



# COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Council Meeting Date: January 22, 2013  
Staff Report #: 13-012

Agenda Item #: D-5

**CONSENT CALENDAR: Rescind Authorization for the City Manager to Approve a Contract with Atkins North America, Inc., and Authorize the City Manager to Approve a Contract with ICF International in the Amount of \$194,457 and Future Augments as may be Necessary to Complete the Environmental Review for the Project Located at 151 Commonwealth Drive and 164 Jefferson Drive**

---

## RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the City Council rescind its authorization for the City Manager to approve a contract with Atkins North America Inc., and authorize the City Manager to approve a contract with ICF International in the amount of \$194,457 and future augments as may be necessary to complete the environmental review for the Commonwealth Corporate Center Project based on the proposal included as Attachment A.

## BACKGROUND

On December 11, 2012, the City Council authorized the City Manager to approve a contract with Atkins North America, Inc. (Atkins) in the amount of \$194,457 and future augments as may be necessary to complete the environmental review for the Commonwealth Corporate Center Project. Due to changes in staffing at Atkins, the contract was never executed. The Atkins team members who were assigned to the project have since been employed by ICF International. As such, staff requested a proposal from ICF International to complete the environmental review for the Commonwealth Corporate Center Project. The proposal, which is included as Attachment A, is substantially consistent with the proposal provided by Atkins, inclusive of the budget, and would allow for continuity of consultant staffing for preparation of the required environmental documents for the Commonwealth Corporate Center Project.

## IMPACT ON CITY RESOURCES

The applicant is required to pay planning permit fees, based on the Master Fee Schedule, to fully cover the cost of staff time spent on the review of the project. The applicant is also required to bear the cost of the associated environmental review and Fiscal Impact Analysis (FIA) preparation. For the environmental review and FIA, the applicant deposits money with the City and the City pays the consultants.

## **POLICY ISSUES**

The proposed project will ultimately require the Council to consider certain land use entitlements. Staff will be identifying policy issues during the Council's review of the project.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

An EIR will be prepared for the project.

Signature on file  
Rachel Grossman  
Associate Planner

Signature on file  
Justin Murphy  
Development Services Manager

**PUBLIC NOTICE:** Public notification was achieved by posting the agenda, with this agenda item being listed, at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. In addition, the City has prepared a project page for the proposal, which is available at the following address: [http://www.menlopark.org/projects/comdev\\_fb.htm](http://www.menlopark.org/projects/comdev_fb.htm). This page provides up-to-date information about the project, allowing interested parties to stay informed of its progress. The page allows users to sign up for automatic email bulletins, notifying them when content is updated.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

- A. ICF International Proposal for preparation of an Environmental Impact Report for the Commonwealth Corporate Center Project, dated January 10, 2013

## **BACKGROUND MATERIAL AVAILABLE AT CITY OFFICES**

[Commonwealth Corporate Center, City Council Staff Report dated December 11, 2012](#)



January 15, 2013

Rachel Grossman  
City of Menlo Park Community Development Department  
701 Laurel Street  
Menlo Park, CA 94025

SUBJECT: Scope of Work and Cost Estimate for Commonwealth Corporate Center Project  
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) Phase II

Dear Ms. Grossman:

ICF is pleased to submit the scope of work and cost estimate to prepare Phase II of the EIR under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for the proposed Commonwealth Corporate Center Project (Project) in the City of Menlo Park. The proposed project manager is Erin Efner, and this scope of work reflects the Project information provided by Menlo Park staff, knowledge of the area, a site visit under Phase I of the Project, and prior experience with similar projects.

This scope focuses on Phase II of the EIR. Phase I included preliminary EIR Tasks 1, 2 and 3 conducted by Atkins. Phase II includes Tasks 4-13, which represents the bulk of the EIR work, to be conducted by ICF as described in Attachment A. The corresponding cost estimate is included in Attachment B.

We will work closely with City staff to coordinate, direct, and review the work and deliverables included in this scope and performed by other consultants contributing to the EIR as appropriate. This includes DKS for the transportation analysis, Bay Area Economics for the fiscal impact analysis and PreVision Design (formerly Adam Phillips Digital) for the visual simulations. The visual simulations by PreVision Design and preliminary transportation work by DKS are included in the Phase I contract currently held by Atkins. The scope of work for transportation work to be conducted by DKS as part of Phase II is included in Attachment C.

The cost estimate for Phase II is \$194,457 (Attachment B). Please note that project description changes could result in the need for a scope/cost amendment. Additionally, the budget includes a cost estimate for printing. However, due to the uncertainty regarding the size of the document and the potential volumes, we request that the printing budget be used as only an estimate and that, if the estimated budget is exceeded, we reduce the number of hard copies and provide more electronic copies or receive a budget augment.

