



CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE
300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove, California 93950

AGENDA REPORT

TO: Honorable Mayor and Members of City Council
FROM: Mark Brodeur, Community and Economic Development Director
MEETING DATE: March 2, 2016
SUBJECT: Consultant Selections for Project Bella Environmental Impact Report and Project Management Services
CEQA: Does not Constitute a "Project" per California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

RECOMMENDATION:

- (1.) Authorize the City Manager to execute a Professional Services Agreement with Kimley-Horn Associates to prepare an environmental impact report for the hotel proposal at the site of the American Tin Cannery otherwise known as Project Bella.
- (2.) Authorize the City Manager to execute a Professional Services Agreement with Curtis Williams to provide project management services on the environmental impact report and special studies for Project Bella
- (3.) Authorize the City Manager to execute a Professional Services Agreement with EMC Planning Group to assist City Staff and to collaborate with Kimley-Horn by authoring and performing specialized administrative, planning, fiscal, legal and environmental services for Project Bella.

DISCUSSION

The City of Pacific Grove issued a Request for Proposal for Project Bella on October 21, 2015. The City distributed the Request for Proposal to a limited number of qualified firms to provide environmental review services for the proposed project. The project includes the redevelopment of the existing approximately 4.88-acre American Tin Cannery (ATC) site, located at 125 Ocean View Boulevard, between Eardley Avenue, Central Avenue and Dewey Street, into a world class, LEED Platinum certified, hotel with various ancillary uses. The project is also located in the coastal zone of the City of Pacific Grove and is subject to the requirements of the City's Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan (currently being updated by the City) and the California Coastal Act.

On November 6th, the City received four proposals. The proposals were opened and reviewed by the Community Development Department. The firms submitting proposals included Michael Baker & Associates of Monterey, EMC Planning Group of Monterey, Kimley Horn & Associates of Capitola, and Denise Duffy & Associates from Monterey.

The Community Development Department reviewed and ranked each of the four proposals. The firms were ranked on cost, % of time dedicated by the firms Principal, the experience of the

designated project manager, the amount of subconsultants added to the team, the quality of the traffic firm, similar past clients, number of meetings allocated, number of months to complete and the quality of the subconsultant firms to review the historicity of the site.

When the review was complete, the Community Development Department found that Kimley-Horn of Capitola was the best firm to complete the EIR. Analysis of their proposal indicates that Kimley Horn understands and appreciates how critical the traffic and historic resource sections of the EIR will be. A key factor in the selection of Kimley-Horn is the fact that they are the only firm with traffic analysis inside their firm. Another key reason is that this project will require close coordination with the City of Monterey and Kimley Horn serves as Monterey's on-call traffic consultant.

The Department of Community and Economic Development completed a Proposal Scoring Matrix (attached). Review of the Matrix shows how the four firms scored in their respective qualities.

The successful completion of the EIR for Project Bella is of critical importance to the developer, city staff and the members of the public. Members of city staff are currently working on several other assignments and outside expertise is warranted to assist staff with the day project management of the environmental impact report and associated studies. Curtis Williams had visited with city staff months before and informed us that he had recently retired to Pacific Grove following his latest assignment as the Community Development Director for the City of Palo Alto and would be interested in helping us from time to time. When it became evident that that city staff would need extra help managing the EIR for Project Bella, we contacted Mr. Williams and asked if he might be available to assist us. We interviewed Curtis and found his credentials to be of the highest quality. Staff believes that having Mr. Williams provide project management of the EIR and associated studies would greatly improve the ultimate quality and processing of this most critical project component. The Director suggests that Mr. Williams would work approximately 15 hours per week on this assignment.

Finally, the Director has identified separate and distinct studies that would assist the transparency of the project with the general public. Upon detailed review of Kimley Horns proposal, it was determined that the project as a whole would benefit from the additional resources of EMC providing these services. The Director requested a separate and distinct scope of services from EMC Planning Group for an evaluation of the legal defensibility and completeness of the EIR, providing staff support services (including CEQA noticing, staff reports, resolutions, findings, and notices), the maintenance of the project record, and undertaking of contracting for specialized studies because of their understanding of localized coastal issues. Those studies include an independent fiscal analysis of the hotel, sea level rise analysis, Phase-1 environmental analysis, traffic peer review and an analysis to assure that water is available to the site and compatibility with the Certified Local Coastal Program. Staff wants to assure the Council and the public that the EIR and the project hotel will be developed at the highest level of quality.

CEQA

The recommended action does not constitute a "Project" as that term is defined under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guideline Section 15378.

OPTIONS

1. Select alternative consultants to prepare the EIR and Project Management.

2. Do nothing.

FISCAL IMPACT

No direct impact. The cost of the EIR consultant and Project Management will be paid for by the developer of Project Bella through a reimbursement agreement with the City of Pacific Grove.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Project Bella Proposal Scoring Matrix
2. Scope of Work for the EIR from Kimley Horn & Associates
3. Scope of Work for Additional Services from EMC Planning Group

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,



Mark J. Brodeur, Director
Community and Economic Development

REVIEWED BY,

Ben Harvey

Ben Harvey
Interim City Manager

**City of Pacific Grove
Community & Economic Development Department
Project Bella
Proposal Scoring Matrix
Revised 12/10/15**

	Cost	% Time of Principal	# of Years Exp. Project Manager	# of Subconsultants Needed	Traffic Firm	# of Hospitality Clients	# of Meetings	# of Months to Complete	Historic Qualifications (+ or-)	# of Intersections Studied	Rank of Billing Rates (1-4)	
1	PMC	175	0.05	17	one	Hatch McDonald	5	10	9.5	+	10	4
2	Denise Duffy	165	0.08	25	three	Hatch McDonald	6	9	11	-	6	2
3	Kimley Horn	172	0.03	30	three	In-house	7	15	8	+	9	3
4	EMC	288	0.06	12	five	Krupka	4	15	10	+	5	1

Ranking

#1 - Kimley Horn:	Analysis of proposal indicates KH understands and appreciates how critical traffic and historic resources are in Pacific Grove. With the most experienced project manager the most budgeted meetings and appropriate types of subconsultants. The closest % of time for Principal, but PM experience at Principal level. They also realize that given the potential controversy, an EIR is suggested. Mid-range price. Only firm with in-house traffic. This is the most critical element to staying on time. Most relevant hotel client types. Requested modifications submitted promptly. Firm is City of Monterey's On-Call Traffic Consultant.
#2 - PMC:	Not far behind the Kimley Horn proposal. They had one of the lower # of similar clientele. This firm had the highest billing rates for the primary authors working on the project. A big plus was only needing one subconsultant. Everything else was done in-house. A fairly high number of past hotel clients. Ranked #2 instead of #3 due to limited numbers of subconsultants required. Requested modifications were done the fastest.
#3 - Denise Duffy:	Although the firm presented the lowest price and most time commitment by the firms Principals, they had one of the lowest number of intersections being looked at. While cultural resources was discussed, there was a lack of attention given to the site being a historic resource. They presented the longest schedule to complete. The firm also presented the lowest number of meetings. The firm displayed a good number of related project experiences. A highly qualified PM, but we were concerned about using an outside consultant to be the project manager.
#4 - EMC:	Initial proposal did not fully address all impacts. Requested an amended scope and fee. Revisions took three weeks to complete. Highest fee. High price seems unjustified given other three proposals. Lowest number of hospitality clients listed. This team has the highest number of outside consultants which can be problematic and more costly. Concern over current workload and high expectations for fast turnaround on City's LCP. Fair to poor performance on PG's LCP. Negative reference from City of Monterey. Lowest number of intersections being studied. City's preference to keep them focused on LCP completion. PM with lowest years of experience.



Work Program

This work program includes the scope of work, project schedule, and project budget.

Scope of Work

Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. (Kimley-Horn) has prepared this Scope of Work to the City of Pacific Grove (the Client/Client) for preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for Project Bella (the project).

Kimley-Horn will be the prime consultant and will be responsible for authorship of the EIR, project management, selected technical analysis, and public engagement. Subconsultants to Kimley-Horn will be Page & Turnbull (Historic Architectural Resources), Pacific Legacy (Archaeology), and Pack Associates (Noise).

Kimley-Horn will provide the Client with a legally defensible project level EIR that will address all aspects of the proposed project while minimizing or avoiding the need for future environmental review. The EIR analysis will be sufficient in detail to allow for the identification of environmental impacts and mitigations. The thresholds of significance for determining impact significance will be clearly defined early in the process, and will be reviewed with the Client prior to preparing the EIR impact sections.

Project Initiation

Project Kick-Off Meeting

Kimley-Horn's project manager and other key team members will meet with Client staff and the project applicant (as appropriate) to discuss the environmental review process for the proposed project and develop a strategy for environmental compliance that meets the requirements of CEQA. This meeting will focus on a discussion of the technical studies that have been or are anticipated to be prepared for the proposed project (in support of the project application) and elements of previous environmental documents that might be utilized in preparation of CEQA documentation for the project.

Research and Investigation

Kimley-Horn will work with Client staff and the project applicant to collect and review all relevant reports and sources of data. Kimley-Horn will review and confirm that the project information collected is suitable for use in developing the project description, as well as applicable impact assessments for the environmental document.

Project research will include coordination with Client staff to acquire relevant environmental data, previous studies for the area, and other available files, exhibits, maps, and reference documents. The initial investigation will consist of a site visit, review of existing land uses and environmental conditions, and a photographic recording of onsite and surrounding uses.

This scope of work assumes the following existing and new technical studies and plans will be utilized for this project.

