

EXHIBIT C-1

AMENDED PROPOSAL TO PREPARE AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

CLOS DE LA TECH WINERY PROJECT

The work program that follows describes changes to our previously approved work program; where no change is proposed we have stated such. As is always the case with our proposed scope, budget and schedule, LSA is open to suggestions for refinement and we look forward to discussing with the County our suggested approach to accomplishing the environmental clearance process.

I. PROJECT UNDERSTANDING

No change.

II. STRATEGIC APPROACH

LSA will prepare the following technical sections in addition to those previously identified: land use, plans and policies; traffic, circulation and parking; noise; air quality; public services and utilities; cultural resources; and visual quality. We will prepare the alternatives analysis based on the draft Alternatives Analysis chapter provided by the applicant. We also anticipate additional effort associated with the biological resources section due in part to the recent designation parts of San Mateo County as critical habitat for the California red-legged frog.

III. PROPOSED WORK PROGRAM

This section outlines LSA's approach and specific work program for completing the environmental documentation for the Clos de la Tech Winery Project in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). A summary of the work program is provided in Table 1.

Task A. Project Initiation

The project initiation task for the proposed project environmental document will provide an opportunity for the LSA team to collaborate and strategize with County staff and representatives of the applicant to refine our recommended approach and work program as warranted. Key project initiation tasks will involve a start-up meeting with the County and the applicant, conducting a site visit, gathering information, and refining the work program. Paramount among the issues to be resolved early in the process will be concurrence on the approach for completing the environmental review process.

1. Start-Up Meeting

No change in scope.

2. Site Visit

No change in scope.

3. Data Gathering and Evaluation

No change in scope.

4. Project Description

LSA reviewed both the County's and the applicant's versions of the draft project description and found that they lacked important details with respect to the project (as did the project description in the 2008 Draft EIR). Specifically, while there was a good description of winery operations, there was little or no description of the vineyard planting and operations, water use, wastewater disposal, stormwater facilities, and other appurtenant facilities, such as roads. As water use for irrigation, winery processes and domestic purposes is an important issue for the project we felt this information needed to be added. We used Shaw Environmental's technical report as the source of this information. Additional graphics will be required to illustrate the project components. Our level of effort for this task was greater than anticipated in our scope and budget, but we feel that the project description, being the foundation of the rest of the document, needs to be more robust. Both the County and applicant have concurred with our additions to the project description.

5. Work Program Refinement

No change in scope.

Table 1: Scope of Work Summary

TASK A: PROJECT INITIATION

1. Start-Up Meeting
2. Site Visit
3. Data Gathering and Evaluation
4. Project Description
5. Work Program Refinement

TASK B: DRAFT EIR

1. Administrative Draft EIR (ADEIR)
 - a. Land Use, Plans and Policies
 - b. Hydrology and Water Quality
 - c. Geology, Soils and Geohazards
 - d. Hazards and Hazardous Materials
 - e. Biological Resources
 - f. Traffic, Circulation and Parking
 - g. Noise
 - h. Air Quality
 - i. Public Services and Utilities
 - j. Cultural Resources
 - k. Visual Resources
 - l. Global Climate Change
 - m. Cumulative and Growth-Inducing Impacts
 - n. CEQA-Required Assessment Conclusions
 - o. Alternatives Analysis
 - p. Compile and Produce ADEIR
2. Screencheck Draft EIR
3. Public Review Draft EIR

TASK C: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES DOCUMENT

1. Administrative Draft C&R
2. Screencheck C&R
3. Final EIR
4. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

TASK D: PUBLIC HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

TASK E. PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Task B. Draft EIR

1. Administrative Draft EIR

The scopes for the additional technical sections to be prepared by LSA and for the additional effort to complete the biological resources section are described below.

a. Land Use, Plans and Policies. LSA will review this section for substance, style, and technical consistency, and will verify that the analysis adequately reflects all components of the project. LSA will specifically address the following items, in addition to others that may be identified after a more detailed review of the section: 1) ensure that the policy analysis is customized to reflect the land use issues associated with the project; 2) review the County's General Plan and Zoning Regulations to ensure that the analysis includes all applicable policies; 3) better define what "divide an established community" means (the subsection currently focuses on land use compatibility); 4) revise the zoning compatibility discussion to reflect the new project description; and 5) if appropriate combine the land use compatibility and land use conflicts impacts discussions, as these appear interrelated.