We look forward to working with you on this project. If you have any questions related to this scope of services or cost estimate, please contact project manager Erin Efner at (415) 205-2268, project director Rich Walter at (415) 677-7167, or me at (415) 677-7144.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Rahul T. Young".

Rahul Young  
Bay Area Branch Leader

**Attachments**

- A. ICF Scope of Work Phase II
- B. Cost Estimate Phase II
- C. DKS Traffic Analysis Scope



## Attachment A

### Scope of Work Phase II

#### Project Understanding and General Approach

The Project includes demolishing the existing structures to construct a corporate center that could include office, Research and Development (R&D), or biotech uses. The Project would include two buildings totaling 259,919 square feet with a maximum height of approximately 72 feet, 4 inches. All parking would be surface, and there would be no underground facilities. Due to the uncertainty, assumptions need to be made for purposes of the analysis. It is recommended that the Draft EIR analyze a conservative scenario for each environmental topic, which may involve assuming different land uses for various environmental topics.

#### Scope of Work

##### Task 4. Administrative Draft EIR

The purpose of this task is to prepare the administrative draft EIR. Synthesize background information for use in the existing setting, evaluate changes to those baseline conditions resulting from implementation of the proposed project to identify significant impacts, and identify mitigation measures to reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level.

For this task, there are four principal activities:

- Determine, by individual resource topic, significance criteria to be used in the analysis
- Perform the analysis and make determinations of impact significance
- Recommend mitigation measures to reduce impacts, if needed

First, we will develop a project description, in coordination with the City and Project Sponsor, which includes the information necessary to analyze the project and prepare the EIR in compliance with CEQA. It is assumed that the City and/or Project Sponsor will provide the information necessary for analysis. We understand that a data needs request has been submitted as part of Phase I, but we may have additional data requests.

We will collect the information necessary to define baseline conditions in the project area. Based on our understanding of the project and vicinity, particular emphasis will be placed on the project's effect on air quality, traffic and circulation, and visual quality. In addition, for a description of existing conditions, we will use information presented in the approved Menlo Gateway Project EIR and the ongoing Menlo Park Facebook Campus EIR.



For each environmental topic, significance thresholds or criteria will be defined in consultation with the City so that it is clear how the EIR classifies an impact. These criteria will be based on CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G; standards used by the City; and our experience in developing performance standards and planning guidelines to minimize impacts.

As stated above, the proposed project could either include office, Research and Development (R&D), or biotech uses. Therefore, it is recommended that the Draft EIR analyze a conservative scenario for each environmental topic, which may involve assuming different land uses for various environmental topics. For example, office uses can accommodate more employees in the floor plan than R&D; therefore, population-driven topics (such as transportation, air quality, climate change, population and housing, public services, and utilities) will be based on office uses. However, life-science and R&D uses generally require more mechanical equipment on the roof than with office uses, which could result in greater noise impacts. Additionally, the laboratories would use and store chemicals and hazardous materials, which would affect the discussion regarding hazardous material use and disposal. Topics that focus on footprint and site design impacts (e.g., visual quality, hydrology, and geology) would not be impacted by the type of use that would occupy the proposed buildings. As such, depending on the environmental topic, the conservative scenario (office, R&D, or biotech uses) will be analyzed.

The analysis will be based on standard methodologies and techniques, and will focus on the net changes anticipated at the project site. The text will clearly link measures to impacts and indicate their effectiveness (i.e., ability to reduce an impact to a less-than-significant level), identify the responsible agency or party, and distinguish whether measures are proposed as part of the project, are already being implemented (such as existing regulations), or are to be considered. This approach facilitates preparation of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) that follows certification of an EIR.

The administrative draft EIR will incorporate the baseline conditions data as well as impact analysis and mitigation measures, plus the alternatives and other CEQA considerations described in Task 5 (below). It is envisioned that the City's initial review of the document will consider content, accuracy, validity of assumptions, classification of impacts, feasibility of mitigation measures, and alternatives analyses. Because the impacts and mitigations are subject to revision based on staff review of the administrative draft, the Executive Summary will be prepared only for the Screencheck Draft. The following task descriptions summarize the data to be collected, impact assessment methodologies to be used, and types of mitigation measures to consider, by environmental issue.

### Issues Anticipated to be Less Than Significant

To streamline the EIR process, it is anticipated that some environmental topics will not require detailed discussion in the EIR and would be “dismissed”.

Based on our preliminary review, the following environmental topics may be scoped out from detailed analysis in the EIR. However, it may be determined following the site visit, upon receipt of additional information, or in response to NOP comments that one or more of the following topics should instead be analyzed in detail in the EIR, in which case a scope and budget amendment may be necessary.



**Agricultural and Forestry Resources.** ICF will describe existing conditions at the project site, identify General Plan designation and zoning districts, and indicate lack of agricultural and forestry uses at the project site.