Table 1: Existing and Proposed Technical Studies

Environmental Resource	Technical Study
Cultural Resources	Historic Resources Assessment prepared by Page & Turnbull; Archaeological Resources Assessment prepared by Pacific Legacy
Geology & Soils	Preliminary Geotechnical Report, Engineering and Grading Plan provided by Project Applicant
Hazards & Hazardous Materials	Phase I provided by Project Applicant
Hydrology & Water Quality	Engineering and Grading Plan; Stormwater Plan provided by Project Applicant
Noise	Noise Technical Report prepared by Pack Associates
Transportation & Traffic	Traffic Impact Assessment prepared by Kimley-Horn

Draft Project Description

Kimley-Horn will prepare a draft of the project description including all referenced figures. As stated in Section 15124 of CEQA, the project description will contain the following information:

- The precise location and boundaries of the project will be shown on a detailed, topographic map. The location of the project will also appear on a regional map.
- A statement of objectives sought by the project. A clearly written statement of objectives will help the Client develop a reasonable range of alternatives to evaluate in the EIR and will aid the decision makers in preparing findings or a statement of overriding considerations, if necessary. The statement of objectives will include the underlying purpose of the project.
- A general description of the project's technical, economic, and environmental characteristics, considering the principal engineering proposals, if any, and supporting public service facilities.
- A thorough discussion of project phasing.
- A statement briefly describing the intended uses of the EIR. This statement will include, to the extent that the information is known to the Client the following:
 - a) A list of the agencies that are expected to use the EIR in their decision-making,

- b) A list of permits and other approvals required to implement the project, and
- c) A list of related environmental review and consultation requirements required by federal, state, or local laws, regulations, or policies.

All decisions subject to CEQA will be listed in the order in which they will occur.

The draft project description will be submitted to the Client for review and comment. The draft project description will then be reviewed by the project applicant to ensure its accuracy.

EIR Outline

Prior to preparation of the Administrative Draft EIR, Kimley-Horn takes the unique approach of preparing a detailed EIR outline that is derived from our in-house proprietary EIR document template. This outline serves as a roadmap for the project and helps to ensure a clear and effective Client working relationship, according to a mutually agreed process and approach. The EIR outline will identify in draft form the following:

- A detailed table of contents that identifies all of the chapters, sections, and organizational structure of the EIR.
- All relevant thresholds of significance including CEQA and those of the Lead Agency and Responsible Agencies (where relevant).
- Discussion of the Effects Not Found to Be Significant and thresholds where there are anticipated to be no impacts or beneficial impacts.
- Preliminary identification of all impact statements and where possible, identification of likely known (standard) mitigation measures.
- Preliminary list of figures and tables.
- Preliminary list of appendices.

Kimley-Horn will review the draft EIR outline with the Client concurrent with review of the draft project description.

Notice of Preparation

Kimley-Horn will prepare the Notice of Preparation (NOP) that summarizes the project and what environmental issues will be addressed fully in the EIR and those that will be determined to be insignificant, as described below.

The NOP package will be prepared pursuant to Section 15082(a) of the CEQA Guidelines. An electronic file in both MS Word will be sent to the Client for review and consideration. Following review and incorporation of comments by the Client, Kimley-Horn will prepare the final NOP.

This scope of work assumes that the Client will be responsible for the preparation of all public notices and distribution of the IS/NOP pursuant to CEQA requirements, including all relevant public agencies.

Table 2: Breakdown of Environmental Topics

Included for Detailed EIR Analysis (Potentially Significant)	Excluded from Detailed EIR Analysis (Insignificant)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Aesthetics ▪ Air Quality / GHG Emissions ▪ Cultural Resources ▪ Geology & Soils ▪ Hazards & Hazardous Materials ▪ Hydrology & Water Quality ▪ Land Use & Planning, Recreation ▪ Noise & Vibration ▪ Transportation & Circulation ▪ Utilities/ Service Systems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Agricultural Resources ▪ Biological Resources ▪ Mineral Resources ▪ Population & Housing ▪ Public Services

Public Scoping Meeting

Staff from Kimley-Horn will attend and facilitate a public scoping meeting for the proposed project. The scoping meeting will be conducted in collaboration with the Client at a location in the vicinity of the project site. The public scoping meeting will serve to obtain information and input from responsible agencies and the public, as well as to inform the public about the CEQA review and EIR process.

Kimley-Horn will prepare a draft and final presentation (in PowerPoint) and will prepare handout materials including copies of the NOP and comment forms. These materials will be reviewed with the Client prior to finalizing.

Review NOP and Refine Project Scope

Based on comments received by the public from the NOP and the public scoping meeting, Kimley-Horn will review the key environmental issues with the project team, clarify/refine the scope of work for the EIR, and identify any additional analytical tasks not included in this proposal.

1st Administrative Draft EIR

Kimley-Horn will prepare a 1st Administrative Draft EIR (EIR) for review and comment by the Client in a format that is consistent with §15000 of the State CEQA Guidelines. The approach to each section of the EIR is summarized below.

Executive Summary

Kimley-Horn will provide an Executive Summary for the Draft EIR including summary of the project, an overview of project impacts, mitigation, levels of significance after mitigation, summary of project alternatives, areas of controversy, and issues to be resolved. The Executive Summary will be presented in a tabular format and will be included in the Screencheck Draft EIR, following Client review of the Administrative Draft EIR.

For each significant impact, only the summary title of the mitigation measure will be provided and not the full text of each mitigation measure. This approach will help ensure a manageably-sized Executive Summary and avoid excessive duplication of text.

For legal defensibility reasons, the Executive Summary will also include a section summarizing the NOP comments and where they are addressed in the body of the EIR.

Introduction and Purpose

This section will identify the purpose of the Draft EIR and statutory authority under CEQA, as well as document-scoping procedures, summary of the EIR format, listing of responsible and trustee agencies and documentation incorporated by reference.

The Introduction will describe the project background and purpose; identify the lead agency, and other trustee agency roles, describe the required approvals (including any permit requirements); describe the intended uses of the EIR (e.g., compliance with CEQA); outline the EIR scoping process; and address areas of known controversy.

Final Project Description

Kimley-Horn will update/finalize the project description based on NOP comments and any minor refinements as provided by the Client and/or the project applicant.

Environmental Analysis

Each environmental section in the Draft EIR will include sections for existing setting, thresholds of significance, an analysis of project-related impacts, and mitigation measures to avoid or reduce significant impacts. Thresholds will be based on the State CEQA Guidelines, as well as those identified thresholds of the Client (as the Lead Agency) and relevant thresholds from Responsible and/or Trustee Agencies (e.g. Caltrans).

Each resource section of the EIR will include a summary of relevant general plan policies that could avoid or reduce significant environmental impacts. Kimley-Horn will ensure that

thresholds of significance are acceptable to Client staff before beginning the environmental analysis.

Aesthetics

The proposed project has the potential to substantially alter the existing visual character of the project site and views of the area from public roadways that surround the project site through build out of the proposed project, as well as views from the waterfront and the Bay.

The aesthetics section of the Draft EIR will identify the visual characteristics of the project site and surrounding area. Kimley-Horn will describe the existing aesthetic environment and visual resources, including a discussion of views within the project site and views from surrounding areas, particularly from the adjacent uses, utilizing pictures and information from a site reconnaissance of the project site and surrounding area and information from the proposed project.

Based on photographs of the project site, project plans, and visual simulations provided by the project architect, this section of the EIR will evaluate the following:

- Description of existing views to and from the project site will be provided with an emphasis on views from public locations.
- Evaluation of the alteration in views of the project site to and from these public viewing areas, based upon visual simulations prepared by the project architect.
- Evaluation of the proposed project for the potential to introduce substantial new night-time lighting or create new sources of glare that could affect surrounding land uses.
- Evaluation of General Plan policies related to aesthetics that are relevant to the proposed project.
- Identification of mitigation measures determined to be appropriate and those determined to be feasible for implementation.

Air Quality / GHG Emissions

Existing Conditions/Regulatory Framework

The project is located within the North Central Coast Air Basin (NCCAB), which is under the jurisdiction of the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD). Baseline meteorological and air quality data developed through the California Air Resources Board (CARB) will be utilized for the description of existing ambient air quality. Air quality data from the nearest air quality monitoring station will be included to help highlight existing air quality local to the project area. The analysis will also describe and address the requirements set forth by the MBUAPCD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines.

Construction-Related Emissions

Kimley-Horn will quantify construction emissions with the latest version of the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) modelling software. A general description of the major

phases of construction and their timing will be prepared. The air pollutant emissions generated during construction will be compared to the MBUAPCD regional thresholds of significance. Kimley-Horn will also qualitatively discuss naturally occurring asbestos impacts, if relevant.

Long-Term Emissions

Kimley-Horn will quantify operational (i.e., area and mobile source) emissions and provide a comparison to the MBUAPCD thresholds of significance. The emissions will be quantitatively derived utilizing CalEEMod. Primary sources of emissions will be related to area sources and local/regional vehicle miles traveled. Project consistency with the latest MBUAPCD Air Quality Management Plan will be evaluated.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The Air Quality Section of the EIR will also include an analysis of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and climate change. A significance threshold has not yet been adopted by the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD). Therefore, the effects of the proposed project will be evaluated based not on the quantity of emissions, but rather on whether practicable available control measures can be implemented.

This approach is based on the concept that if a project implements reduction strategies identified in AB-32, the Governor's Executive S-3-05, or other strategies to help toward reducing GHGs to the level proposed by the governor, it could reasonably follow that the project would not result in a significant contribution to the cumulative impact of global climate change.

For informational/full disclosure purposes, CalEEMod will be run to disclose the estimated GHG emissions generated by the project both during construction and during project operations.