e. Biological Resources. Our initial budget assumed that the previous Draft EIR had covered most issues to some extent and could be relied upon for the basic background information and some information on impacts and mitigation. Based upon more detailed examination of the document and supporting materials, the results of our site visit, and recent federal regulatory actions, it has become apparent that the Biological Resources section of the previous Draft EIR was very incomplete and requires substantial rewriting. One example is the treatment of California red-legged frogs (CRLF). The document does not give due consideration to the fact that non-breeding aquatic habitat will be impacted by the project and that there is potential breeding habitat on the adjacent property less than 1,000 feet from the project site (a distance easily traversed by frogs). In addition, on March 17, 2010, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) designated parts of San Mateo County, including the project area as critical habitat for CRLF. This critical habitat unit was proposed after the 2008 Draft EIR was published, but before the 2009 technical report by Shaw Environmental, in which it is not mentioned. CRLF critical habitat requires consideration in the new Draft EIR.

The California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) now requires that CEQA documents use the vegetation classification in the Manual of California Vegetation (2nd Edition). These updated classifications were not used in the previous Draft EIR. All previous vegetation classification information in the Draft EIR (both text and figures) requires updating to the new classifications.

LSA had intended to use the existing maps from the 2008 DEIR in the new Draft EIR, however, during the field site visit additional wetlands were identified that require mapping. We also need to digitize the areas on the map to quantify impacts to the various habitats on the site. While we obtained GIS data from Shaw Environmental, we found that some data layers were inaccurate and had to be re-georeferenced and a base map acquired.

Also complicating our analysis is the fact that the project description in the previous Draft EIR and as provided by the County and applicant did not fully describe the project with respect to some important project features, such as proposed roads, that could have impacts to biological resources. Additional effort will be required to determine the location, extent, and magnitude of the impacts and to develop mitigation strategies to address the impacts.

Our requested budget augment for biological resources reflects additional effort for the following tasks:

- Description, analysis and development of mitigation to address CRLF
- Description, analysis and development of mitigation to address wetlands
- Preparation of GIS mapping of wetlands for purposes of quantification and analysis

- Revision to vegetation classification descriptions and identification on maps

f. Traffic, Circulation and Parking. LSA will review this section for substance, style, and technical consistency, and will verify that the analysis adequately reflects all components of the project. In addition, LSA will revise the criteria of significance (and associated discussion) to reflect the newly-adopted changes to Appendix G of the *CEQA Guidelines*. LSA will specifically address the following items, in addition to others that may be identified after a more detailed review of the section: 1) review the policy discussion to ensure it is customized to the project; 2) revise the “Caltrans” discussion in the setting section to be better oriented to policy considerations; 3) refine the traffic impact analysis to focus more on the effectiveness of the roadway system rather than capacity; 4) address potential conflicts between project-related trucks on SR 35 and bicycle use; and 5) determine whether the impact analysis adequately analyzes the extended road.

g. Noise. LSA will review this section for substance, style, and technical consistency, and will verify that the analysis adequately reflects all components of the project. LSA will specifically address the following items, in addition to others that may be identified after a more detailed review of the section: 1) clarify setting information related to noise and how it is measured; 2) clarify what constitutes effective noise attenuation measures in the setting section; 3) customize the setting discussion so it better reflects the project and relevant sensitive uses; 4) better describe the methods of the noise analysis and confirm applicable noise thresholds; 5) verify that construction noise surrounding the site would indeed be elevated as a result of the project; and 6) customize the construction-period mitigation measure so it better reflects the project.

h. Air Quality. LSA will review this section for substance, style, and technical consistency, and will verify that the analysis adequately reflects all components of the project. LSA will specifically address the following items, in addition to others that may be identified after a more detailed review of the section: 1) remove the short background discussion of global climate change in the setting section and remove the short analysis in the impact section because global climate change will be discussed in a separate section; 2) revise the regulatory section to delete material that is not needed to understand the impacts of the project; 3) summarize information about criteria pollutants in a table to facilitate understanding and comparison of the pollutants as appropriate; 4) verify that there are no policies in the County General Plan that pertain to air quality (as stated in the section); 5) update pollution data from the Redwood City monitoring station (and region), as applicable; and 6) briefly discuss potential emissions from cultivated areas (e.g., the potential for soil erosion).