**Biological Resources.** It appears that there are no biological resources at the project site. However, this needs to be confirmed with a reconnaissance level of analysis. We will conduct the following tasks:

- Conduct background research to determine the biological resources that could be affected by the proposed project such as special-status species or protected trees. This research will include review of Menlo Park's tree ordinance, the use of the California Department of Fish and Game's Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDDB), the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Special-Status Species Online Database, and the California Native Plant Society's online inventory. An aerial photograph of the project site will be reviewed to identify areas of habitat types that can later be confirmed through field verification.
- Conduct a site visit to characterize potential special-status plant and wildlife habitats that may be present, and determine if potential wetlands are present on the sites (included in Task 1). A list of plant and wildlife species observed during the survey will be collected and presented in the analysis. Given the developed nature of the project site, it is not expected that wetlands or special-status species will be present; however a site visit will be required to make this determination. Although no species specific surveys are proposed for this scope, if any incidental sightings of special-status species occur during the survey, they will be recorded.
- Evaluate the proposed project's effects on the identified biological resources, and recommend mitigation as warranted. Based on prior experience in the region, and the disturbed nature of the site, we anticipate that the prominent issues for the proposed project will be limited to migratory birds, roosting bats (within the abandoned buildings), and protected trees.

**Land Use.** Land use and planning generally considers the compatibility of a proposed project with neighboring areas, change to, or displacement of existing uses, compliance with zoning regulations, and consistency of a proposed project with relevant local land use policies that have been adopted with the intent to mitigate or avoid an environmental effect. With respect to land use conflicts or compatibility issues, the magnitude of these impacts depends on how a proposed project affects the existing development pattern, development intensity, traffic circulation, noise, and visual setting in the immediately surrounding area, which are generally discussed in the respective sections. The project would require a Conditional Development Permit and zoning amendment to allow for an increase in height but is otherwise consistent with land use designations.

ICF will conduct the following tasks and, where appropriate, will rely on previously prepared EIRs for the City of Menlo Park for both content and impact methodology:



- Describe existing land uses, intensities, and patterns in the vicinity of the project site and the compatibility of the proposed land uses and zoning with current development.
- Describe the proposed project's potential to divide an established community.
- Evaluate any potential conflicts between the proposed and current land uses that would result in environmental impacts. These conflicts could include a use that would create a nuisance for adjacent properties or result in incompatibility with surrounding land uses, such as differences in the physical scale of development, noise levels, traffic levels, or hours of operation.
- Evaluate the extent to which adopted City development standards or proposed design standards would eliminate or minimize potential conflicts within the proposed project site, resulting in environmental impacts. The Menlo Park General Plan, Zoning Ordinance and other applicable plans will be examined and the proposed project's consistency with applicable portions of these plans will be described.

**Mineral Resources.** ICF will describe existing conditions at the project site and identify the mineral resources zone classification for soils at the site. It is anticipated that the site does not contain significant mineral resources.

### Aesthetics

Data needs to complete section include landscape plans, lighting plans, and building architectural styles and exterior finishings. ICF will prepare the Aesthetics section of the EIR based on the visual simulations prepared by Adam Phillips Digital (scope and budget included in Phase I) and will also conduct the following tasks:

- Visit the project site and surroundings, to identify and photodocument existing visual character and quality conditions, views to and from the project site, and other urban design features.
- Coordinate with City staff in selecting viewpoints from which Adam Phillips Digital will prepare visual simulations.
- Based on scenic resources and views identified in the Menlo Park General Plan (see below) and visual simulations, analyze potential adverse aesthetic effects resulting from the proposed project. The surrounding sensitive viewer locations that could be affected by the proposed development include Joseph P. Kelly Park.
- Review existing General Plan goals and policies related to visual quality to determine conflicts with any relevant plans and policies.
- Using the visual simulations and field observations, analyze whether the proposed project would substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the project area and its surroundings due to grading, height, bulk, massing, architectural style, and building materials, and other site alterations.



- Analyze potential degradation of views from roadways, US 101, adjacent uses, and other sensitive viewer locations.
- Analyze lighting and glare impacts created by the proposed buildings, focusing on motorists on US 101.

Shadows from the proposed buildings would increase over existing conditions due to the increase in building height. Shadows could reach sensitive surrounding uses, including Joseph P. Kelly Park. If, based on further discussions with the City and Project Sponsor as well as a thorough site reconnaissance, it is determined that shadow impacts should be evaluated in the EIR, the scope and budget could be amended to prepare shadow diagrams.

