standards, calculate the park acreage or in-lieu fee that would be required with buildout of the proposed project. Determine whether existing and planned parks in the County would be adequate to cover the proposed project and County-wide demand. Consult with the County regarding cumulative projects in the area and their proposed parklands.
5. Discuss potential impacts of project buildout in terms of demand for public services, ability to provide services, and the possible need for construction of additional facilities.
6. Document project characteristics that would "pre-mitigate" potential impacts of the project.
7. List mitigation measures recommended by the service providers.
8. Discuss the potential for the project in conjunction with related projects to result in cumulative impacts to public services.

Transportation / Traffic (Hexagon Transportation)

The traffic study will form the basis of the Traffic section of the EIR. Hexagon's proposed scope of services was developed based on their understanding of the project and on the County of San Mateo Traffic Impact Study requirements. The scope must be reviewed and approved by County staff prior to the commencement of the study. The Scope of Services provided below is therefore subject to change.

Approach:

The purpose of the traffic analysis is to satisfy the requirements of San Mateo County and the City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG) of San Mateo County – the agency that administers the County Congestion Management Program (CMP). The study will determine the traffic impacts of the proposed development on key intersections in the vicinity of the project site. The proposed study intersections are:

1. State Route 1 (Cabrillo Highway) and Cypress Avenue
2. State Route 1 and Capistrano Road (North)
3. State Route 1 and Coral Reef Avenue
4. State Route 1 and Capistrano Road (South)
5. Airport Street and Los Banos Avenue
6. Airport Street and La Granada Avenue
7. Airport Street and Stanford/Cornell Avenue
8. Broadway Avenue and Prospect Way
9. Capistrano Road and Prospect Way

Traffic conditions will be evaluated for the weekday AM and PM peak hours. The AM peak hour is generally between 7:00 and 9:00 AM, and the PM peak hour is typically between 4:00 and 6:00 PM. It is during these periods that the most congested traffic conditions occur on an average day.

The traffic impact analysis will consist of the following tasks:

1. ***Site Reconnaissance.*** The physical characteristics of the site and the surrounding roadway network will be reviewed to identify existing roadway cross-sections, intersection lane configurations, traffic control devices, and surrounding land uses.
2. ***Observation of Existing Conditions.*** Existing traffic conditions will be observed in the field in order to identify any operational deficiencies and to confirm the accuracy of calculated levels of service.
3. ***Data Collection.*** Existing AM and PM peak-hour traffic volumes will be obtained by conducting new turning-movement counts at up to 9 study intersections. Additional counts will require authorization and additional budget.
4. ***Evaluation of Existing Conditions.*** The existing traffic conditions at the study intersections will be evaluated based on intersection level of service standards and using the TRAFFIX software. The level of service (LOS) methodology contained in the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) will be utilized for all LOS analyses.
5. ***Evaluation of Background Conditions.*** Traffic volumes from approved developments in the vicinity of the project site will be added to the existing peak-hour volumes to obtain traffic volumes for background conditions. A list of approved developments will be obtained from San Mateo County. Planned roadway network improvements, and/or improvements associated with approved developments, will be assumed under background conditions. Intersection level of service under background conditions will be evaluated using TRAFFIX and the CMP methodology.
6. ***Site Traffic Projections.*** Based on the development size, site-generated traffic will be estimated using the vehicular trip generation rates included in the latest edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual.
7. ***Directions of Approach and Departure.*** The directional distribution of site-generated traffic will be forecast based on existing travel patterns, relative locations of complementary land uses in the area, and information from previous traffic studies conducted for developments in the area.
8. ***Traffic Assignment.*** Trips generated by the proposed development will be assigned to the roadway network in the immediate area of the project site based on the directions of approach and departure discussed above.
9. ***Evaluation of Project Conditions.*** Project-generated traffic will be added to background conditions traffic volumes to obtain project conditions traffic volumes. Project conditions will be evaluated and compared to background conditions in order to identify impacts directly associated with the proposed project.
10. ***Evaluation of Cumulative (Future) Conditions.*** Future (20 year horizon) traffic conditions will be evaluated with and without the proposed project. Traffic volumes for future conditions will be obtained from the C/CAG Travel Demand Forecast model or derived by alternative accepted methodologies in coordination with San Mateo County staff. Future

traffic conditions with the proposed project will be compared to future traffic conditions without the project in order to identify cumulative impacts by the proposed project.