i. Public Services and Utilities. LSA will review this section for substance, style, and technical consistency, and will verify that the analysis adequately reflects all components of the project. LSA will specifically address the following items, in addition to others that may be identified after a more detailed review of the section: 1) update the information in the setting section, as appropriate (some of the information is 3 years old); 2) update the remaining lifespan information on the Ox Mountain landfill, as it dates from 1998; and 3) in regard to public services, clarify that references to the project not substantially increasing the on-site population take into account the increase in the temporary farm worker population.

j. Cultural Resources. LSA will review this section for substance, style, and technical consistency, and will verify that the analysis adequately reflects all components of the project. LSA will specifically address the following items, in addition to others that may be identified after a more

detailed review of the section: 1) clarify the language in the introduction to indicate that the first step of the analysis must include an evaluation of the *potential* for resources to occur on the site (not just whether identified resources exist); 2) delete some of the setting section because it is irrelevant to the project site; 3) add a brief discussion to the setting section which discusses the potential of the site to contain fossils; 4) clarify the statement that the project site contains no historic resources, because it could contain historic-period archaeological materials (based on Impact 3.10-1); 5) clarify statements in the impacts section about the project not resulting in significant excavation or grading; and 6) provide support as to why fossils are not likely to be found at the project site.

k. Visual Resources. LSA will review this section for substance, style, and technical consistency, and will verify that the analysis adequately reflects all components of the project. LSA will specifically address the following items, in addition to others that may be identified after a more detailed review of the section: 1) move the viewpoint location map to precede the visual simulations; 2) change the reference to cultural resources at the beginning of the impacts section; 3) clarify why Impact 3.11-1 is potentially significant; 4) better substantiate why the expansion of vineyards is not considered a significant impact to visual resources; and 5) specify whether views would be compromised from SR 35, which is a scenic route.

o. Alternatives Analysis. This task was previously identified as optional. We now include time to review and comment on the Alternatives Chapter that was provided by the applicant. No effort is proposed to develop or analyze additional alternatives.

2. Screencheck Draft EIR

No change in scope.

3. Public Review Draft EIR

No change in scope.

Task C. Comments and Responses Document and Final EIR

LSA will prepare the Comments and Responses (C&R) document on the project following the public review period.

1. Administrative Draft C&R Document

No change in scope.

2. Screencheck C&R Document

No change in scope.

3. Final C&R Document

No change in scope.

TASK D. PUBLIC HEARINGS

No change in scope.

TASK E. PROJECT MANAGEMENT

No change in scope.

IV. BUDGET

1. Revised Budget

For completion of the additional scope of work set forth in this proposal, LSA's preliminary cost estimate is \$38,180. A detailed breakdown of the budget estimate is provided in Attachment 1, including the incremental increase and the revised total cost.

Attachment 1
Revised Budget

Attachment 1
Clos de la Tech Winery Project EIR Preliminary Budget (Original)

