

EXHIBIT F

ADDITIONAL SCOPE OF WORK

Highland Estates Environmental Impact Report (EIR)

Fire Defense Zone. The topic of wildland fires was to be included in the draft EIR as indicated in our letter dated August 8, 2008. The 75-foot fire defense zone behinds lots 1 through 4 was proposed as part of the project and included in the draft EIR as such. The budget that we provided to analyze this topic was simply to identify who would maintain and monitor the zone and to document that in the EIR. However, this issue resulted in extensive effort and coordination with County staff, Cal Fire, and the County Fire Department to resolve the issue of who was to maintain and monitor the fire defense zone. Additionally, Impact Sciences worked diligently with the County to develop a feasible mitigation measure using County ordinances and based on conversations with Cal Fire and County Fire Department. The fire defense zone was ultimately eliminated from the project description and a mitigation measure was included to mitigate the impact. We did not anticipate that this topic would require this level of effort from Impact Sciences and our staff expended time on this task that was not included in the contracted scope and budget.

Willows. The project biologist conducted a site reconnaissance of lot 11 (new area added to the project) and discovered that a wetlands area is located adjacent to the proposed area of disturbance. The project biologist recommended that either we provide additional GIS mapping to delineate the wetlands boundary for additional fees or that the applicant provide the information. The applicant chose to provide this information. The Impact Sciences project team peer reviewed the information and determined that the information was not sufficient for the purpose of the CEQA analysis. Impact Sciences requested that the applicant's consultant provide us an additional letter identifying two things: (1) area of disturbance and (2) location of all willow trees. The project biologist received the additional information, deemed it adequate, and incorporated that into our analysis. The peer review of two reports and incorporation of that information resulted in additional work effort not originally anticipated in the contracted scope and budget.

Removal of Significant Trees Onsite. The project biologist requested an updated tree survey for the project after discovering that the original tree survey was not accurate based on a field visit. Upon receipt of the survey, our project biologist concluded that the tree survey provided by the applicant's arborist was not complete because it did not accurately identify the trees to be removed. We recommended that additional tree survey work be completed by the applicant's consultant. However, the information did not sufficiently document the circumference or lot location of the trees to be removed and it was difficult to discern which trees of significance were to be removed. This resulted in additional work efforts on our part to identify trees of significance since this was not provided to us upon our request. These work efforts caused us to expend additional labor hours that were not originally anticipated in the contracted scope and budget.

Visual Simulations. The site plan for lot 3 was revised subsequent to the approval of the visual simulations by County staff. This required us to revise the Bunker Hill Drive site viewpoint for post-

construction conditions (Figure 4.1-2 and Figure 4.1-9 in the EIR). These work efforts led to additional labor hours that were not originally anticipated in the contracted scope and budget.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions. The discussion of greenhouse gas emissions was not part of our contracted scope and budget. During our August 28 project meeting, Impact Sciences offered to provide a qualitative analysis of greenhouse gas emissions in the EIR given the relatively small scale of the project. We also advised the County to review the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) technical advisory with their legal counsel to determine how they wanted to address this topic in the EIR. We stated that we would try and absorb the costs for a qualitative analysis to the extent feasible. Based on sample greenhouse gas analysis provided to the County by Impact Sciences that showed both qualitative and quantitative analysis, the County requested that Impact Sciences quantify greenhouse gas emissions. Although Impact Sciences tried to absorb these costs, the quantification of greenhouse emissions required more work effort than a qualitative discussion, and caused us to expend labor hours that were not included in the contracted scope and budget.

Revised Notice of Preparation. Impact Sciences budgeted about four hours to write the revised Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the inclusion of the RM text amendment to the project description. Similar to our original scope, we assumed that the County would distribute the NOP, including a compilation of the appropriate agencies and their addresses. However, the County requested that Impact Sciences assist with the development of the agency list, which included compiling addresses and identifying the appropriate agencies that would receive the NOP. This work effort exceeded what was anticipated in the contracted scope and budget and led to additional labor hours in excess of the four hours that were budgeted for this task.