### Transportation/Traffic

Due to the level of technical detail in the transportation scope, the full text of the transportation impact analysis (TIA) has been included as Attachment C. In summary, DKS has identified 29 study intersections and 12 roadway segments that will be considered in the analysis. Due to comments received during the NOP scoping period, DKS has added additional study intersections and roadway segments to their analysis and will conduct a Transportation Impact Analysis. The original tasks were previously included in Phase I of the scope. Although Phase I has been revised due to NOP comments, all costs for the additional tasks performed by DKS have been included in the Phase II budget (Attachment B).

DKS will also prepare the analysis in the format of a chapter to the EIR. All technical data will be appended to the EIR. The analysis will be prepared consistent with the City of Menlo Park and San Mateo County Congestion Management Program (CMP) requirements.

This scope assumes that the City and Project Sponsor's transportation consultant will provide third party review of the TIA.

### Air Quality

This section will analyze construction-related and operational criteria pollutants using the 2011 Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) CEQA Guidelines, in consultation with the City. In addition, ICF will evaluate the potential for adverse health effects associated with toxic air contaminant (TAC) exposures to sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project site. ICF will use the Air Quality Screening Analysis<sup>1</sup> which identifies existing sources and potential receptors within 1,000 feet of the proposed project boundaries.

#### 2011 BAAQMD Guidelines

In January 2012, the Superior Court for the Court of Alameda County issued a minute order granting a petition for writ of mandate and determined that BAAQMD failed to

---

<sup>1</sup> Air Quality Screening Analysis. March 16, 2012. Prepared by Atkins North America, Inc. San Francisco, CA.



comply with CEQA in adopting its revised Guidelines. A writ of mandate vacating BAAQMD's adoption of the revised Guidelines was granted on February 14, 2012. BAAQMD has not issued additional guidance in light of the Court's decision. Under CEQA, it is ultimately up to the Lead Agency to determine which thresholds of significance and methodology to apply. ICF believes that the use of the BAAQMD's 2011 Guidelines provide conservative thresholds and, therefore, unless the City has other significance thresholds, recommends the continued use of these thresholds until such time as revised thresholds are developed by the BAAQMD. It is ICF's belief that should new thresholds be developed by the BAAQMD as a result of this lawsuit, the current thresholds will be more stringent. Therefore, any project held to the current BAAQMD thresholds would, at the minimum, maintain their significance findings.

### Criteria Pollutants

Criteria pollutants are emitted during construction from project-related construction and demolition activities and operation from project operation or implementation.

Construction emissions are produced from both equipment and dust during construction and demolition activities. Emissions typically result from material handling, traffic on unpaved or unimproved surfaces, demolition of structures, removal of debris, use of paving materials and architectural coatings, exhaust from construction worker vehicle trips, and exhaust from diesel-powered construction equipment. The project proposes to construct 259,919 square feet of general office building which is below the 277,000 square feet construction screening level for development projects within the BAAQMD. However, the details of the construction activities are unknown at this time and therefore may exceed some of the criteria anticipated in the screening analysis such as no overlap of any construction phases, extensive site preparation, or extensive material transport. Further the BAAQMD recommends the quantification of construction related emissions for GHG quantification and for the Health Risk Analysis (as discussed in their respective sections below); emissions from construction activities will be included in the emissions inventory for the proposed project. Criteria pollutant emissions associated with the construction activities will be estimated using the CalEEMod model and will be compared to the 2011 BAAQMD-adopted CEQA thresholds of significance. The modeling will include, at a minimum, reductions from the Basic Construction Mitigation Measures that are recommended for all construction activities. Should the project's construction/demolition activities exceed thresholds, mitigation measures will be proposed to reduce emissions to below the thresholds or to the extent practicable.

Operational emissions generated by project implementation are primarily associated with mobile sources; however natural gas usage, landscaping, maintenance, and stationary sources such as emergency generators and boilers also contribute to the emission of criteria air pollutants. The project proposes to construct 259,919 square feet of general office building. While this is below the 346,000 square feet operational screening level for development projects within the BAAQMD, the development may include research and development or biotech facilities and, therefore, do not qualify as normal office use.



A full air quality analysis for operational activities must be quantified<sup>2</sup>. The total criteria pollutant emissions will be estimated using the CalEEMod model and will be compared to the 2011 BAAQMD-adopted CEQA thresholds of significance for daily and annual operational activities. This comparison will serve as the basis for determining if the project would result in a significant adverse impact when compared to the BAAQMD-adopted significance criteria. Should the project's operational activities exceed thresholds, mitigation measures will be proposed to reduce emissions to below the thresholds or to the extent practicable. Area source emissions from individual buildings will be determined based on the land use anticipated. Mobile emissions associated with project-related vehicle operations will use trip rates, vehicle trips, and vehicle trip lengths as identified in the project-specific transportation analysis if available or will use the modeling default assumptions.