LSA Associates																	HydroFocus						
	Principal-in-Charge (Clore)	Project Manager (Brown)	Senior Planner	Principal Biologist (Foreman)	Senior Biologist (Lacy)	Biologist (Lichtwardt)	Biologist (Lee)	Biologist (Lohmann)	Cultural Resources (Staff)	Global Climate Change (Chung)	Global Climate Change (Paukovits)	Transportation (Staff)	Word Processing	Graphics/GIS/Production	LSA Subtotal	Principal Engineer	Principal Hydrologist	Senior Hydrologist/Engineer	Assistant Hydrologist	Tech	GIS	HydroFocus Subtotal (see detailed scope and budget)	Team Total
TASKS/SUBTASKS	Hourly Rate:	\$225	\$165	\$125	\$190	\$130	\$95	\$100	\$125	\$190	\$105	\$125	\$90	\$105		\$224	\$176	\$160	\$97	\$81	\$97		
TASK A: PROJECT INITIATION																							
1. Start-Up Meeting	4	4			8										\$2,600	10	2	10				\$4,188	\$6,788
2. Site Visit	2	2				8	8	8							\$3,300							\$0	\$3,300
3. Review of Background Materials and Peer Review	2	8	8	1		12	12	12							\$6,740	34	39	43	4	4		\$22,057	\$28,797
4. Project Description	2	4	2										1	1	\$1,555							\$0	\$1,555
5. Notice of Preparation															\$0							\$0	\$0
5. Work Program Refinement	4	4													\$1,560							\$0	\$1,560
Subtotal for Task A	14	22	10	1	8	20	20	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	\$15,755	44	41	53	4	4	0	\$26,245	\$42,000
TASK B: DRAFT EIR																							
B.1 Administrative Draft EIR (ADEIR)																							
a. Land Use, Plans and Policies															\$0							\$0	\$0
b. Hydrology and Water Quality	1	18	8										2	4	\$4,795	12	19	25	4		1	\$10,512	\$15,307
c. Geology, Soils, and Geohazards	1	8	4										2	2	\$2,435							\$0	\$2,435
d. Hazards and Hazardous Materials	1	12	4										1		\$2,795		6					\$1,056	\$3,851
e. Biological Resources		6		1	16	32	16	8					2		\$9,040							\$0	\$9,040
f. Traffic, Circulation, and Parking															\$0							\$0	\$0
g. Noise															\$0							\$0	\$0
h. Air Quality															\$0							\$0	\$0
i. Public Services and Utilities															\$0							\$0	\$0
j. Cultural Resources															\$0							\$0	\$0
k. Visual Resources															\$0							\$0	\$0
l. Global Climate Change	1	2								2	34				\$4,505							\$0	\$4,505
m. Cumulative and Growth-Inducing Impacts		2	6												\$1,080							\$0	\$1,080
n. CEQA-Required Assessment Conclusions		2	6												\$1,080							\$0	\$1,080
o. Alternatives Analysis (see optional task, below)															\$0							\$0	\$0
p. Compile and Produce ADEIR	16	24	36										16	8	\$14,340							\$0	\$14,340
B.2 Screencheck Draft EIR	6	12	8										4		\$4,690							\$0	\$4,690
B.3 Public Review Draft EIR	4	8	4										6	8	\$4,100							\$0	\$4,100
Subtotal for Tasks B	30	94	76	1	16	32	16	8	0	2	34	0	33	22	\$48,860	12	25	25	4	0	1	\$11,568	\$60,428
TASK C: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES DOCUMENT																							
C.1 Administrative Draft C&R	16	32	24		2	16	12	8			4		4	2	\$16,810	8	5	28				\$7,148	\$23,958
C.2 Screencheck Draft C&R	4	12	12			2					2		2		\$4,960							\$0	\$4,960
C.3 Final EIR	2	6	6										6	8	\$3,570							\$0	\$3,570
C.4 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program	2	4	4										2		\$1,790							\$0	\$1,790
C.5 Notice of Determination															\$0							\$0	\$0
Subtotal for Task C	24	54	46	0	2	18	12	8	0	0	6	0	14	10	\$27,130	8	5	28	0	0	0	\$7,148	\$34,278
TASK D: PUBLIC HEARINGS																							
Subtotal for Task D	20	24	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	\$10,240	0	4	24	0	0	0	\$4,544	\$14,784
TASK E: PROJECT MANAGEMENT																							
Subtotal for Task E	16	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$9,540	0	4	8	0	0	0	\$1,984	\$11,524
TOTAL LABOR (ALL TASKS)	104	230	140	2	26	70	48	36	0	2	40	0	52	37	\$111,525	64	79	138	8	4	1	\$51,489	\$163,014

Attachment 1
Clos de la Tech Winery Project EIR Preliminary Budget (Original)