Project Description. During its preparation, the draft EIR was updated and modified several times to be consistent with various iterations of the project description (i.e., driveway locations, reconfiguration of lots 9 and 10, various changes to lot 3, number of trees removed, haul routes, and modifications to the annexation process). This required not only revisions to the project description text but also modifications to graphics and other components of the EIR several times throughout the preparation of the draft EIR. Although, we did budget to address comments received from County staff, the work efforts exceeded the allocated budget due to the numerous changes.

Asbestos-Related Hazards. A substantial amount of text was added to the topic of asbestos-related hazards as a result of a scoping comment provided during the scoping meeting. The discussion of this topic was not anticipated in our contracted scope and budget, and additional labor hours were required to address this topic in the EIR.

Cultural Resources. With concurrence from the County, Impact Sciences added Condor Country Consulting to our team to complete the cultural resources study for this project which was not included in the contracted scope and budget.

Highland Estates EIR
Breakdown of Hours and Costs for Out of Scope Work

Tasks	PM	Staff	Staff	Project Biologist	Condor Consulting	Graphic Artist
Rate per Hour	\$140.00	\$85.00	\$95.00			\$85.00
Fire Defense Zone	10					
Willows	8			\$1,680.00		
Removal of Significant Trees	6			\$1,867.50		
Visual Simulations	2					7
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	18	32				
Revised NOP	4					
Project Description	4					6
Asbestos-Related Hazards	9		2			
Cultural Resources	2	6			\$6,150.00	
Total Hours	63	38	2			13
Total Costs	\$8,820.00	\$3,230.00	\$170.00	\$3,547.50	\$6,150.00	\$1,105.00
					TOTAL	\$23,022.50

NOTE: The costs of these out-of-scope services have consumed the budget that was intended for the completion of the Final EIR (\$18,730). Of the \$23,022.50 spent for the out of the scope items, \$4,292.50 is the amount that has exceeded the contracted budget.

EXHIBIT G

ADDITIONAL SCOPE OF WORK

Highland Estates Environmental Impact Report (EIR)

A detailed description of the tasks that will be required to complete the revised draft EIR is provided below.

Task 1: Prepare Revised Administrative Draft EIR

Impact Sciences will recirculate the Highland Estates draft EIR in accordance with all requirements of the *State CEQA Guidelines*. We will prepare a revised cover to cover administrative draft EIR (ADEIR) of the Highland Estates draft EIR including, changes to the table of contents; introduction; executive summary; project description; environmental setting; impacts, and mitigation measures; and alternatives, as described below. Impact Sciences will submit five (5) printed copies of the revised ADEIR for the County to review and comment.

Task 1.1: Project Description

County staff will provide language regarding the density credit calculations, lot line adjustments, and an explanation of the size of Lot 8 to Impact Sciences for incorporation into the project description. Additionally, County staff will provide two graphics clarifying the density and lot line adjustments, for incorporation into the document. Impact Sciences will include and clarify new information associated with truck traffic (as a result of the new information provided by Treadwell & Rollo associated with geotechnical mitigation), dedication of open space, number of protected trees to be removed, description of the bio-retention planters, and Figure 3.0-3, Existing Zoning. Other minor changes as a result of the comments received on the December 2008 draft EIR will also be included.

Task 1.2: Introduction and Executive Summary

Impact Sciences will revise the Introduction and Executive Summary in accordance with the changes made to **Section 3.0, Project Description**, and other sections and subsections of the revised draft EIR, including the impact summary, alternatives to the project, and issues to be resolved/areas of controversy. Impact Sciences will include a discussion of the revised draft EIR process, orient the reader to where the changes are made and how those changes are presented, and describe how the comments from the December 2008 draft EIR and the revised draft EIR will be processed. We will also work with County staff to include text reflecting the results of the meeting held on March 16, 2009 between the public, the County, the EIR team, and the applicant. Lastly, we will update **Table 2.0-1, Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures** to reflect changes to the draft EIR.

Task 1.3. Section 4.0, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures

Impact Sciences will address the issues listed below in **Section 4.0, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures** of the revised draft EIR.