Kimley-Horn will propose mitigation measures, if necessary, which would reduce potential significant impacts from the proposed project to a less-than-significant level.

Cultural Resources

This section will be prepared utilizing the relevant technical studies as identified in [Table 1: Existing and Proposed Technical Studies](#).

Historic Resources Technical Report

Page & Turnbull, as a subconsultant to Kimley-Horn, will prepare a Historic Resources Technical Report for the project. To complete the report, Page & Turnbull will review existing information, perform historic research, and conduct an analysis of the proposed project for its impact under the California Environmental Quality Act. This work will involve the following tasks:

Field Survey

Page & Turnbull will visit the site, take digital photographs of the exterior facades, and prepare field notes on the buildings' character-defining features and previous alterations. This survey will also examine the interior of the buildings, if access is available. Information obtained during the survey will assist in completing the written description and the construction history.

Review Previous Documentation

Page & Turnbull will conduct a review of any previous studies and existing information available on the subject property, which includes Page & Turnbull's Pacific Grove Historic Context Statement (2011) and related research.

Additional Historic Research

Based upon our review of the existing information, Page & Turnbull will conduct additional research as deemed necessary. Research may be conducted at local repositories including the Pacific Grove and Monterey Public Libraries, Heritage Society of Pacific Grove, Pacific Grove Planning Department, Monterey County Historical Society, and Monterey County offices. In addition, we will use online repositories including Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, the Internet Archive, Ancestry.com, and the Online Archive of California.

Report Preparation

Historic Context and Evaluation of Significance

The historic research will take the form of a Historic Resource Technical Report (HRTR), which will include an architectural description, historic context, and the evaluation of significance according to California Register and local register criteria. The HRTR will include maps, photographs (existing conditions and historic) and other illustrations, as necessary. The HRTR will make a determination about whether the property meets the qualifications to be considered a historic resource under CEQA.

Following submittal of the HRTR, Page & Turnbull will respond to one set of written comments before preparing the Final HRTR.

Proposed Project Analysis/Mitigation

Once the significance of the building has been established, Page & Turnbull will analyze the impact of the proposed project pursuant to CEQA, inclusive of project-specific impacts and cumulative impacts analysis. In consultation with the prime environmental consultant, we will conduct an evaluation of the property pursuant to the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*. We will analyze only one (1) proposed project. If changes are made to the proposed project and new or revised project analysis is required, additional professional fee may be requested. If the project is found to have an impact on the property (as defined by CEQA), we will aid you in outlining appropriate project alternatives and mitigation measures.

Meetings and Communication

Page & Turnbull have allocated time for one (1) two-hour meeting with the Client and City staff to review the Draft HRTR. Staff time has also been allocated for conference calls or other project communication.

Public Hearings (Optional)

As an optional task, Page & Turnbull is available to attend and present at up to two (2) public hearings related to environmental review of the proposed project. Attendance at this meeting shall be at the discretion of the prime consultant. We have assumed time for attendance at the public hearing and preparation of a presentation. If additional time is needed, Page & Turnbull may request additional services.

Archaeological Investigation

Pacific Legacy, as a subconsultant to Kimley-Horn, will prepare an Archeology Survey Report (ASR) for the project. Tasks for this work include the following:

Literature Review

Pacific Legacy will undertake a Record and Information Search at the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System at Sonoma State University. This record search will be designed to avoid duplication with records on file with Pacific Legacy for other Monterey/Pacific Grove projects. For those areas not covered by records on file with Pacific Legacy, the Project Bella record search will be conducted within a two block radius of the project area. The results of Record and Information Search results will be included in the ASR.

Pacific Legacy will contact relevant historical societies or other institutions via letter to determine if any areas of historical concern are documented. We will also contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in Sacramento and request that a sacred lands search be conducted. We will also obtain from the NAHC a list of interested Native American groups for Stanislaus County who may have information regarding cultural resources on the property. We will contact local interested Native American groups regarding known resources within the project area as required by Section 106 guidance. The NAHC has ten days to respond to our request. Once a list of interested Native Americans is obtained from the NAHC, they will be mailed a project map and request for consultation.

Pacific Legacy will prepare an overview and synthesis of materials collected for inclusion in the ASR. Pacific Legacy will use information gathered during the literature search to develop the appropriate background sections of the EIR and for alternatives analysis. Discussion of a variety of cultural resource classes (i.e., Native American sites, ethnographic sites, historic homesteads, historic structures, and mining features) within the Area of Potential Effect (APE) will be included. Pacific Legacy will also map resource locations on appropriate U.S.G.S. maps not identified by the CCIC for use in survey. The ASR will also present a discussion of the potential to encounter as of yet unidentified prehistoric and historic resources within the study area.

Field Assessment

The field assessment will include surface examination of the Project Bella development area. While the majority of the area is developed with buildings and the parking lot, there is the cut bank along Sloat between Dewey and Eardley Avenues which will be inspected. Due to the proximity of the project to a three known prehistoric resources and one known historic debris scatter there is the potential for buried archaeological sites. Cultural resources, if found, will be recorded on State forms DPR 523, depending on the type of resource.

Archaeological Survey Report

After field studies are completed, the ASR will be prepared as appropriate for documenting the type(s) of resources encountered. The ASR report will meet the requirements of inventory level survey. The report, at a minimum, will include a project description, project location, prehistory and history of the area, results of the literature search (historic and prehistoric), field methods, field constraints, results of field reconnaissance, and summary and conclusions. The report will include mapping archaeological site location data and survey coverage areas, as needed.

The Draft ASR will be provided to Kimley-Horn and the Client for review and comment prior to preparing a Final ASR.

Assumptions

- No more than 2 acres will require archaeological survey.
- No more than one day of archeological survey will be completed.
- One cultural resource will need recording and a positive ASR will be prepared.
- No cultural resources will be evaluated for the NRHP or CRHR.
- No ground trothing for buried deposits.

EIR Section

Findings from the HRTR and ASR will be used by Kimley-Horn as the basis for preparing the Cultural Resources section of the EIR, consistent with Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.

The section will also summarize the findings, impact determinations, and identified mitigation measures. The Cultural Resources section will also address the requirements of Assembly Bill 52 regarding Tribal Cultural Resources. This scope of work assumes that the Client will be responsible for all consultation outreach.

Geology & Soils

This section will be prepared utilizing the relevant technical studies as identified in **Table 1: Existing and Proposed Technical Studies**. Additional resources will include the U. S. Department

of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service website, and other existing geotechnical background information as provided by the Client.

Kimley-Horn will describe the seismicity of the area and the potential for liquefaction, subsidence and similar effects, as applicable. This section will include information associated with the regional and site-specific geology and soils constraints (such as compressible soils, serpentine soils, active faults, landslide hazards, disruptions, displacements, compaction, or over-covering of the soil, and areas subject to subsidence) and existing topography. Specifically, this section will:

- Discuss potential project impacts including areas potentially subject to significant grading impacts, seismic hazards, landform modifications, and wind and/or slope water erosion to the extent feasible.
- Discuss the proposed project consistency with the grading standards/policies. In addition, mitigation measures will be discussed to reduce impacts associated with the proposed project.
- Describe the potential geotechnical and geologic hazards that may be present including, but not limited to, liquefaction, settlement, compression, subsidence, erosion, expansive soils, collapsible soils, inundation, naturally occurring asbestos, and existing fills.

Should a potentially significant impacts(s) be identified, Kimley-Horn will recommend mitigation measures to reduce these impacts to the extent feasible.

Hazards & Hazardous Materials

This section will be prepared utilizing the relevant technical studies as identified in **Table 1: Existing and Proposed Technical Studies**.

This section will examine the project site's environmental condition and the chemicals of potential concern (COPCs). Through the peer review, Kimley-Horn will identify open environmental issues, if any, and mitigation measures that may be appropriate to support the Environmental Compliance Document for the proposed project.

Kimley-Horn will verify the existing regulatory conditions per the State Cortese Database Listing. Kimley-Horn will analyze the project-related impacts, particularly regarding a potential soil contamination associated with the existing and past agricultural operations on-site (including those regarding proposed future school sites per the Department of Toxic Substances Control's laws and regulations). Potential accidental conditions during construction and operations, involving hazardous materials will be analyzed. Project emergency access and airport safety hazards will also be considered, if relevant.

Should a potentially significant impacts(s) be identified, Kimley-Horn will recommend mitigation measures to reduce these impacts to the extent feasible.

Hydrology & Water Quality

This section will be prepared utilizing the relevant technical studies as identified in **Table 1: Existing and Proposed Technical Studies**.

Kimley-Horn will describe the hydrological setting, including its location within the regional watershed system. Kimley-Horn will also describe the potential urban water pollutant types and their sources. This will include assessment of flood hazards and determination of 100-year flood zones, if applicable. Information sources will include published flood maps, the U.S. Geological Survey, and the California Department of Water Resources.

The project site is located in the Pacific Grove Area of Biological Significance (ASBS), which extends along the Pacific Grove shoreline from the Monterey Bay Aquarium to just before Point Pinos. The 2012 State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) General Exception (Resolution Nos. 2012–0012 and 2012–0031) governs point and non-point source waste discharges to the ASBS, including municipal storm water discharges. Stormwater point discharges originating from both the City of Pacific Grove and the City of Monterey are permitted under SWRCB Order No. 2013-0001-DWQ NPDES General Permit No. CAS000004, Waste Discharge Requirements for Stormwater Discharges from Small MS4s.

Both Pacific Grove and Monterey participate in two regional efforts to collaborate on water quality protection, such as those of the ASBS, including the Monterey Regional Stormwater Management Program and the Central Coast ASBS Regional Monitoring Program.