TASKS/SUBTASKS	Principal-in-Charge (Clore)	Project Manager (Brown)	Senior Planner	Principal Biologist (Foreman)	Senior Biologist (Lacy)	Biologist (Lichtwardt)	Biologist (Lee)	Biologist (Lohmann)	Cultural Resources (Staff)	Global Climate Change (Chung)	Global Climate Change (Paukovits)	Transportation (Staff)	Word Processing	Graphics/GIS/Production	LSA Subtotal	Principal Engineer	Principal Hydrologist	Senior Hydrologist/Engineer	Assistant Hydrologist	Tech	GIS	HydroFocus Subtotal <i>(see detailed scope and budget)</i>	Team Total
	Hourly Rate:	\$225	\$165	\$125	\$190	\$130	\$95	\$100	\$120	\$125	\$190	\$105	\$125	\$90		\$105	\$224	\$176	\$160	\$97	\$81		
MISCELLANEOUS COSTS																							
Communications	\$400															\$0	\$400						
Mailings/postage	\$100															\$0	\$100						
Travel	\$600															\$0	\$600						
Report Printing	\$3,600															\$0	\$3,600						
TOTAL MISCELLANEOUS COSTS	\$4,700															\$0	\$4,700						
TOTAL TEAM COSTS															\$116,225	\$167,714							
OPTIONAL TASK: ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS																							
Subtotal for Optional Task	2	24	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$6,410	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0	\$6,410

Attachment 1
Clos de la Tech Winery Project EIR Preliminary Budget (Amendment 1 Incremental)

LSA Associates																HydroFocus								
TASKS/SUBTASKS	Hourly Rate:	Principal-in-Charge (Clore)	Project Manager (Brown)	Senior Planner	Principal Biologist (Foreman)	Senior Biologist (Lacy)	Biologist (Lichtwardt)	Biologist (Lee)	Biologist (Lohmann)	Cultural Resources (Staff)	Global Climate Change (Chung)	Global Climate Change (Paukovits)	Transportation (Staff)	Word Processing	Graphics/GIS/Production	LSA Subtotal	Principal Engineer	Principal Hydrologist	Senior Hydrologist/Engineer	Assistant Hydrologist	Tech	GIS	HydroFocus Subtotal <i>(see detailed scope and budget)</i>	Team Total
		\$225	\$165	\$125	\$190	\$130	\$95	\$100	\$120	\$125	\$190	\$105	\$125	\$90	\$105		\$224	\$176	\$160	\$97	\$81	\$97		
1. Start-Up Meeting																\$0							\$0	\$0
2. Site Visit																\$0							\$0	\$0
3. Review of Background Materials and Peer Review								6	4							\$1,080							\$0	\$1,080
4. Project Description	2	8												2	12	\$3,210							\$0	\$3,210
5. Notice of Preparation																\$0							\$0	\$0
5. Work Program Refinement																\$0							\$0	\$0
Subtotal for Task A	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	0	0	0	0	2	12	\$4,290	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0	\$4,290
TASK B: DRAFT EIR																								
B.1 Administrative Draft EIR (ADEIR)																								
a. Land Use, Plans and Policies	2	4	12												4	\$3,030							\$0	\$3,030
b. Hydrology and Water Quality																\$0							\$0	\$0
c. Geology, Soils, and Geohazards																\$0							\$0	\$0
d. Hazards and Hazardous Materials																\$0							\$0	\$0
e. Biological Resources		6		2	16	24	16	16						2	18	\$11,320							\$0	\$11,320
f. Traffic, Circulation, and Parking	1	4	12										6			\$3,135							\$0	\$3,135
g. Noise	1	4	12													\$2,385							\$0	\$2,385
h. Air Quality	1	4	10									8				\$2,975							\$0	\$2,975
i. Public Services and Utilities	1	2	12													\$2,055							\$0	\$2,055
j. Cultural Resources	1	4	8							8						\$2,885							\$0	\$2,885
k. Visual Resources	1	2	10												2	\$2,015							\$0	\$2,015
l. Global Climate Change																\$0							\$0	\$0
m. Cumulative and Growth-Inducing Impacts																\$0							\$0	\$0
n. CEQA-Required Assessment Conclusions																\$0							\$0	\$0
o. Alternatives Analysis	2	16	8													\$4,090							\$0	\$4,090
p. Compile and Produce ADEIR																\$0							\$0	\$0
B.2 Screencheck Draft EIR																								
B.3 Public Review Draft EIR																								
Subtotal for Tasks B	10	46	84	2	16	24	16	16	8	0	8	6	2	24	\$33,890	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0	\$33,890
TASK C: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES DOCUMENT																								
C.1 Administrative Draft C&R																								
C.2 Screencheck Draft C&R																								
C.3 Final EIR																								
C.4 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program																								
C.5 Notice of Determination																								
Subtotal for Task C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0	\$0
TASK D: PUBLIC HEARINGS																								
Subtotal for Task D	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0	\$0
TASK E: PROJECT MANAGEMENT																								
Subtotal for Task E	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL LABOR (ALL TASKS)	12	54	84	2	16	24	22	20	8	0	8	6	4	36	\$38,180	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0	\$38,180