- Impact Sciences will add and describe the cumulative list of projects, and clarify cumulative approach and analysis in the revised draft EIR.
- Impact Sciences will describe the views of the project site from Polhemus Road, Crown Court, and Baywood Plaza in the revised draft EIR. Impact Sciences will evaluate the potential visual impacts associated with these views in the revised draft EIR. The description of impacts will be provided in a narrative format, and visual simulations will not be prepared.
- Impact Sciences will describe the visual appearance and visibility of the 100-foot fire clearing setback requirement to adjacent areas.
- Impact Sciences will clarify the text in **Section 4.2, Biological Resources** to address the comment on the red-legged frog and purple needle grass raised by a commenter.
- Impact Sciences will update and revise **Section 4.3, Geology and Soils** with the supplemental geologic investigation to be conducted by Treadwell & Rollo (scope of work attached). Specifically, this work will include the following:
 - perform additional site reconnaissance and geologic mapping of the four development areas (the lots along Ticonderoga Drive, Bunker Hill Avenue, and at the end of Cowpens Way and Cobblehill Place), utilizing the new topographic survey once it becomes available (to be prepared by BKF Engineer and is not part of the scope of services);
 - a separate site geologic map showing site geology, landslide limits, and any existing fill at each of the four areas will be prepared and submitted with their report;
 - prepare revised geologic cross-sections for each of the four development areas based on the updated topographic surveys;
 - consult with Mr. Ted Sayre of Cotton Shires and Associates, Mr. Scott Fitinghoff of Cornerstone Earth Group, and Mr. Darwin Myers to review the updated maps and cross-sections, and mutually agree on the locations for subsurface exploration within the Ticonderoga Drive lots;
 - excavation and down-hole logging of three hand-dug test pits excavated and shored in accordance with OSHA requirements by Soil Stability Construction, Inc. to depths between about 10 feet and 35 feet below the ground surface in the area of the mapped landslide along the Ticonderoga lots;
 - one test pit will be excavated to approximately 30 feet deep within the limits of the landslide on Lot 6, a second test pit will be excavated to approximately 35 feet deep within the limits of the landslide near the boarder of Lots 7 and 8, and a third test pit will be excavated to approximately 10 feet deep along the edge of Ticonderoga Drive (should the landslide depth be shallower than 25 feet in the two deeper pits, the pits will terminate at a depth of approximately 10 feet below the lowest observed slide plane);
 - laboratory testing, including Plasticity Index tests, Modified Proctor Tests, and shear tests of samples obtained from the pits;

- prepare mitigation measures comparable to those discussed during the March 16 project meeting, including the proposed schematic buttress fill plan and cross-section, showing the approximate depth and limits of gracing to mitigate the landslide;
 - qualitatively evaluate the site hydrogeology characteristics and develop drainage recommendations as appropriate;
 - perform static and pseudo-static (seismically loaded) quantitative slope stability analyses of the proposed buttress fill mitigation; and
 - prepare a revised geologic investigation report.
- Impact Sciences will describe potential impacts to the downstream wastewater conveyance system (Crystal Springs County Sanitation District) during the wet peak period and how the project would offset impacts through mitigation. We will work with the County's Public Works Department to develop a mitigation that would result in a zero increase of wastewater to the existing system. We will update the text starting on page 4.4-30 of the draft EIR, as requested in the Public Works comment letter dated January 21, 2009.
 - Impact Sciences will contact PG&E to determine whether off-site electrical improvements would be required for this project, in conjunction with other planned or approved projects. We will document the results in the revised draft EIR.
 - Impact Sciences will modify and clarify the text on traffic and transportation, using the responses provided by Fehr and Peers, in response to the Caltrans comment letter received on the December 2008 draft EIR.

Task 1.4: Alternatives

Impact Sciences will revise and update **Section 6.0, Alternatives** in response to the comments received to this section of the draft EIR. Specifically, Impact Sciences will update **Section 6.1.1, Impacts of the Proposed Project** in accordance with other changes made to the revised draft EIR, clarify the "alternate off-site location" in response to the comments received on this topic, eliminate current discussion of "Development Consistent with Land Use Designation and Zoning" as this is addressed in Alternative 2, No Project, Residential Use Alternative and address the visual and geotechnical issues raised regarding Alternative 4, Reduced Density Alternative.