The hydrology and water quality impact analysis will address short-term temporary construction-related effects on hydrology and water quality; long-term project-related water quality; permanent changes to stormwater drainage and/or flooding; project-related impacts to groundwater quantity and quality; and cumulative on-site and off-site hydrology and water quality impacts.

Applicable federal, state, and local regulations for stormwater drainage, grading and erosion control, and other water quality protection procedures will be described, inclusive of the construction and structural (BMPs), such as low-impact development (LID) strategies, in the Pacific Grove ASBS Draft Compliance Plan (2014). Kimley-Horn will discuss potential flooding hazards, general management practices, and mitigation measures to reduce the effects of storm water runoff.

Kimley-Horn will summarize the groundwater conditions in the project area and will discuss the use of groundwater, trends, and general aquifer conditions. This effort will rely on existing sources and will not include water quality testing, or field verification of stream conditions.

Significant impacts could relate to increased rate and volume of runoff from impervious surfaces, erosion and sedimentation, and transport of urban contaminants. Completion of this section will include the following:

- Describe surface drainage patterns of the project area and adjoining areas.
- Summarize the drainage network of the project area, including information on channel conditions, culvert locations and sizing, and capacity of existing drainage facilities to pass flows. This will include identification of flood hazards in the project area.
- Identify applicable City of Pacific Grove and State policies, programs, and standards associated with storm water detention and water resources. Analyze pre- and post-development runoff and detention basin size(s) and location(s).
- It is anticipated that increases in storm water drainage resulting from construction of the proposed project would be mitigated through detention and/or retention of storm water flows onsite. The section will also discuss other Best Management Practices for mitigation of any significant impacts associated with water quality.

Should a potentially significant impacts(s) be identified, Kimley-Horn will recommend mitigation measures to reduce these impacts to the extent feasible

Land Use & Planning

This section of the EIR will evaluate potential impacts related to land use in the project area that could result from implementation of the project.

Existing land uses in the immediate vicinity of the project site will be described based on site visits, aerial photographs, and relevant plans. This section will also analyze the distribution, location, and extent of proposed land uses, and analysis of the proposed project with respect to logical growth patterns, compatibility, and contiguity with development in surrounding areas. In particular, the section will discuss land use compatibility related to project site's proximity to existing residential uses to the northwest and west, as well as the destination and visitor-serving uses along Cannery Row to the east.

This section will address project consistency with the City of Pacific General Plan, the City's Municipal Code, and applicable ordinances.

Noise & Vibration

Pack Associates, as a subconsultant to Kimley-Horn, will prepare a technical noise report for use in preparing the noise section of the EIR. This report will be reviewed by Kimley-Horn for completeness necessary to prepare the environmental analysis prior to incorporation into the appendix of the EIR. The technical noise analysis will include the following tasks:

- Conduct noise level measurements of the existing ambient noise environment at the most impacted residential properties to the northwest of the proposed project site. The ambient noise measurements period will be from a Thursday to a Monday to capture weekday and weekend background noise levels.
- Determine the noise levels generated by the project from construction, traffic and hotel activities/operations.

- Calculate the Day-Night Levels (DNL) and evaluate the noise impacts to the project, the project-generated noise impacts and exposure increases due to the project against the standards of the City of Pacific Grove Health and Safety Element and the State of California Code of Regulations, Title 24, and the guidelines of the Californian Environmental Quality Act.
- Develop noise mitigation measures, as necessary, to achieve compliance with the standards and guidelines.
- Prepare and submit a report including our findings and recommendations.

The EIR analysis will discuss temporary construction-related impacts as well as impacts during project operations. This section will contain a characterization of current average sound levels at the project site, as well as a review and description of the noise exposure standards related to existing surrounding land uses, including single-family residential development in relation to the standards defined by the General Plan and applicable state standards for noise exposure. Additional information will include a definition of acoustical terminology. The EIR will identify mitigation measures determined to be appropriate and those determined to be feasible for implementation for each individual proposed land use, as applicable.

Existing Conditions/Regulatory Framework

Pack Associates will review applicable noise and land use compatibility criteria for the project area. Noise standards regulating noise impacts will be discussed for land uses on and adjacent to the project site. Pack Associates will conduct a site visit of the project site and conduct short-term noise level measurements in and adjacent to the project site. The noise monitoring survey will be conducted to establish baseline noise levels in the project area.

Construction-Related Noise and Vibration

Construction would occur during implementation of the proposed project. Noise impacts from construction sources will be analyzed based on the anticipated equipment to be used, length of a specific construction task, equipment power type (gasoline or diesel engine), horsepower, load factor, and percentage of time in use. The construction noise impacts will be evaluated. Analysis requirements will be based on the sensitivity of the area, noise ordinance specifications, and the Federal Transit Administration's vibration analysis guidance.

Operational Noise Sources

Potential effects of stationary noise sources will be evaluated based on the city's land use compatibility standards. Compliance with applicable noise standards will be evaluated, with recommended mitigation measures included where appropriate. Additionally, noise impacts to the adjacent existing and proposed residential uses will be analyzed.

On- and off-site noise impacts from vehicular traffic will be assessed using the U.S. Federal Highway Traffic Noise Prediction Model (FHWA-RD-77-108). The analysis will focus on noise impacts associated with the development of the proposed project. Model input data will

include average daily traffic volumes, day/night percentages of autos, medium and heavy trucks, vehicle speeds, ground attenuation factors, and roadway widths. The 24-hour weighted community noise equivalent levels (CNEL) will be presented in a tabular format. The analysis will also utilize vehicle classifications so noise associated with the heavy trucks can be quantified.

The CEQA analysis will discuss temporary construction-related impacts as well as impacts during project operations. This section will contain a characterization of current average sound levels at the project site, as well as a review and description of the noise exposure standards related to existing surrounding land uses, including single-family residential development in relation to the standards defined by the City of Pacific Grove General Plan and applicable state standards for noise exposure. Additional information will include a definition of acoustical terminology.

The Noise section will propose mitigation measures, if necessary, which would reduce potential significant impacts from the proposed project to a less-than-significant level.

Transportation and Circulation

Trip Generation and Distribution

The project will generate approximately 1,840 average daily trips associated with construction of 225 rooms (@ 8.18 daily trips per unit). Credits would be obtained from the existing uses on the site using historical occupancy rates.

Kimley-Horn will prepare a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) which will be used to prepare the transportation impact section of the EIR. The following intersections are anticipated to be included in the study, primarily due to the coordinated signals and adaptive control system along the corridors. However, it may be possible to tier the analysis off the Lighthouse Specific Plan and qualitatively address project impacts to the system. Our scope includes an assessment of existing conditions only and then utilizing the Lighthouse Specific Plan data. This no technical analysis will be performed for Cumulative and cumulative plus project conditions, only a qualitative assessment. The traffic study will include AM and PM peak hour intersection level of service analysis for the following intersections:

City of Pacific Grove

1. Ocean View Boulevard / Eardley Avenue
2. Ocean View Boulevard / Dewey Street
3. Central Avenue / Dewey Street
4. Lighthouse Avenue / Eardley Avenue
5. Forest Avenue / David Avenue

City of Monterey

6. Ocean View Boulevard / David Avenue

7. David Avenue / Foam Street
8. Lighthouse Avenue / David Avenue
9. Lighthouse Avenue / Del Monte Avenue / Washington Street

Option Study Intersections

Based on project plans and a preliminary analysis of traffic impacts for these intersections, as well as subsequent discussions with the City of Pacific Grove, the project applicant, and the City of Monterey, additional intersections may need to be studied based on the final net total trip generation rates. Our initial assessment is that analysis of these intersections will not be necessary and therefore are not included in this scope of work:

City of Monterey

10. Foam Street / Irving Avenue
11. Foam Street / Prescott Avenue
12. Foam Street / Hoffman Avenue
13. Foam Street / Drake Avenue
14. Foam Street / Reeside Avenue
15. Foam Street / Cannery Row
16. Lighthouse Avenue / Private Bolio Road
17. Lighthouse Avenue / Reeside Avenue
18. Lighthouse Avenue / Dickman Avenue
19. Lighthouse Avenue / Drake Avenue
20. Lighthouse Avenue / McClellan Avenue
21. Lighthouse Avenue / Hoffman Avenue
22. Lighthouse Avenue / Prescott Avenue
23. Lighthouse Avenue / Irving Avenue



Intersections will be analyzed following the 2010 *Highway Capacity Manual* (HCM) methodology using Synchro software.

Kimley-Horn will analyze the following four scenarios: Existing, Existing + Project, Cumulative, and Cumulative + Project. The analysis will use the Client-supplied a list of approved but not yet constructed projects to include in the Cumulative scenario.

Data Collection

This task will include data collection at the study intersections. Kimley-Horn will collect traffic counts, field data, review movements, signal timing, and saturated flows. The existing City Synchro model will be used to do the evaluation.

Traffic Analysis – Existing and Existing + Project

Kimley-Horn will present traffic results in existing conditions and develop traffic estimates for the project using trip generation rates from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) *Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition*. Traffic trip distribution will be assigned to the study intersections based on the existing traffic patterns and in consultation with Client staff.

Kimley-Horn will calculate intersection levels of service using Synchro software for both the Existing and Existing + Project scenarios. If any deficiencies are identified, Kimley-Horn will recommend mitigation measures. Mitigation measures will consist of the following:

- Potential signalization of Ocean View Street/Eardley Street.
- Sidewalk improvements.
- Gap closure for bicycle and pedestrian facilities.
- Improving bicycle and pedestrian connections along the Monterey Bay Scenic train including potential widening of the segment adjacent to the project, also roadway crossing improvements.
- A parking management plan for employees.
- Bicycle sharing programs for the hotel.
- Transit ridership promotion through TDM measures.