For the assessment of CO impacts, we will use the BAAQMD screening-level procedure and data from the transportation and circulation analysis to determine the need for a quantitative CO analysis. If the screening level criteria are exceeded, we will perform localized CO modeling based on methodology contained in the Caltrans Transportation Project-Level Carbon Monoxide Protocol. We will use the CALINE4 model and the latest version of ARB emission factors (EMFAC2011) to estimate CO concentrations at key intersections analyzed in the transportation and circulation analysis. CO concentrations at up to 3 intersections within will be evaluated. CO impacts will be assessed by evaluating whether the proposed project meets the ambient air quality requirements for localized pollutants by determining whether it causes or contributes to an exceedance of state or federal CO standards.

According to BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines only net new emissions associated with a project are subject to CEQA. In order to accurately account for emission increases from the project, the net difference between existing (pre-project) and project emissions will be calculated. Further, unless accurate trip rates can be determined, all previous land use will assume no traffic thereby providing a conservative estimate of net project level emissions.

### Health Risk Assessment

ICF will evaluate the potential for adverse health effects associated with toxic air contaminant (TAC) exposures to sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project site. A preliminary evaluation TAC sources expected to contribute to local exposures include motor vehicles traveling on local roadways, trucks associated with local commercial facilities, and potential future onsite features operating under Air District permits. BAAQMD methodology suggests that cancer risk be evaluated with respect to diesel particulate matter (DPM) and total organic gases (TOG). Where applicable, cancer risk from TOGs will be derived using a weighted toxicity value developed through the

---

<sup>2</sup> Bay Area Air Quality Management District, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, Updated May 2011, p. 3-2.



speciation of TOG. The weighted toxicity value will incorporate the individual toxicity of each compound that makes up TOGs.

For construction-related emissions, the determination of health risks is based predominantly on construction equipment exhaust. Typically construction activities considered in HRA assessments include project-related demolition, grading, excavation, infrastructure installation and foundation and structure construction. Construction emissions for diesel related exhaust as determined from the CalEEMod model above will be used to determine the concentration at nearby sensitive receptors. The ISTSC3 model will be used to determine concentrations of DPM and PM2.5 at the nearby receptors. These concentrations will be used to develop specific health risk and PM2.5 concentrations at the nearby receptors. These will be compared to the BAAQMD's thresholds of significance to determine project level impacts.

For operational emissions, the BAAQMD recommends that TAC exposure from existing sources be evaluated to determine health risks associated with locating sensitive receptors within 1,000 feet of existing sources or locating a potential source within 1,000 feet of an existing sensitive receptor. The Air Quality Screening Analysis identifies all existing sources and potential receptors within 1,000 feet of the proposed project boundaries.

The project design includes a back-up generator and, thus, a refined analysis will need to be conducted to determine the risk from the back-up generator. In addition, a caveat will be included in the analysis to determine maximum emissions that can be accommodated onsite before the cumulative threshold is reached, and that future tenants will need to provide permits or individual health risk assessments to prove that operations will not exceed cumulative levels. Should known onsite impacts exceed regulatory thresholds for acceptable levels of risk or PM concentrations, mitigation measures will be proposed to reduce anticipated risk. Airborne concentrations will be estimated for sources using the ISTSC3 dispersion model as recommended by BAAQMD in Recommended Methods for Screening and Modeling Local Risks and Hazards (BAAQMD May 2011). For each of the sources where emissions are exceeded Cancer Risk and PM2.5 emissions will be further modeled in order to show more accurate emissions of both risk categories.

The Air Quality Screening Analysis identified 4 stationary sources and 1 mobile source of TACs within the 1,000 foot radius. Of the 4 stationary sources, one is listed as being at the project site. Assuming this is still active, the project would remove this risk from the area; therefore, this source would count as a decrease in risk/concentration for the project area. None of these sources have estimated risk available from the BAAQMD screening tools and therefore a stationary source information request has been submitted.

Based on the results of the screening level analysis for stationary and mobile sources,



quantitative estimates will be determined for cumulative excess lifetime cancer risks, non-cancer HIs, and PM2.5 concentrations associated with potential exposure for on-site and off-site receptors as applicable for each study area.

Where applicable, for off-site receptors, the project's contribution to cumulative cancer risk will be addressed both quantitatively and qualitatively. Based on the analysis of risk from the operation of the onsite stationary sources, a representative off-site receptor will be chosen. This receptor will be the one associated with the highest potential risk resulting from the project operation. In order to determine the cumulative risk, the potential risk from all sources within 1,000 feet of the proposed project will be evaluated and compared to the significance thresholds.

### Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and climate change analysis will discuss the potential impacts on the study areas from climate change, as well as the projects anticipated emissions of greenhouse gases. This section will examine potential impacts to the study area, construction-related emissions, and operational emissions.