Task 1.5: Overall Report Review, Revision, Production, and Meeting Attendance

This task provides for overall document review and revision, and publications. Impact Sciences will conduct technical and principal-level review of all sections of the revised ADEIR prior to submission to the County.

Impact Sciences will meet with the County two times during the preparation of the revised draft EIR.

Task 2: Publish Draft EIR and Notice of Completion

The revised ADEIR will be revised in response to County comments. Impact Sciences will prepare a screencheck draft EIR, which will be utilized by the County as a final check of the revised draft EIR prior to printing and distribution. Upon approval of the screencheck revised draft EIR, Impact Sciences will print and submit 37 hard copies and 37 compact discs. We assume the County will distribute the document to appropriate agencies. Impact Sciences will distribute the copies to the State Clearinghouse.

Task 3: Project Management

This task encompasses project management and coordination. Specific responsibilities include senior project oversight to adherence to the budget and schedule; contract administration; project team coordination; coordination with County staff; day-to-day technical data coordination; and setting up and moderating teleconferences, and meetings with the project team, as needed.

Budget

Out of scope costs must be authorized by the County prior to the start of work. **Table 1, Proposed Costs** shows the proposed costs to prepare the revised draft EIR. As shown, the fee for Impact Sciences to prepare the revised draft EIR is \$22,970. This fee covers preparation of the revised draft EIR through publication, expenses, and attendance at two project meetings. **Table 1** also provides the cost (including the 10 percent mark up) for Treadwell & Rollo to conduct the additional geotechnical supplemental analysis. As shown in the table and described in their attached proposal, they have included costs to assist with response to comments on the revised draft EIR and to attend three public hearings. These tasks were not budgeted in their original scope of work. The total cost to prepare the revised draft EIR and supplemental geotechnical analysis, including Treadwell & Rollo's assistance in response to comments and public hearing attendance, is **\$63,247**.

Table 1, Proposed Cost

Task	PIC (\$220)	PM (\$140)	Staff (\$100)	Graphics/ Publication (\$85)	Total Cost
Impact Sciences					
Task 1: Prepare Revised Administrative Draft EIR					
Task 1.1: Project Description	1 (\$220)	2 (\$280)	4 (\$400)	2 (\$170)	\$1,070
Task 1.2: Introduction and Executive Summary	1 (\$220)	2 (\$280)	4 (\$400)	2 (\$170)	\$1,070
Task 1.3: Section 4.0	2 (\$440)	12 (\$1,680)	16 (\$1,600)	2 (\$170)	\$3,890
Task 1.4: Alternatives	1 (\$220)	4 (\$560)	8 (\$800)	2 (\$170)	\$1,750
Task 1.5: Publications/Meetings	4 (\$880)	16 (\$2,240)	4 (\$400)	16 (\$1,360)	\$4,880
Task 2: Publish DEIR/NOC	1 (\$220)	4 (\$560)	12 (\$1,200)	22 (\$1,870)	\$3,850
Task 3: Project Management	1 (\$220)	16 (\$2,240)			\$2,460
Expenses					<u>\$4,000</u>
<i>Subtotal</i>					\$22,970
Treadwell & Rollo, Inc.					
Supplemental Geologic Report					\$34,997
Response to Comments/Public Meeting Attendance					\$5,280
<i>Subtotal</i>					\$40,277
TOTAL					\$63,247

Schedule

Impact Sciences can submit a revised ADEIR within 12 weeks of authorization to proceed, provided that all of the information we need is available at the time of authorization. Treadwell & Rollo has indicated in their letter proposal (attached) that they can begin their work upon receipt of the updated topographic surveys from BKF Engineers. Once they have received this information, the supplemental geological technical investigation will be completed in 10 weeks.