11. **Signal Warrant Analysis.** The level of service analysis at the unsignalized study intersections will be supplemented with an evaluation of the need for signalization. This evaluation will be made on the basis of the Peak Hour Warrant (Warrant 3 – Part B) in the 2003 Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) and the 2003 MUTCD California Supplement. The warrant will be evaluated using AM and PM peak-hour volumes under the existing, background, project, and cumulative conditions.
12. **Evaluation of Vehicle Queuing.** For selected locations, the adequacy of existing or planned storage at turn pockets will be assessed by means of comparison with expected maximum vehicle queues. The TRAFFIX analysis software will be used for this purpose.
13. **Site Access Analysis.** The site plan will be reviewed for the adequacy of site access and on-site circulation based on location of the proposed driveways and on-site roadway layout. Vehicle queuing and turn-pocket vehicle storage capacity at driveways and within the site also will be evaluated.
14. **Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Transit Facilities.** A qualitative analysis of the project's effect on transit service in the area and on bicycle and pedestrian circulation in the study area will be included in the traffic report.
15. **Description of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures.** Based on the intersection level of service results, impacts of the site-generated traffic will be identified and described. Measures will be formulated to mitigate any significant project impacts. The recommended mitigation measures will identify the locations and types of improvements or modifications necessary. Improvements could include street widenings, lane additions, changes in lane usage, addition of traffic signals, or modifying existing traffic signals.
16. **Alternatives Analysis.** Hexagon will conduct a limited analysis of project alternatives. The analysis will estimate the number of trips associated with each alternative and compare them to the project. A qualitative assessment will be made about whether the alternative would result in greater or lesser impacts than the project.
17. **Meetings.** The fee estimate includes attendance at up to two meetings with the project team and/or County of San Mateo staff in connection with this study. This proposal does not include, however, any appearances or presentations at public hearings, including Planning Commission meetings.
18. **Reports.** Our findings and recommendations will be summarized in a draft report. Hexagon Transportation Consultants will respond to editorial comments from Christopher A. Joseph and Associates and/or County of San Mateo staff on the draft report and incorporate them into a final report, which will be used by Christopher A. Joseph and Associates to prepare the Circulation section of the Draft EIR. Hexagon will respond to comments on the Draft EIR for incorporation into the Final EIR. A total of 30 hours has been allocated for responding to comments.

19. ***Additional Services.*** Any work not specifically referenced in the above Scope of Services—for example conducting additional intersection counts, mitigation drawings, or analyzing additional intersections or scenarios—shall be considered additional services.
20. ***(Optional) Alternatives Evaluation.*** As an optional task, Hexagon could prepare a complete analysis of project alternatives. The complete analysis would include evaluation of traffic conditions at each study intersection for each scenario, as well as a description of required mitigation measures.

Utilities and Service Systems (CAJA)

With regard to sewer service, the project site is within the jurisdictional boundaries of the Granada Sanitary District, which have indicated that there is currently no sewer main that serves the project site. With regard to water service, the project site is not within the jurisdictional boundaries of any water district. It is, however, within the sphere of influence of the Coastside County Water District (CCWD), is adjacent to CCWD boundaries and is eligible for annexation. The applicant plans to seek water service from CCWD, which will require review by the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO).