Climate change is defined as any significant change in the climate such as temperature, wind, precipitation, that lasts for decades or longer. Climate change is influenced by natural factors, natural process, and human activities which increase the level of greenhouse gases present in the atmosphere. Since the type and size of the proposed project precludes the use of the BAAQMD's screening levels (screening level is 53,000 square feet), greenhouse gas emissions from the project must be quantified. BAAQMD guidelines recommend that emissions from construction as well as all of the direct and indirect emissions from operational activities be quantified.

Climate change is considered a cumulative analysis in that impacts from one project, although not singularly able to directly influence climate change, will combine with the impacts from existing as well as other future projects to influence the levels of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. Therefore, the climate change analysis will discuss the potential impacts on the study areas from climate change as well as the projects anticipated emissions of greenhouse gases.

For construction-related emissions, emissions of carbon dioxide will be estimated using CalEEMod, in accordance with the BAAQMD's 2011 Guidelines as outlined under the criteria pollutant construction emissions.

For operational emissions, emissions of carbon dioxide equivalents (CO<sub>2</sub>e) will be estimated using the CalEEMod model. The model will use default energy consumption and waste generation assumptions unless project specific data is provided by the project applicant. The total greenhouse gas emissions estimates will be compared to the 2011 BAAQMD-adopted CEQA thresholds of significance for greenhouse gas emissions. This comparison will serve as the basis for determining if the project would result in a



significant adverse impact and whether features of project design are adequate to reduce emissions or if additional mitigation measures would be required to reduce impacts to below significance thresholds. Project design features or mitigation will be applied to reduce GHG emissions to the BAAQMD threshold or to the furthest extent possible.

## Noise

Primary noise sources in the project vicinity include local and regional roadway traffic. Noise-sensitive receptors in the project vicinity include recreational uses at Joseph P. Kelly Park and residential uses in the Belle Haven neighborhood to the southeast. ICF will complete the following tasks:

- Summarize the existing noise environment for the project area and related environmental noise impacts. The analysis will provide existing conditions information and relevant background information, including noise fundamentals, descriptors, and applicable federal, state, and City of Menlo Park General Plan Noise Element. Federal Transit Administration (FTA) standards do not apply to this project and will not be discussed, nor will the project be evaluated using FTA noise criteria.
- Existing noise conditions will be quantified through ambient noise measurements consisting of a maximum of two site visits and the measurement of on-site and off-site ambient noise levels (up to four short-term [i.e., 15-minute] with vehicle counts and one long-term [i.e., 24-hour]). All monitoring locations will be approved by the City.
- Based on comments received from the Menlo Park Planning Commission during the NOP scoping session on August 20, 2012, ICF will conduct additional noise measurements in the residential neighborhood to the south of US 101 and the project site. ICF will analyze the impact of the proposed new buildings and if they would create bounce-back noise from the traffic on US 101 to the residential neighborhood. An analysis of noise reflection will be included.
- Assess the potential short-term, construction-related exterior and interior noise impacts (e.g., on-site heavy-duty equipment) with respect to nearby noise-sensitive receivers. Project-generated noise levels at these receivers will be quantified using the reference noise measurement data along with standard noise modeling practices (e.g., combined construction noise level, acceptable assumptions regarding exterior-to-interior noise reduction due to building façade).
- Quantify potential transportation noise source increases (e.g., increased traffic Jefferson Drive) generated by the proposed project. Traffic noise modeling will be based on average daily traffic (ADT) volumes obtained from the transportation impact study that will be prepared for this project.<sup>3</sup> A Federal Highway

---

<sup>3</sup> ADT may instead be generated using the CalEEMod model that will be used for the Air Quality analysis.