Traffic Analysis – Cumulative and Cumulative + Project

Kimley-Horn will develop traffic estimates for the approved near-term projects within the study area (the Cumulative scenario). Kimley-Horn will then develop traffic estimates that include the approved projects with the project (the Cumulative + Project scenario). This will be done using trip generation rates from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) *Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition*. Trips will be assigned to the study intersections based on the anticipated cumulative traffic patterns. Kimley-Horn will then qualitatively assess the Cumulative and Cumulative + Project scenarios, tiering off the City General Plan and the Lighthouse Specific Plan. Mitigation measures would be similar to the list above.

Evaluation of Proposed Site Access

Kimley-Horn will conduct a traffic analysis of potential queuing and operations for the proposed project site driveways. Recommendations for potential site plan changes will also be made as necessary. Loading dock access will be evaluated.

Construction Traffic Impacts

Kimley-Horn will evaluate construction traffic impacts, including demolition of the existing buildings and construction activities through building the project. Base data will be provided by the applicant.

Evaluation of Proposed Site Access

Kimley-Horn will conduct a traffic analysis of potential queuing and operations for the proposed site on Eardley Avenue at the planned hotel vehicular entrance. Recommendations for potential site plan changes will also be made as necessary.

Transportation Demand Management

Based upon project impacts, Kimley-Horn will meet with Pacific Grove and stakeholder agencies to formulate a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan to mitigate impacts of the project. Measures that will be identified may include the following:

- Transit or Transit Subsidies for Monterey-Salinas Transit Trolley, Jazz Service, and/or Local Bus Service
- Parking Management
- On-Site Amenities
- Vanpool Assistance
- Bicycle Trails, Lanes and Path Improvements
- Transportation Coordinator
- Information Kiosk/Display Case
- Special Promotions

Utilities & Service Systems

This section will be prepared utilizing the relevant technical studies as identified in [Table 1: Existing and Proposed Technical Studies](#).

The Utilities and Service Systems section of the EIR will address water supply, wastewater, electricity, natural gas, and communications. Project-related demand for facilities and services will be estimated and compared against existing capacity and proposed future capacity associated with the proposed project. Service demand will be evaluated for each utility and service. Potential impacts to these utilities and service systems will be addressed and any impacts will be based on whether any new facilities would be needed and if construction of

such facilities could generate significant impacts. Kimley-Horn's description of the proposed infrastructure systems and any impacts upon them or resulting from them will be based on the infrastructure plans and any supporting technical studies as provided by the project applicant.

Kimley-Horn will coordinate with the Client and relevant service and utility agencies to document existing and planned facilities, current and projected usages, and excess capacities. Additional infrastructure and services capacity required to meet project needs associated with the proposed project will be described. Anticipated impacts will be assessed based upon a comparison of the increased demand for services and utilities and the ability of the city and other utility districts to accommodate this increased demand.

Cumulative Impacts

Consistent with Section 15130 of the CEQA Guidelines, Kimley-Horn will discuss cumulative impacts of the project when the project's incremental effect is cumulatively considerable. The analysis shall be conducted using either a "list of past, present and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts" or "a summary of projections contained in an adopted general plan or related planning document, or in a prior environmental document that has been adopted or certified which described or evaluated regional or area wide conditions contributing to the cumulative impact."

If using the "list" approach, Kimley-Horn shall identify region of influence for each issue area being analyzed. Assumptions will be coordinated with the cumulative traffic analysis and with the assumptions of other projects in the vicinity to ensure consistency. This analysis will address each topic covered in the EIR environmental analysis and will identify appropriate mitigation measures that may reduce any potentially significant cumulative impacts to a less than significant level.

Alternatives to the Project

Kimley-Horn will work in coordination with the Client to develop up to four alternatives to the Project (including a no action alternative). Each alternative will be contrasted with the proposed project in terms of the extent to which project objectives and reduction in adverse impacts are achieved. Kimley-Horn will prepare a qualitative analyses of impacts from each alternative with respect to each environmental analysis topic covered in the EIR, and provide quantitative and comparative analysis where data is available (in accordance with recent case law and CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(d)). The environmentally superior alternative will be identified.

Other CEQA Considerations

Effects Not Found to Be Significant

This section will discuss impacts to resources not found to be significant. It is anticipated that the following issues will be briefly addressed in this section:

- Agricultural and Forestry Resources

- Biological Resources
- Mineral Resources
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation

Significant Environmental Effects Which Cannot Be Avoided if the Project Is Implemented

Impacts that are both significant and unavoidable will be identified. These will be determined based on the analysis in the EIR and thresholds of significance established in the EIR or by regulatory agencies. Should there be significant unavoidable adverse impacts, these will need to be addressed in a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes Which Would Be Caused by the Project Should it Be Implemented

This section will summarize the major changes to the environment that would result from development and occupation of the proposed project. It will focus on the physical environmental changes in the project setting such as those caused by grading and paving, the level of commitments to use of non-renewable resources represented by the project, and potential for secondary impacts that may place additional burdens on non-renewable resources.

Growth-Inducing Effects

As a required discussion according to CEQA Section 15126.2(d), Kimley-Horn will provide a Growth Inducing Effects discussion in the EIR. Kimley-Horn will work with the Client to establish the anticipated growth conditions in the project area and parameters for consideration of any secondary impacts from growth. Kimley-Horn will evaluate the potential for the proposed project to generate additional growth in the area using standard growth analysis criteria, such as the project's potential to foster economic or population growth or its potential to remove obstacles to population growth through extension of infrastructure.

References and List of Preparers

This section will provide a list of references for citations found in the body of the EIR. In addition, this section will also identify all federal, state, or local agencies, other organizations and private individuals consulted in preparing the Draft EIR, and the persons, firm, or agency preparing the draft EIR, by contract or other authorizations (per CEQA Section 15129).

1st Administrative Draft EIR Compilation

Kimley-Horn will assemble all completed sections into a single consolidated 1st Administrative Draft EIR submittal (ADEIR) with appendices. The ADEIR will include figures to enhance the written text and clarify the proposed project's environmental impacts. The entire document will be reviewed to ensure consistent references to terms, methodology of analysis, and correct use of grammar.

The 1st Administrative Draft EIR will be sent to the Client, EMC Planning Group, and legal counsel for review and comment.

2nd Administrative Draft EIR

Following a review meeting with the Client, as well as input from EMC Planning Group and legal counsel, Kimley-Horn will prepare a 2nd Administrative Draft EIR (ADEIR) for review by the Client. This scope of work assumes that review of this 2nd ADEIR will be editorial in nature and no new technical analysis or substantive revisions to the 2nd ADEIR will be required.

Public Review Draft EIR

Screencheck Draft EIR

Following internal review of the 2nd ADEIR, Kimley-Horn will revise the document based on comments received and provide a track-changes Screencheck Draft EIR for Client review. This will consist of responding to Client comments on the 2nd ADEIR requiring a minor corrections and editing, but no new technical studies or site-specific data collection. Revisions to the technical appendices are not anticipated.

Public Review Draft EIR

Based on comments received by the Client, EMC Planning Group, and legal counsel on the Screencheck Draft EIR, Kimley-Horn will prepare the Public Review Draft EIR. Revisions are assumed to be limited to editorial and formatting changes.

This scope of work assumes that the Client will be responsible for preparing the Notice of Completion (NOC) and Notice of Availability (NOA) and distribution of the Draft EIR to the State Clearinghouse and to other public agencies and interested parties.

Certification of the Environmental Impact Report

1st Administrative Final EIR

Kimley-Horn will meet and/or coordinate with the Client to review written comments on the Public Review Draft EIR; comments from public meetings/hearings (if applicable); and develop a strategy and framework for responding to comments. Given the fact that Kimley-Horn does not know how many comment letters will be received, this scope includes an initial estimate of time in the project budget. Once all comments are received, Kimley-Horn will review and discuss any modifications to the budget estimate with the Client.

The introduction to the AFEIR will document compliance with all CEQA Statutes and Guidelines throughout the CEQA process. It will also provide an index of all changes made to the Draft EIR in response to comments received. The comments and responses will comprise the second section of the AFEIR, where each comment letter will be reproduced and specific responses to each comment will be provided. The third section of the AFEIR will present those pages of the

Draft EIR on which changes were made in response to the comments using underlined text for additions and ~~strikeout~~ text for deletions.

The 1st Administrative Final EIR will be sent to the Client, EMC Planning Group, and legal counsel for review and comment.

2nd Administrative Draft EIR

Following a review meeting with the Client, as well as input from EMC Planning Group and legal counsel, Kimley-Horn will prepare a 2nd Administrative Draft Final EIR (ADFEIR) for review by the Client. This scope of work assumes that review of this 2nd ADFEIR will be editorial in nature and no new technical analysis or substantive revisions will be required.

Screencheck and Final EIR

Kimley-Horn will respond to Client, EMC Planning Group, and legal counsel comments on the 2nd ADFEIR, complete necessary revisions, and prepare the Screencheck and Final EIR. Per Client direction, the Final EIR will be either: 1) A single, complete document with the complete revised text of the Draft EIR, indicating changes, or 2) A reprinting of only those pages from the Draft EIR on which changes were made, with the changes tracked with underlining and strikethrough, as appropriate.

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

To comply with the CEQA Guidelines Section 21081.6, Kimley-Horn will prepare a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for concurrent review with the AFEIR. Kimley-Horn will work with the Client to identify appropriate monitoring steps/procedures and to provide a basis for monitoring such measures during and upon project implementation. The MMRP will be created in a tabular checklist format that indicates those mitigation measures identified in the EIR, the monitoring milestone (at what agency/department responsible for verifying implementation of the measure), and the method of verification (such as documentation or field checks,).