Approach:

1. Document existing conditions in the County and project area, as appropriate. Contact the local landfill and Coastside County Water District (CCWD) and the Montara Water and Sanitary District (MWSA) by telephone or letter to obtain information on existing conditions, assess the potential impacts of the proposed project, and provide input on appropriate mitigation measures.
2. Based on readily available solid waste, water and sewage generation factors, calculate the project's estimated solid waste and sewage generation as well as water demand.
3. Based on information provided by the service providers, determine whether existing supplies and capacities could adequately accommodate the project. Discuss potential impacts.
4. Discuss LAFCO annexation requirements of the project site into the CCWD.
5. Document project characteristics that would “pre-mitigate” impacts to utility service.
6. Document mitigation measures recommended by the service provider.
7. Discuss the potential for the project in combination with related development to result in cumulative impacts to utility service.

General Impact Categories: The General Impact Categories section of the EIR will summarize the significant unavoidable impacts that were identified in the Environmental Impact Analysis (if any are identified); growth-inducing impacts of the proposed project; and the significant irreversible environmental changes associated with the project.

Alternatives to the Proposed Project: This section of the EIR will identify and evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project that are crafted to avoid or significantly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the proposed project while still meeting most of the project objectives. One of the alternatives that will be analyzed in the EIR will be the No Project Alternative (assuming continuation of the existing conditions, no development of the site), as required by CEQA. As the project site does not permit residential uses, the EIR will address implementation of the proposed project at an alternative site(s). Other alternatives could include a Reduced Density Alternatives or Modified Site Plan Alternative. The selection of other project alternatives will be made in consultation with County staff after all of the significant impacts of the proposed project have been identified. For the purposes of this proposes, CAJA will analyze up to four alternatives, including the No Project Alternative.

Preparers of the EIR and Persons Consulted: This section will identify the lead agency staff, project applicant and subconsultants staff, EIR consultant and subconsultants staff, and all agency personnel consulted during the preparation of the EIR.

Bibliography: The Bibliography section will list all sources of information used during the preparation of the EIR.

Deliverables: 5 bound copies of the ADEIR. CAJA will submit copies of the ADEIR to the County staff for distribution and one round of review.

Task 5. Prepare Draft EIR

CAJA will address all of the County's comments on the ADEIR. It is assumed that the comments from the County will be consolidated into one set. Whether the applicant is allowed to review the ADEIR will entirely be up to County staff. We assume that any comments made by the applicant will first be reviewed by County staff and only those comments deemed applicable will be submitted to CAJA for consideration, and these comments will be consolidated with the County's comments. (Note: Any changes to the project description made during this review could require changes to the analysis in the Administrative Draft EIR and could require amendments to the proposed scope of work and budget.) CAJA will prepare one copy of the screencheck Draft EIR that the County can review to confirm that all comments have been addressed. We will also prepare the NOC. This proposal assumes that the County will distribute the Draft EIR and NOC.

Deliverables: One unbound copy of the screencheck Draft EIR; 50 bound copies of the Draft EIR and one copy of the NOC for distribution by the County.

Task 6. Prepare Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP)

During the review period of the Draft EIR, CAJA will prepare and submit an administrative version of the MMP. The MMP will include a summary of the proposed project, project location map, and in table format, will identify required mitigation measures, standards of success, parties responsible for implementing and monitoring the measures, funding sources, timing, and provisions for remedial measures where success standards are not met.

Deliverables: Five bound copies and one unbound copy of the Administrative Draft MMP.

Task 7. Attend EIR Public Hearings and Meetings

The RFP identifies required attendance at up to 11 meetings or hearings, including: six staff meetings, one scoping meeting, two Planning Commission hearings and two Board of Supervisors hearings. Mr. Reilly will attend each meeting and hearing. This proposal also includes attendance by the EIR traffic engineer and hydrologist at up to two meetings or hearings.

CAJA staff will assist the County in preparing necessary materials for the hearings, such as: a) a handout depicting and briefly describing the project and summarizing impacts and mitigation measures, and b) other large-scale graphics. CAJA staff will arrange for a court reporter to attend the meeting to record all oral comments, but the cost of a court reporter is not included in this proposal. After the close of the public comment period for the Draft EIR, CAJA staff will review all comments, identify which comments requiring special attention, and discuss response approach with County staff and CAJA team members.