- Administration-approved traffic noise prediction model (e.g., RD-77-108) will be used to determine roadway traffic noise levels with adjustments to account for California Vehicle Noise Emission (CALVENO) factors for standard automobiles, medium trucks, and heavy trucks. Traffic noise levels will be quantified for affected roadway segments under existing, existing-plus-project, cumulative, and cumulative-plus-project scenarios. The EIR will determine if modeled increases to roadway noise levels would considerably affect existing noise-sensitive land uses. Modeled cumulative-plus-project traffic noise levels will be used to determine future interior and exterior noise levels on the project site.
- Assess stationary noise sources (e.g., HVAC, parking) associated with implementation of the proposed project. Long-term impacts will be determined from existing documentation, standard attenuation rates and modeling techniques. Impacts will be determined at adjacent noise-sensitive receivers and compared to applicable noise regulations.
  - Assess land use compatibility in terms of exterior noise levels with existing and future predicted noise environments (e.g., transportation and stationary) based on applicable regulations and local agency guidance. Stationary sources of noise that currently exist in the project area will be discussed based on site visit observations, aerial photographs, and existing documentation. ICF will discuss the types of existing stationary noise sources that are present. Stationary sources that dominate the project area noise environment will be measured and levels associated with such sources will be included in the EIR.
  - Include a discussion of the potential exposure of sensitive receivers to excessive groundborne vibration attributable to project implementation (e.g., use of heavy-duty construction equipment). This discussion will include a description of existing vibration sensitive receivers (sensitive land uses, and structures). ICF will conduct a reconnaissance level survey of surrounding land uses, sensitive receivers, and historical/architectural structures considered to be potentially sensitive to groundborne vibration levels. Typical short-term and long-term groundborne vibration levels will be predicted based on documented source-specific vibration levels and standard modeling procedures as recommended by federal and state agency guidance. In addition, based on comments received from Exponent during the NOP scoping period, ICF will evaluate vibration impacts on this specific sensitive receptor. A list of sensitive equipment used by Exponent may be required.
  - Evaluate noise and vibration impacts based on compliance or exceedance of applicable regulations and guidance provided by local, state, and federal agencies. Additionally, the EIR will assess noise and vibration significance based on the generation or exposure to substantial permanent or temporary increases in ambient levels. Mitigation measures and their relative effectiveness will be provided for noise and vibration impacts that are found to be significant.



## Cultural Resources

The existing buildings on the site were originally constructed in 1956. Based on a preliminary site reconnaissance, we do not anticipate these structures to be considered historic. However, due to their age, it is important that a historian visit the site, conduct background research, and make a determination as to eligibility. Due to the disturbed nature of the site, impacts to archaeological or paleontological resources are not anticipated. ICF will conduct the following tasks:

- Conduct records search of the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) to identify any previously recorded cultural resources and cultural resource investigations within 0.25 miles of the project site.
- Conduct records search of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) sacred lands database to determine if any Native American cultural resources are present in the vicinity of the project site. Local Native American organizations and individuals identified by NAHC will also be contracted regarding information on potential Native American resources in the project vicinity. The EIR will summarize any responses related to this effort. We assume that no issues will arise.
- Site visit by architectural historian to evaluate existing structures.
- Conduct archival research on history of site.
- Prepare brief memo summarizing the historical determination of significance in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines. This scope assumes there will be no historical resources.
- Standard mitigation measures for archaeological or paleontological resources will be identified.

## Geology/Soils

ICF will prepare the Geology/Soils section of the EIR and will conduct the following tasks:

- Review the Geotechnical Report to be provided by the Project Sponsor.  
  
Report the type and magnitude of seismic activity typical in the San Francisco Bay Area, the standards to be met by proposed structures to resist damage during seismic events, and design features to be incorporated in the proposed project to comply with those standards.
- Evaluate the geohazard risks from development at the project site, using available geologic and/or soils maps, published literature, and other information, reports, and/or plans. The main issue that will be analyzed is the seismic and geotechnical safety of the proposed buildings.



- Assess potential project geohazard impacts in light of existing regulations and policies that would serve to minimize potential impacts. Pertinent regulatory requirements will be explicitly identified so that the nexus between regulations and minimized impacts is apparent. In general, construction of development similar to the proposed project has little or no effect on the geology of an area, but is still subject to seismic groundshaking and local soil conditions, including ground oscillation and long-term and differential settlement. Standard design and construction techniques and compliance with City standards (including applicable portions of the California Building Code and the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System [NPDES]) typically eliminate or minimize seismic and geotechnical hazards.

### Hydrology/Water Quality

ICF will prepare the Hydrology/Water Quality section of the EIR and will conduct the following tasks:

- Describe the existing regulatory environment, including, but not limited to, the Construction General Permit, Municipal Regional Permit for stormwater discharges (including how the project relates to C.3 requirements), the City of Menlo Park Municipal Code, and the California Building Code. These regulations require specific measures for reducing potential impacts on hydrology and water quality as well as from flooding.
- Assess potential project hydrology and water quality impacts in light of existing regulations and policies that would serve to minimize potential impacts. Pertinent regulatory requirements will be explicitly identified so that the nexus between regulations and minimized impacts is apparent.
- Identify mitigation measures, where feasible, to minimize potentially significant or significant proposed project impacts.

### Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Based on technical information received for the project site, ICF will prepare the Hazards and Hazardous Materials section of the EIR. According to the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) prepared for the project, the project site is listed on several databases including: RCRA-SQG, HAZET, Historical UST, LUST, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), California Hazardous Material Incident Reporting System (CHMIRS), Waste Discharge System (WDS), Emission Inventory

System (EMI), ERNS, and San Mateo County Business Inventory (BI). Based on information provided in the Phase I ESA, ICF will conduct the following tasks:

- Identify potential exposure to hazardous materials or waste during construction activities and during long-term operation at the project site.
- Describe applicable federal, State, and local regulations and how these regulations apply to the proposed project and reduce the potential for impact.