The MMRP will be prepared pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081.6. For each mitigation measure contained in the EIR, the MMRP will identify: the party or parties responsible for implementation (individuals, departments); timeframe and mechanism for monitoring; funding source(s); and monitoring and performance criteria (to measure success of mitigation). The MMRP will be bound separately for use as an independent document for field verification of adequate implementation of mitigation measures and any remedial action necessary to achieve adequate mitigation.

To the extent feasible, Kimley-Horn will tie mitigation measures directly to required authorizations (e.g., grading and building permits, PUD, etc.). Revisions will be made to the MMRP as directed by the Client following internal review of the AFEIR.

Meetings and Project Management

This task assumes attendance by Kimley-Horn staff at the following meetings:

- Project kick-off meeting (1)
- Public Scoping meeting (1)
- Client coordination meetings (12)
- Agency coordination meetings (2)
- Public Hearings (3)

This scope of work assumes that Kimley-Horn's role at the public meetings will be to provide support to the Client in answering questions and providing general guidance and recommendations. Kimley-Horn will not be responsible for providing presentation materials. Attendance at public meetings/hearings assumes preparation of one PowerPoint presentation.

Project Deliverables

Kimley-Horn will provide hard copies of the following project deliverables to the Client:

- Draft Project Description and EIR outline – 3 copies
- 1st Administrative Draft EIR– 6 copies (in three ring binders, appendices digital only via file-sharing web site)
- 2nd Administrative Draft EIR – 6 copies
- Screencheck Draft EIR – 3 copies
- Public Review Draft EIR – 25 copies plus 25 CDs
- Public Review Draft EIR Technical Appendices – digital only
- 1st Administrative Draft Final EIR – 6 copies
- 2nd Administrative Draft Final EIR – 6 copies
- Screencheck Final EIR – 3 copies
- Final EIR – 25 copies plus 25 CDs

In addition, Kimley Horn will provide an electronic, internet-ready version of the Draft and Final EIR for web posting. The specifications for fulfilling this requirement are as follows.

- Text will be provided in PDF format using Adobe Acrobat. Chapters will be separated into individual PDF files with figures provided at the end of each chapter.
- A Table of Contents will be provided in PDF format, which includes relative links (not absolute links) to each section in the document.
- The electronic, internet-ready versions of the DEIR and FEIR will be posted to an electronic file-sharing web site (i.e. ShareFile) for Client download in “ready to post” format.

Project Schedule

Kimley-Horn has assumed an eleven (11) month schedule from the date of contract award to delivery of the Final EIR.

Based on comments received by public agencies on the NOP/IS, this schedule may need to be revised should such comments constitute a significant change in the scope of work. This schedule may also need to be revised should a significant number of comments on the Public Review Draft EIR be received, in excess of those assumed and budgeted.

This scope of work assumes that all parties; including the Consultant and their subconsultants, the Client and their support staff, and the applicant and their consultants, will work in a mutually collaborative and professional manner in support of the common goals of the project. This will require the timely delivery of all applicant materials, timely response to inquiries and follow up, and timely review of all Consultant deliverables as described in the Project Assumptions, below.

To expedite the project schedule, the following strategies will be implemented by the Consultant:

- Client approval of a draft project description and EIR outline within 30 days from receipt of all architectural and engineering plans, as well as any technical studies required to prepare the project description.
- Traffic Analysis: 1) Draft trip distribution/generation table (including proposed trip credits) to City within 6 weeks from data of contract approval with buy-in from the cities of Pacific Grove and Monterey by mid-February; and 2) City sign-off of the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) & Mitigation per the project schedule.
- Twelve face-to-face project team meetings, including the provision for working product review meetings where Kimley-Horn would bring our laptop and make document revisions at the meeting(s).

Project Budget

The project budget is shown at the end of this section.

Project Assumptions

In addition to any assumptions noted above, the scope and associated costs are based on the following assumptions:

General

1. The cost estimate includes meetings described in this scope of work. Additional meetings will be billed on a time and materials basis.
2. The project schedule assumes that all architectural and engineering plans, as well as any technical studies required to prepare the project description will be provided to the Consultant within 30 calendar days of the execution of contract. A list of information needs will be provided at the project kick-off meeting and refinements to the list submitted within two weeks, based on review of received information. Furthermore, Kimley-Horn assumes that all technical studies required by the project applicant to address the respective environmental resource section(s) are provided at least three (3) months prior to release of the Public Review Draft EIR and that no further modifications, refinements or additions to the information will be required. Failure to meet these deliverables on the part of the applicant, and/or their consultants may result in a delay to the project schedule.
3. The Client will provide Kimley-Horn with all technical materials, maps, project plans, GIS data, etc.
4. No new technical analysis or preparation of technical reports will be required, other than those identified in this scope of work.
5. All technical studies provided to Kimley-Horn are assumed to be technically accurate and not require a peer review. Unless specifically stated otherwise, Kimley-Horn's review of these technical studies will be limited to an assessment of their completeness necessary to prepare the work products identified in this scope of work.
6. Deliverables will be submitted to the Client in electronic (PDF) format and source files, except for printed copies as identified in this scope of work.
7. Client will act as a clearinghouse for comments on all administrative draft documents and will provide Kimley-Horn with a single, internally reconciled set of comments for each submitted draft document.
8. There will be a single round of review and revision to all draft document deliverables. If Client feels that additional reviews are necessary, a contract amendment for additional work may be necessary, depending on the nature and circumstances associated with the additional changes (e.g. changes to the project description, additional technical analysis required, etc.). These changes can be characterized as being outside of the control or knowledge of Kimley-Horn and would not be considered reasonable from the standpoint of professional standards of service and appropriate due diligence.

9. Revisions to screencheck documents will focus on typographical errors, formatting issues, and other minor edits. Such revisions will not include substantive content changes from the Client and the project applicant. Edits other than typographical and formatting may require discussion and substantiation from the project applicant.
10. The Client will be responsible for the preparation and distribution of all public notices and publications (e.g. newspaper) unless otherwise noted in this scope of work.
11. The project budget is based on completion of work within an agreed upon schedule. If substantial delay occurs, an amendment of the budget may be warranted to accommodate additional project management time and other costs. Substantial delay is normally defined as 90 calendar days or more.
12. This project includes an allowance for printing as shown in the attached budget. This is an allowance only, based on the numbers of products and copies shown in this scope of work. If this allowance is exceeded, additional printing costs will be billed at Kimley-Horn's direct cost.
13. The Client will be responsible for meeting logistics, including schedule coordination, public outreach, document production, printing notices, mailing costs, room reservations, room set-up and take-down, and refreshments.
14. The Client will be responsible for identifying and communicating with all stakeholders including on-going scheduling and coordination and distribution of all materials.
15. The Client will coordinate/schedule all internal staff meetings.
16. Project schedule assumes timely review by the Client or their designee(s) (no more than five [5] working days) for all product deliverables. Outside review by the applicant or their representative(s) or Client designee; including legal review separate from Client staff, shall result in a modification to the project schedule.
17. Kimley-Horn retains the right to transfer budget allocations between tasks to support completion of the work products, as needed, as long as the total budget is not exceeded. Shifts in task budget allocation will be at the discretion of Kimley-Horn's Project Manager.
18. The project budget is a fixed-fee, unless where otherwise noted, and is subject to the contract requirements as agreed to between Kimley-Horn and the Client.

CEQA Documents

19. Because the extent of public and agency comments received on CEQA documents (e.g. Draft EIR) is unknown, the proposed budget includes a preliminary budget estimate of time to respond to comments. Kimley-Horn will consult with the Client after the evaluation of the comments to determine if the preliminary budget estimate is sufficient.
20. Once the proposed project description, baseline and alternatives are approved by the Client for analysis in the CEQA document, it is assumed that they will not change

significantly thereafter. If changes requiring revisions to the CEQA document occur, an amendment of the budget may be warranted.

21. The project applicant will provide various technical reports (as noted) that will be used as supporting background information. This scope of work assumes that these reports will be sufficient in their accuracy and comprehensive in their level of detail sufficient for preparing the CEQA analysis. Kimley-Horn, and our sub-consultants (where applicable), will review the first draft of these documents. Should it be found that the information presented is not adequate (at the discretion of Kimley-Horn and the Client), and that additional substantive revisions are required, Kimley-Horn reserves the right to request additional compensation on a time and materials basis, per prior approval by the Client.
22. The CEQA statutes or guidelines may change during the course of this project, or legal decisions can alter the extent of the analysis needed. If amendments or decisions redoing work already performed or substantially increasing effort, a contract amendment may be warranted.