Attachment 1
Clos de la Tech Winery Project EIR Preliminary Budget (Amendment 1 Incremental)

TASKS/SUBTASKS	Principal-in-Charge (Clore)	Project Manager (Brown)	Senior Planner	Principal Biologist (Foreman)	Senior Biologist (Lacy)	Biologist (Lichtwardt)	Biologist (Lee)	Biologist (Lohmann)	Cultural Resources (Staff)	Global Climate Change (Chung)	Global Climate Change (Paukovits)	Transportation (Staff)	Word Processing	Graphics/GIS/Production	LSA Subtotal	Principal Engineer	Principal Hydrologist	Senior Hydrologist/Engineer	Assistant Hydrologist	Tech	GIS	HydroFocus Subtotal <i>(see detailed scope and budget)</i>	Team Total
	Hourly Rate:	\$225	\$165	\$125	\$190	\$130	\$95	\$100	\$120	\$125	\$190	\$105	\$125	\$90		\$105	\$224	\$176	\$160	\$97	\$81		
MISCELLANEOUS COSTS																							
Communications																\$0	\$0						
Mailings/postage																\$0	\$0						
Travel																\$0	\$0						
Report Printing																\$0	\$0						
TOTAL MISCELLANEOUS COSTS																\$0	\$0						
TOTAL TEAM COSTS																\$38,180	\$38,180						
OPTIONAL TASK: ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS																							
Subtotal for Optional Task		-2	-24	-16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(\$6,410)	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0	-\$6,410

Attachment 1
Clos de la Tech Winery Project EIR Preliminary Budget (Amendment 1 Total)