Highland Estates Project EIR Schedule

ID	Task	Duration	Start	Finish	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan
1	Prepare Revised ADEIR *	85 days	Tue 5/5/09	Tue 7/28/09									
2	County Review of Revised ADEIR	9 days	Wed 7/29/09	Thu 8/6/09									
3	Meeting to Discuss Revised ADEIR	1 day	Fri 8/7/09	Fri 8/7/09									
4	Publication of NOP for Revised DEIR	1 day	Fri 8/14/09	Fri 8/14/09									
5	Prepare Revised DEIR	15 days	Mon 8/10/09	Mon 8/24/09									
6	County Review of Screencheck Revised DEIR	5 days	Mon 8/24/09	Fri 8/28/09									
7	Prepare and Publish Revised DEIR and NOC	8 days	Fri 8/28/09	Fri 9/4/09									
8	Revised DEIR Review Period	45 days	Fri 9/4/09	Sun 10/18/09									
9	Planning Commission Preliminary Hearing	1 day	Wed 10/14/09	Wed 10/14/09									
10	Meeting to discuss comments on Revised D	1 day	Fri 10/23/09	Fri 10/23/09									
11	Prepare Admin Draft FEIR/MMRP	15 days	Mon 10/19/09	Mon 11/2/09									
12	County Review Admin Draft FEIR/MMRP	9 days	Mon 11/2/09	Tue 11/10/09									
13	Prepare Screencheck FEIR	6 days	Wed 11/11/09	Mon 11/16/09									
14	County Review of Screencheck FEIR	3 days	Tue 11/17/09	Thu 11/19/09									
15	Publish FEIR and Circulate for 10 days	13 days	Thu 11/19/09	Tue 12/1/09									
16	Planning Commission Hearing	1 day	Wed 12/9/09	Wed 12/9/09									
17	Board of Supervisors Hearing*	1 day	Tue 1/12/10	Tue 1/12/10									
18	Notice of Determination	1 day	Wed 1/13/10	Wed 1/13/10									

* Assuming proposal is accepted by the Board of Supervisors and availability of updated topographic maps provided by BKF Engineers are provided.

Treadwell&Rollo

14 April 2009
Proposal P07-268

Ms. Audrey Darnell
Impact Sciences, Inc.
2101 Webster Street, Suite 1825
Oakland, California 94612

Subject: Revised Proposal
Supplemental Geologic Investigation
Highland Estates Residential Development Project
San Mateo County, California

Dear Ms. Darnell:

Treadwell & Rollo, Inc. is pleased to present this revised proposal to perform a supplemental geologic investigation for the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) being prepared for the proposed Highland Estates Residential Development project in unincorporated San Mateo County, California. We have previously submitted a prior version of this proposal dated 20 March 2009, and have revised this proposal to include clarifications to the scope of services and changes in our schedule as discussed with you and Ms. Camille Leung of the San Mateo County Planning Department.

We have previously conducted a geologic evaluation for the project and submitted the results of that investigation in our report dated 23 September 2008. That report was incorporated into a DEIR that was published in December 2008. During the public review of the DEIR, Cotton Shires and Associates, geologic and geotechnical consultants for the Highlands Community Association, submitted a Supplemental Geologic and Geotechnical Evaluations letter dated 13 February 2009.

This letter contained recommendations for further investigation to characterize the extent and depth of the landslide impacting the four lots (Lots 5 through 8) along Ticonderoga Drive and further analyses to develop a schematic buttress repair mitigation. This schematic buttress should be used to develop a grading plan describing the limits of mitigation grading and quantity of material to be removed and replaced.

In addition, the letter recommended that additional studies be performed to evaluate: *spring activity, stabilization piers, and historic landsliding for the Bunker Hill Drive lots; the potential for asbestos exposure from project grading; hydrology analyses and the potential for increased peak discharge to initiate debris flows or erosion; appropriate surface drainage control; evaluations of project slope stability under seismic ground shaking conditions; and an evaluation of the potential for adverse off-site impacts from the proposed property (landsliding into adjacent developed property).*

A project discussion meeting was held on 16 March 2009 between Treadwell & Rollo, Inc., Cotton Shires and Associates, Impact Sciences, San Mateo County Staff including the County Geologist Ms. Jean Demouthe, and the project geotechnical consultant Cornerstone Earth Group. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the geologic and geotechnical constraints to each of the four areas of development, and come to a consensus on what, if any, further studies should be performed as part of the EIR.