**Project Bella EIR
Fee Estimate**

Agenda No. 12B, Attachment 2
Page 29

PROFESSIONAL FEES FOR PLANNING CONSULTING SERVICES

		ESTIMATED COST
TASKS		
1.0	Project Initiation	\$10,140
	Research and Investigation	\$1,236
	Draft Project Description	\$7,476
	EIR Outline	\$888
	Review NOP and Refine Project Scope	\$540
2.0	Administrative Draft EIR	\$78,309
	Executive Summary	\$1,932
	Introduction and Purpose	\$1,108
	Final Project Description	\$696
	Environmental Analysis	
	Aesthetics	\$3,704
	Air Quality/GHG Emissions	\$1,392
	Cultural Resources	\$1,392
	Geology & Soils	\$1,568
	Hazards & Hazardous Materials	\$1,108
	Hydrology & Water Quality	\$1,852
	Land Use & Planning	\$1,453
	Noise	\$1,622
	Transportation & Circulation	\$29,810
	Utilities & Service Systems	\$1,108
	Cumulative Impacts	\$1,392
	Alternatives	\$2,500
	Other CEQA Considerations	\$1,488
	Administrative Draft EIR (compilation & QC)	\$13,192
	2nd Administrative Draft EIR	\$10,992
3.0	Public Review Draft EIR	\$9,016
	Screencheck Draft EIR	\$6,084
	Public Review Draft EIR	\$2,932
4.0	Certification of the EIR	\$13,614
	1st Administrative Final EIR	\$6,796
	2nd Administrative Final EIR	\$3,398
	Screencheck and Final EIR	\$1,932
	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program	\$1,488
	Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations	\$0

**Project Bella EIR
Fee Estimate**

Agenda No. 12B, Attachment 2
Page 30

PROFESSIONAL FEES FOR PLANNING CONSULTING SERVICES		
5.0	Meetings & Project Management	\$50,726
	Project Kick-off Meeting (1)	\$3,956
	Public Scoping Meeting (1)	\$1,776
	Client Coordination Meetings (12)	\$19,064
	Agency Coordination Meetings - Traffic (2)	\$3,240
	Public Hearing Presentation Materials (draft & final)	\$540
	Planning Commission / City Council Meetings/Hearings (3)	\$4,340
	Ongoing Project Management / Administrative Support	\$17,810
	Subtotal Hours	
	Subtotal - Labor Cost	\$161,805
	Subconsultants and Expenses	\$44,071
	Subconsultants	
	Page & Turnbull	\$15,708
	Pacific Legacy	\$9,404
	Edward L. Pack & Associates	\$5,500
	Printing & CD Duplication (outsourced)	\$3,500
	Misc. Direct Expenses	\$250
	Indirect (internal) Expense Allocation (6% of KHA labor)	\$9,708
	Total Labor & Expenses	\$205,876
	Contingency	
	10% of Total Budget	\$20,588
	Total Budget	\$226,463

Note: All work will be performed at a "Not to exceed" lump sum. The total budget includes all miscellaneous costs for travel/mileage, reproduction, reimbursables, telephone, postal, delivery, reference materials and incidental expenses. KHA will receive payment on a percentage basis using milestones. The project manager reserves the right to make adjustments to staff allocations as



Planning for Success.

PROPOSAL

PROJECT BELLA STAFF SUPPORT SERVICES

PREPARED FOR
City of Pacific Grove

February 19, 2016

EMC PLANNING GROUP INC.
A LAND USE PLANNING & DESIGN FIRM

I.0

INTRODUCTION

The City of Pacific Grove is requesting a proposal from EMC Planning Group to provide staff support services for the proposed Project Bella (“proposed project”). The City has selected Kimley-Horn to provide environmental review and documentation services for the proposed project. The proposed project includes the redevelopment of the existing American Tin Cannery into a world class hotel with various ancillary uses. Our understanding of the proposed project is summarized below.

As the City’s staff support for the proposed project, EMC Planning Group will provide the role of reviewing all work products prepared by Kimley-Horn on behalf of the City. EMC Planning Group will serve as the City’s primary staff representative during the project’s CEQA review and approval process.

I.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The project site is located at 125 Ocean View Boulevard, between Eardley Avenue, Central Avenue, and Dewey Street in the City of Pacific Grove. The project site is bisected by Sloat Avenue. The site is located within the City’s coastal zone and is subject to the requirements of the City’s Local Coastal Program (currently being updated by the City) and the California Coastal Act. The Assessor’s Parcel Numbers (APNs) for the site are 006-231-001, 006-234-400, and 006-234-500.

The project site is fully developed as a retail complex and consists of a series of multi-level buildings with approximately 165,000 square feet of retail and restaurant space on approximately 2.9 acres of the site with surface parking occupying the remaining 1.6 acres. The existing buildings on the site were originally constructed in 1927 for use in the sardine heyday; however, the American Tin Cannery has been home to outlet shopping since 1988. The

American Tin Cannery was once a popular retail attraction, but has lost appeal in recent years and the majority of the outlet mall space appears underutilized.

1.2 PROJECT UNDERSTANDING AND ISSUES

Proposed Project

The proposed project is the redevelopment of the existing approximately 4.88-acre American Tin Cannery site into a world class hotel with various ancillary uses. The hotel would have approximately 160 rooms and suites, divisible into 225 rooms, and would include public event and meeting spaces, food and beverage facilities, spa and fitness center, a museum, an interpretive center, parking, and ancillary support space and facilities. The hotel complex is to be designed and constructed to the highest standards of sustainability with a goal to achieve Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Platinum certification, a green building certification program that recognizes best-in-class building strategies and practices.

The project site is located in the City's "coastal zone." The coastal zone is the geographic area to which the policies of the California Coastal Act of 1976 (Coastal Act) apply. The Coastal Act requires each coastal city and county to prepare a Local Coastal Program (LCP) that establishes the kind, location, and intensity of land and water uses appropriate to its portion of the coastal zone. An LCP consists of a local government's land use plan (LUP) and implementation plan (IP) (e.g. zoning ordinances, zoning district maps, etc.) that implement the provisions and policies of the LCP. The City of Pacific Grove ("City") began the process of preparing its LCP for its coastal zone more than 35 years ago. The City's LCP LUP was certified in 1989, but several attempts by the City to prepare implementing ordinances in support of a certified IP were not successful. As such the Coastal Commission is the agency responsible for reviewing and issuing Coastal Development Permits for development within its jurisdiction area.

Pacific Grove is currently in the process of updating its LCP with the support of the Coastal Commission. As part of the process, the City has completed a Background Report and Vulnerability Assessment for the Coastal Zone (which have been approved by the Coastal Commission staff) and drafted an updated LUP, which is currently being finalized. The City anticipates completion of the updated LCP and submission to the Coastal Commission Staff for certification by summer of 2016.

In reviewing proposed development projects in Pacific Grove's coastal zone, the Coastal Commission will consider the site's certified LUP designation, associated LUP policies and the zoning designation. The Coastal Commission will also consider documentation completed to date as part of the City's LCP update process.

The project site has an LCP LUP designation of Visitor-Commercial. The area of the site occupied with buildings is zoned Visitor Commercial District (C-V), and zoned Heavy Commercial District (C-2) on the area of the site with existing surface parking. Hotels uses are not permitted in either zoning district without a vote of approval from the public. Therefore, the project applicant has submitted to the City the American Tin Cannery Initiative Measure, to be submitted directly to the voters, to allow hotel use on the project site with a use permit. The vote is anticipated to take place in March 2016.

1.3 APPLICANT SUBMITTALS

It is our understanding that that applicant will prepare the following technical reports and submit them to the City as components of the project application: visual simulations, geotechnical assessment, and civil engineering efforts including a plan for public services.

2.0

PROPOSED SCOPE OF WORK

The following detailed scope of work outlines the tasks and projected budget proposed to assist the City of Pacific Grove with staff review services associated with the proposed project's California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) compliance and the City review process. As a result of information still to be delivered, this projected budget is an estimate only and subject to change during the contract period with the City.

SCOPE OF WORK TASKS

The following description of scope of work tasks is based on EMC Planning Group's current understanding of the City's needs for the proposed project. The scope of work can be readily refined as needed to ensure that the City's needs are fully addressed.

Task 1 Project Management/Administration

- Prepare EMC Planning Group project files and contract files, prepare and monitor project budgets and schedule and contract management.
- Conduct EMC Planning Group internal team meetings.
- Manage EMC Planning Group sub-consultants and provide project team coordination.
- Maintain and manage the overall CEQA review and project consideration process and approval all work products on behalf of the City. This task assumes EMC Planning Group will be maintaining and managing the overall City CEQA review and project consideration process on behalf of the City, coordinating the schedule, managing other

consultant inputs, providing some technical studies, peer review, quality controlling products, helping the City with noticing and responding to public and agency comments, coordinating with the City Attorney and Special Legal Counsel, keeping the administrative record throughout the process, preparing staff reports, preparing resolutions, preparing findings, and preparing conditions for project consideration.

- Communication protocol and attorney-client privilege information will be discussed at the proposed project kick-off meeting to determine and agree upon the day to day approach throughout the City's processing of the proposed project.

Task 2 *Project Meetings*

- **Project Meetings.** Execute all project meetings including coordination, scheduling, and logistics. This task assumes up to fifteen meetings (15). This task also assumes EMC Planning Group will coordinate with the City's Project Manager for all project meetings.
- **Planning Commission and City Council.** EMC Planning Group will attend up to two (2) total public hearings, for the City's Planning Commission and the City Council. EMC Planning Group will be available to answer questions/support City staff at the Planning Commission and City Council hearings.

Task 3 *Project Description*

This task includes background research, an extensive review of project plans, review of exiting technical reports.

- Review the applicant's project description site plans to identify information gaps/questions.

EMC Planning Group will review the following existing/forthcoming technical reports from the applicant to identify information gaps/questions and discuss with City staff:

- Geotechnical Report; and
- Plan for Services.
- Review technical reports from Kimley-Horn to assure consistency with the project description and to inform early decision making on project description changes to avoid potential environmental impacts.
- The ultimate goal of this task is to, on behalf of the city, work with the applicant to provide a complete and thorough project description to be used by the City's CEQA consultant for

preparation of the project's EIR. This is a critical component of the CEQA process, as essentially the EIR cannot begin to be prepared until a complete project description has been prepared. Based on our understanding of the existing level of design for the project, the need to integrate technical report recommendations, and the fact that there may be several iterations of the project description, we anticipate this task will require substantial time and effort to complete.