If requested, CAJA will assist the County with development of press releases and website postings to provide information to the public regarding the EIR process. In addition, CAJA would provide assistance to the County with the preparation of notices and transmittal documents as required by CEQA.

Deliverables: One electronic copy of the draft matrix.

Task 8. Prepare Final EIR

CAJA staff will prepare responses to all written and oral comments received on the Draft EIR and will make any changes to the Draft EIR resulting from responses to comments. The Final EIR will ultimately include the Draft EIR and could include some or all of the following additional chapters: Introduction, List of Commenters, Revised Summary, Revisions to the Draft EIR, Response to Comments, and Master Responses (if such responses are prepared). CAJA staff will prepare and submit copies of the Administrative Final EIR to the County for one round of review. After the County's review of the document, CAJA staff will address all comments and will prepare and submit the screencheck version of the Final EIR to the County.

Deliverables: 5 bound copies of the Administrative Final EIR; 50 bound copies of the Final EIR for distribution by the County.

Task 9. Prepare Final MMP

After the Final EIR has been completed, CAJA will amend the MMP based on any changes requested by the County and any changes resulting from public review of the Draft EIR.

Deliverables: Five bound copies and one unbound copy of the Final MMP.

Task 10. Project Management

In addition to services provided by CAJA, CAJA will provide management and oversight of all technical subconsultants by implementing the following procedures further outlined in Section

IV. Program Management & Schedule. The Project Manager will also attend all meetings and hearings, and will review all EIR sections prior to submittal to the County.

Task 11: Preparation of the Statement of Facts and Findings

Prior to consideration of the proposed project and certification of the Final EIR, CAJA staff will prepare the Statement of Facts and Findings (the Findings) for any significant environmental effects identified in the EIR. The Findings will individually identify the significant environmental effects of the proposed project and provide a reasoned discussion of the appropriate findings of the Lead Agency. This task assumes that County staff will play a key role in the preparation of the Findings.

Deliverables: One paper copy of the Findings.

COST PROPOSAL

The proposed budget, with a breakdown of cost by task, is shown in the following Table. If awarded the contract, CAJA staff will refine the scope of work and budget based on input from County staff, if needed.

ASSUMPTIONS

This proposal incorporates the following assumptions:

- Only the issues outlined in the scope of work will be analyzed in the EIR. If it is determined that additional issues need to be analyzed, an amendment to the scope of work and budget will be required.
- Once the project description has been defined, no substantive changes will be made to the project description. Changes to the project description could result in changes to analysis that has already been conducted and will require an amendment to the scope of work and budget.
- CAJA assumes that the project applicant will provide electronic versions of a topographic map for the project site and other appropriate project data in acceptable, clean CAD files. The proposed scope of work and cost estimate for the visual simulations is valid only if detailed topographic mapping of the site and surrounding area, and CAD drawings of the existing built environment are provided. These models must be in either 3D Max or AutoCAD format. Supporting vector data must be in .dwg (AutoCAD release 14 or higher), or ESRI ArcGIS compatible vector format. Referenced files must be included with the master file. Files that are native raster format (such as aerial imagery, site photos, etc.) must be in either .tiff or .jpeg format. Files may not be locked, and AutoCAD data may not contain objects created by unavailable ObjectARX applications. Translation from other formats will be done on a time and materials basis, and are not part of the proposed cost estimate. Changes to viewpoints after work has commenced will be billed on a materials basis or pursuant to an amendment to the scope of work and budget.
- County staff comments on all work products will be submitted to CAJA staff in one (1) consolidated set of comments (per work product). If the County allows the project applicant to review the Preliminary Project Description, it is expected that the

applicant's comments will be submitted to us along with the County's comments. Any comments on the Administrative Draft EIR made by the applicant will first be reviewed by County staff and only those comments deemed applicable will be submitted to CAJA for consideration, and these comments will be consolidated with the County's comments.

VXD:kcd - VXDQ1421_WKA.DOC