LSA Associates																HydroFocus							
	Principal-in-Charge (Clore)	Project Manager (Brown)	Senior Planner	Principal Biologist (Foreman)	Senior Biologist (Lacy)	Biologist (Lichtwardt)	Biologist (Lee)	Biologist (Lohmann)	Cultural Resources (Staff)	Global Climate Change (Chung)	Global Climate Change (Paukovits)	Transportation (Staff)	Word Processing	Graphics/GIS/Production	LSA Subtotal	Principal Engineer	Principal Hydrologist	Senior Hydrologist/Engineer	Assistant Hydrologist	Tech	GIS	HydroFocus Subtotal (see detailed scope and budget)	Team Total
TASKS/SUBTASKS	Hourly Rate:	\$225	\$165	\$125	\$190	\$130	\$95	\$100	\$125	\$190	\$105	\$125	\$90	\$105		\$224	\$176	\$160	\$97	\$81	\$97		
TASK A: PROJECT INITIATION																							
1. Start-Up Meeting	4	4			8										\$2,600	10	2	10				\$4,188	\$6,788
2. Site Visit	2	2				8	8	8							\$3,300							\$0	\$3,300
3. Review of Background Materials and Peer Review	2	8	8	1		12	18	16							\$7,820	34	39	43	4	4		\$22,057	\$29,877
4. Project Description	4	12	2										3	13	\$4,765							\$0	\$4,765
5. Notice of Preparation															\$0							\$0	\$0
5. Work Program Refinement	4	4													\$1,560							\$0	\$1,560
Subtotal for Task A	16	30	10	1	8	20	26	24	0	0	0	0	3	13	\$20,045	44	41	53	4	4	0	\$26,245	\$46,290
TASK B: DRAFT EIR																							
B.1 Administrative Draft EIR (ADEIR)																							
a. Land Use, Plans and Policies	2	4	12											4	\$3,030							\$0	\$3,030
b. Hydrology and Water Quality	1	18	8										2	4	\$4,795	12	19	25	4		1	\$10,512	\$15,307
c. Geology, Soils, and Geohazards	1	8	4										2	2	\$2,435							\$0	\$2,435
d. Hazards and Hazardous Materials	1	12	4										1		\$2,795		6					\$1,056	\$3,851
e. Biological Resources		12		3	32	56	32	24					4	18	\$20,360							\$0	\$20,360
f. Traffic, Circulation, and Parking	1	4	12									6			\$3,135							\$0	\$3,135
g. Noise	1	4	12												\$2,385							\$0	\$2,385
h. Air Quality	1	4	10								8				\$2,975							\$0	\$2,975
i. Public Services and Utilities	1	2	12												\$2,055							\$0	\$2,055
j. Cultural Resources	1	4	8						8						\$2,885							\$0	\$2,885
k. Visual Resources	1	2	10											2	\$2,015							\$0	\$2,015
l. Global Climate Change	1	2								2	34				\$4,505							\$0	\$4,505
m. Cumulative and Growth-Inducing Impacts		2	6												\$1,080							\$0	\$1,080
n. CEQA-Required Assessment Conclusions		2	6												\$1,080							\$0	\$1,080
o. Alternatives Analysis (see optional task, below)	2	16	8												\$4,090							\$0	\$4,090
p. Compile and Produce ADEIR	16	24	36										16	8	\$14,340							\$0	\$14,340
B.2 Screencheck Draft EIR	6	12	8										4		\$4,690							\$0	\$4,690
B.3 Public Review Draft EIR	4	8	4										6	8	\$4,100							\$0	\$4,100
Subtotal for Tasks B	40	140	160	3	32	56	32	24	8	2	42	6	35	46	\$82,750	12	25	25	4	0	1	\$11,568	\$94,318
TASK C: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES DOCUMENT																							
C.1 Administrative Draft C&R	16	32	24		2	16	12	8			4		4	2	\$16,810	8	5	28				\$7,148	\$23,958
C.2 Screencheck Draft C&R	4	12	12			2					2		2		\$4,960							\$0	\$4,960
C.3 Final EIR	2	6	6										6	8	\$3,570							\$0	\$3,570
C.4 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program	2	4	4										2		\$1,790							\$0	\$1,790
C.5 Notice of Determination															\$0							\$0	\$0
Subtotal for Task C	24	54	46	0	2	18	12	8	0	0	6	0	14	10	\$27,130	8	5	28	0	0	0	\$7,148	\$34,278
TASK D: PUBLIC HEARINGS																							
Subtotal for Task D	20	24	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	\$10,240	0	4	24	0	0	0	\$4,544	\$14,784
TASK E: PROJECT MANAGEMENT																							
Subtotal for Task E	16	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$9,540	0	4	8	0	0	0	\$1,984	\$11,524
TOTAL LABOR (ALL TASKS)	116	284	224	4	42	94	70	56	8	2	48	6	56	73	\$149,705	64	79	138	8	4	1	\$51,489	\$201,194

Attachment 1
Clos de la Tech Winery Project EIR Preliminary Budget (Amendment 1 Total)

TASKS/SUBTASKS	Principal-in-Charge (Clore)	Project Manager (Brown)	Senior Planner	Principal Biologist (Foreman)	Senior Biologist (Lacy)	Biologist (Lichtwardt)	Biologist (Lee)	Biologist (Lohmann)	Cultural Resources (Staff)	Global Climate Change (Chung)	Global Climate Change (Paukovits)	Transportation (Staff)	Word Processing	Graphics/GIS/Production	LSA Subtotal	Principal Engineer	Principal Hydrologist	Senior Hydrologist/Engineer	Assistant Hydrologist	Tech	GIS	HydroFocus Subtotal <i>(see detailed scope and budget)</i>	Team Total
	Hourly Rate:	\$225	\$165	\$125	\$190	\$130	\$95	\$100	\$120	\$125	\$190	\$105	\$125	\$90		\$105	\$224	\$176	\$160	\$97	\$81		
MISCELLANEOUS COSTS																							
Communications	\$400															\$0	\$400						
Mailings/postage	\$100															\$0	\$100						
Travel	\$600															\$0	\$600						
Report Printing	\$3,600															\$0	\$3,600						
TOTAL MISCELLANEOUS COSTS	\$4,700															\$0	\$4,700						
TOTAL TEAM COSTS															\$154,405	\$205,894							
OPTIONAL TASK: ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS																							
Subtotal for Optional Task	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0	\$0	