Task 4 Noticing

- EMC Planning Group will prepare and distribute all CEQA noticing required for the proposed project's CEQA review and approval process through the City. This task anticipates the preparation and distribution of the following noticing documents: Notice of Preparation (NOP), Notice of Intent (NOI), Notice of Completion (NOC), and Notice of Determination (NOD). This task assumes that all required fees for filing of noticing documents will not be the responsibility of EMC Planning Group, and if paid by EMC Planning Group will be reimbursed by the City. Although EMC Planning Group is willing to assist, all noticing required for meetings and public hearings will be the responsibility of the City.

Task 5 ADEIR Review

- EMC Planning Group, in consultation with the City, will review and approve the Administrative Draft EIR (ADEIR) once it has been submitted to the City by the City's CEQA consultant. We will coordinate with the City's attorney on protocol to receive, review, and provide comments on ADEIR content. This task assumes that the City's CEQA consultant will provide a complete ADEIR for review to the City with all sections of the ADEIR included and completed in draft form to the extent reasonable feasible (for example: the Summary section of the EIR would not be expected to be complete at time of the original ADEIR submittal).
- EMC Planning Group anticipates three (3) rounds of review between the CEQA document preparer, the City, and EMC Planning Group Team (including our Special Legal Counsel, and, where appropriate and if requested, Applicant's legal counsel) before finalization of a Draft EIR for public review. Due to the complex nature and number of reviewers, substantial time and effort is anticipated for this task.

Task 6 DEIR Responses to Comments / Final EIR

- EMC Planning Group, in consultation with the City, will review and approve of the draft responses to comments prepared by the City's CEQA consultant in response to comment received on the Draft EIR submitted for public review. This task assumes one set of response to comments will be provided to the City by the City's CEQA consultant addressing every comment received on the DEIR.
- EMC Planning Group anticipates three (3) rounds of review between the CEQA document preparer, the City, and EMC Planning Group Team (including our Special Legal Counsel, and, where appropriate and if requested, Applicant's legal counsel) before finalization of the draft responses/Final EIR. Due to the complex nature and number of reviewers, substantial time and effort is anticipated for this task.

Task 7 Technical Analyses

In addition to staff support and review services to the City, the City has requested that EMC Planning Group provide the following technical analyses associated with the proposed project or the project's CEQA review. EMC Planning Group will provide these services/reports through a combination of in-house staff and sub-consultants, as outlined below.

EMC Planning Group Technical Analysis

- **LCP/Zoning/GP Consistency Analysis.** EMC Planning Group will prepare a consistency analysis of the proposed project with the City's General Plan, Local Coastal Program, and Zoning. This task anticipates one (1) round of revisions following City review of the consistency analysis.
- **Water Supply/Demand Assessment.** EMC Planning Group will conduct a thorough review of existing water entitlements to the project site and water demand anticipated from the proposed project. EMC Planning Group will provide a letter report to the City detailing the results of our assessment. This task anticipates one (1) meeting with the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District. This analysis should be adequate for purposes of the EIR. However, once more detailed design plans are submitted to the City, this analysis should be refined for building permit approvals.
- **Historical Report Peer Review.** EMC Planning Group will conduct a peer review of the historical report to be prepared by the EIR preparer's consultant. EMC Planning Group will ensure that the project site's historical status has been correctly addressed in the project's historical report based on findings and correspondence between the City and

historical consultants investigating the project site's historical status in the past. In consultation with the City, EMC Planning Group will provide final approval of the project's historical report.

Sub-Consultant Technical Reports

- **Sea Level Rise Analysis (Climate Change).** EMC Planning Group's sub-consultant, Revell Coastal, will prepare an analysis of potential impacts to the project from sea level rise. This will include participating in team meetings, review of existing maps, preparation of a fatal flaws memorandum, and the preparation of wave run analysis based on calculations on adjacent properties.
- **Fiscal Analysis.** EMC Planning Group's sub-consultant, Applied Development Economics, will prepare a fiscal analysis of the proposed project. The fiscal analysis will be completed and submitted to the City by April 5th, 2016.
- **Phase I Site Assessment.** EMC Planning Group's sub-consultant, Running Moose Environmental Consulting, will prepare a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment for the proposed project.

Sub-Consultant Peer Reviews

- **Transportation Impact Analysis Peer Review.** As a sub-consultant to EMC Planning Group, Krupka Consulting will provide a peer review of the project's Transportation Impact Analysis, ADEIR Traffic section, and draft responses to comments specific to traffic impacts of the proposed project. In consultation with the City and EMC Planning Group, Krupka Consultant will provide final approval of the project's Transportation Impact Analysis, ADEIR Traffic section, and draft responses to comments specific to traffic impacts of the proposed project. Krupka Consulting will also be available to attend up to five (5) meetings associated with the proposed project.
- **Archaeological Analysis.** EMC Planning Group will retain Gary S. Breschini, Ph.D. to provide a peer review of the CEQA consultant's archaeological report. In consultation with the City and EMC Planning Group, Gary Breschini will provide final approval of the project's archaeological report.

Task 8 Staff Reports & Resolutions

- EMC Planning Group will prepare all staff reports required for the City's CEQA review and project consideration process. This task anticipates preparing staff reports for one (1) City Planning Commission hearing and one (1) City Council hearing.
- EMC Planning Group will also prepare required resolutions for one (1) City Planning Commission hearing and one (1) City Council hearing.

Task 9 Conditions of Approval

- EMC Planning Group will be responsible for preparing the project conditions of approval. This task anticipates meetings with various City of Pacific Grove and City of Monterey agencies to review project plans and discuss specific project conditions which may apply. This task assumes a maximum of five (5) meetings specifically to discuss conditions of approval for the project.

Task 10 Project Findings

- EMC Planning Group will prepare findings for the proposed project once the EIR and project are ready for the City Planning Commission and City Council to consider. Due to the complexity of the project, we anticipate this task requiring substantial time and effort, undergoing two (2) rounds of review and revisions with our special legal counsel and the city attorney review.

Task 11 Project Record

- EMC Planning Group will be responsible for maintenance of the project's administrative record, on behalf of the City. This task anticipates weekly coordination and assemblage of project-related records, including printing and filing all project related correspondence conducted through email. EMC Planning Group will maintain a hard copy of the project's administrative record throughout the CEQA and project consideration process with the City. Upon completion of EMC Planning Group's contract with the City, we will deliver the entire project record to the City for City recording purposes.

Task 12 Public Records Request Response

- In the event a public records request on the proposed project occurs during the project's CEQA and project review process, EMC Planning Group will be responsible for providing

a copy of the administrative record on behalf of the City to the requestor. As it cannot be known at this time how large the project's administrative record will ultimately be or if/how many public records requests may be filed with the City, a time and cost estimate is included in the attached budget for one (1) public records request response. In the event that more than one public record request is submitted throughout the CEQA review and City approval process, a contract amendment will be required.

Special Legal Counsel

EMC Planning Group recommends Truman & Elliot, LLP provide special legal counsel services during the CEQA review and project consideration process. Truman & Elliot will provide on-call legal counsel for the CEQA review and the project consideration process, on an as needed basis. Truman & Elliot will also provide a review of the project's ADEIR, responses to comments received on the DEIR, and provide review services for the CEQA and project findings. No cost has been included in EMC Planning Group's proposal for the services of Truman & Elliot, as it is anticipated that Truman & Elliot will be retained by the City directly under separate agreement.

2.4 SCHEDULE

EMC Planning Group will begin providing the services described in this proposal immediately after contract approval and notice to proceed from the City. EMC Planning Group will continue providing services described in this proposal throughout the duration of the CEQA review and project consideration process for the proposed project. It is understood by EMC Planning Group that the intention of the City is for EMC Planning Group to execute and manage meetings and scheduling of the proposed project EIR, as well as prepare and manage project consideration materials for decision makers.

2.5 BUDGET

The proposed project budget is presented on the following page.

Project Bella Staff Support Services		
Task		
Staff	Total Hours	Total Cost
Billing Rate (Per Hour)		
Task 1: Project Management/Administration	121.0	\$20,950.00
Task 2: Project Meetings	112.0	\$20,330.00
Task 3: Project Description	70.0	\$10,590.00
Task 4: Noticing	39.0	\$4,810.00
Task 5: ADEIR Review	99.0	\$18,330.00
Task 6: RTC/Final EIR Review	67.0	\$12,540.00
Task 7: Technical Analyses (EMC)	90.0	\$15,140.00
Task 8: Staff Reports & Resolutions	95.0	\$13,565.00
Task 9: Conditions of Approval	81.0	\$13,205.00
Task 10: Findings	62.0	\$10,075.00
Task 11: Project Admin. Record	72.0	\$8,870.00
Task 12: Public Records Request	34.0	\$4,315.00
Subtotal (Hours)	Total Hours	Total Cost
Subtotal (Cost)	942.0	\$152,720.00

Additional Costs	
Production Costs	\$350.00
Travel Costs	\$50.00
Postal/Deliverables	\$100.00
Miscellaneous	\$500.00
Administrative Overhead 10%	\$100.00
Total	\$1,100.00

Subconsultant Fees	
Revell Coastal	\$10,000.00
ADE	\$16,800.00
Krupka Consulting	\$10,500.00
Running Moose Environmental	\$2,500.00
Gary S. Brechini, PhD	\$500.00
Subconsultant Overhead 10%	\$4,030.00
Total	\$44,330.00

Total Costs	\$198,150.00
--------------------	---------------------

Note: Special Legal Counsel is not included in this budget. This scope contains an introductory letter, biographies, and a letter to David Laredo, City Attorney. It is our understanding that the City would retain Special Legal Counsel, and make them available to the Project Bella team on an as needed basis.