Ms Audrey Darnell
Impact Sciences, Inc.
14 April 2009
Page 2

SCOPE OF SERVICES

During that meeting, it was agreed upon by all parties to further evaluate the landslide impacting the Ticonderoga lots by performing additional subsurface exploration in the area of the landslide, and by conducting additional geologic mapping and evaluations for all of the four building sites, utilizing updated topographic surveys to be performed by BKF Engineers (the project surveyor and civil engineer). We understand that the project applicant will be contracting directly with BKF to perform a new survey of all four building areas, with sufficient resolution to develop 2-foot contour intervals.

The purpose of our supplemental investigation will be to perform the agreed upon scope of services at the consultant's meeting. Based on the discussions at the meeting, our scope will include:

- performing additional site reconnaissance and geologic mapping of all four development areas (the lots along Ticonderoga Drive, Bunker Hill Avenue, and at the ends of Cowpens Way and Cobblehill Place), utilizing the new topographic survey, once it becomes available. A separate site geologic map showing site geology, landslide limits, and any existing fill at each of the four areas will be prepared and submitted with our report;
- preparing revised geologic cross-sections for each of the four development areas based on the updated topographic surveys;
- additional consultation with Mr. Ted Sayre of Cotton Shires and Associates, Mr. Scott Fitinghoff of Cornerstone Earth Group, and Mr. Darwin Myers to review the updated maps and cross-sections, and mutually agree on the locations for subsurface exploration within the Ticonderoga Drive lots;
- excavation and down-hole logging of three hand-dug test pits excavated and shored in accordance with OSHA requirements by Soil Stability Construction, Inc. to depths between about 10 feet and 35 feet below the ground surface in the area of the landsliding impacting the Ticonderoga Drive lots. One test pit will be excavated to about 30 feet deep within the limits of the landslide on Lot 6, one test pit will be excavated to about 35 feet deep within the limits of the landslide near the boarder of Lots 7 and 8, and a third test pit will be excavated to about 10 feet deep along the edge of Ticonderoga Drive. Should the landslide depth be shallower than 25 feet in the two deeper pits, the pits will terminate at a depth about 10 feet below the lowest observed slide plane;
- laboratory testing, consisting of Plasticity Index tests, Modified Proctor Tests, and shear tests of samples obtained from the pits;
- preparing mitigation measures comparable to those discussed during the 16 March 2009 meeting, including developing a proposed schematic buttress fill plan and cross-section, showing the approximate depth and limits of grading to mitigate the landslide;
- qualitatively evaluating the site hydrogeology characteristics and developing drainage recommendations if appropriate;
- performing static and pseudo-static (seismically loaded) quantitative slope stability analyses of the proposed buttress fill mitigation. A force diagram will also be provided for any proposed retaining wall that may be incorporated into a mitigation of the landslide;

Ms Audrey Darnell
Impact Sciences, Inc.
14 April 2009
Page 3

- preparing a revised geologic investigation report based on our prior study and our updated investigation and analyses to be used to revise the DEIR;
- reviewing the geologic portion of the DEIR once it is compiled;
- responding to public comments of the DEIR and attending three public hearings as requested.

The excavated pits will be left open for representatives from the various consulting firms to visit and observe the subsurface conditions and allow the project geotechnical consultant to obtain samples for future laboratory testing. Following logging, the pits will be backfilled in compacted lifts using the spoils generated from their excavation.

FEE

We propose to perform our services on a time-and-expense basis in accordance with our at 2009 Schedule of Charges, which is attached. We estimate our fee for these services will be \$36,600. The estimated fees will not be exceeded unless the scope of service changes and not without your prior written authorization.

Because of the large amount of outside expense associated with excavating, shoring, and backfilling the test pits and performing the laboratory testing, we request a retainer of \$15,000 prior to the onset of our field investigation.

SCHEDULE

We can begin our review upon receiving authorization and copies of the updated topographic surveys from BKF Engineers. We anticipate that our initial field mapping and cross-section development will take approximately 2 to 3 weeks to complete. Once the pit locations are agreed upon, we anticipate that the subsurface investigation will take an additional 2 weeks. Following the subsurface investigation, our laboratory testing will take approximately 2 to 3 weeks to complete, followed by our slope stability analyses which will take about 1 week to complete. Our report preparation will take approximately 2 weeks following the completion of our analyses.