- Evaluate potential public health risks at the site from groundwater and soil contamination from prior land uses. In addition, the analysis will focus on any potentially poor hazardous materials “housekeeping” practices at the site or from nearby uses. This information will be augmented by previously prepared Phase I ESA.
- Include a discussion of the potential hazardous materials that could be used during the operation of the proposed project and any potential releases of these materials, focusing on the conservative scenario of R&D or life science uses.
- Include a discussion of the potential public health risk from exposure to hazardous building components in the structures to be demolished at the project site (e.g., asbestos, PCBs, etc.).

### Population/Housing

This section will examine the project's effect on population and housing in the City and, to a lesser extent, in the region. Since the project involves neither residential development nor displacement of housing, the project's effects are indirect and will focus on the housing needed to accommodate the increased employment that would result from the project. ICF will undertake the following tasks:

- Discuss qualitatively the indirect housing effect resulting from the project and in the context of Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) regional household forecasts and fair share housing allocations and discuss whether the City can accommodate the demand.
- Estimate the indirect employment growth in the region from the “multiplier effect” due to increased employment, using ABAG's regional input-output factors.

### Public Services

Based on information received from various service providers, ICF will prepare the Public Services section of the EIR and will conduct the following tasks:

- As necessary, conduct phone/email interviews with the City's police, fire, and park and recreation departments, the school district, and the library to determine current service levels and capacity to serve increased demand.
- Estimate project-generated demand for public services based on existing operational standards obtained from the service providers. Other measures of demand will also be considered, such as the projected increase in the calls for service and the projected demand of recreational facilities and library services.
- In accordance with CEQA, evaluate the extent to which project demands would trigger the need for new public facilities whose construction might result in physical environmental effects.



### Utilities/Service Systems

The Utilities/Services Systems section of the EIR will examine the proposed project's effect on water supply, wastewater treatment, solid waste disposal, and energy generation and transmission. ICF will describe the existing conditions (capacity and current consumption levels), the impacts (the effects of the demand calculations against infrastructure capacity), and work with the City and the utility providers to identify reasonable mitigation measures. This scope of work assumes that the Project Sponsor will provide the water demand calculations, wastewater generation estimates, and energy calculations. If these are not readily available, ICF can assist with these calculations. As part of its Greenhouse Gas emissions, ICF will estimate solid waste generation resulting from construction and operation of the project. Our scope of work assumes that a Water Supply Assessment (WSA), approved by the relevant water supply agency, will be provided by the Project Sponsor or City.

Based on technical information for the project site and information received from the utility providers, ICF will prepare the Utilities/Service Systems section of the EIR and will conduct the following tasks:

- Describe existing utility providers, system capacity, and improvement plans.
- Peer review the utility demand calculations by Project Sponsor (if appropriate).
- Evaluate the net change in the demand for water, wastewater, solid waste, and energy, relative to existing and planned capacity for the utilities.
- Discuss whether implications of the project triggering the expansion or construction of new infrastructure or facilities.

#### ***Deliverables:***

- Five hard copies of Administrative Draft EIR
- One electronic copy of Administrative Draft EIR in MS Word
- One electronic copy of Administrative Draft EIR in Adobe PDF format

***City Involvement:*** Review and comment on the document.

### Task 5. Project Alternatives and Other CEQA Considerations

The purpose of this task is to complete drafts of the remaining sections (Alternatives and Other CEQA Considerations) of the EIR for City staff review.

This task involves preparation of other required sections examining particular aspects of the project's effects and the identification and comparison of project alternatives.

#### Other CEQA Considerations

This task involves documenting unavoidable adverse impacts, growth-inducing effects, and cumulative effects of the revised project:

- The unavoidable effects will be summarized from analyses performed in Task 4.



- Growth-inducing effects will be based on economic multipliers for the proposed uses (these multipliers provide information on direct and induced growth and were developed by the Association of Bay Area Governments for the regional input-output model), as well as comparisons with ABAG 2009 projections for the City. Growth inducement will be discussed in the context of population increases, utility and public services demands, infrastructure, and land use.
- Cumulative effects where relevant will be addressed in Task 4 and summarized as part of this section of the EIR. The future projects in the vicinity of the proposed project would be considered as they relate to potential cumulative impacts. This scope assumes the City will help develop the approach for analyzing cumulative effects, typically a combination of using the general plan and a list of planned projects.

### Alternatives

The alternatives to the proposed project must serve to substantially reduce impacts identified for the proposed project while feasibly attaining most of the project objectives. ICF assumes that one reduced project alternative will be quantitatively analyzed and will be based on a sensitivity analysis to reduce identified impacts. Up to two additional alternatives will be defined and evaluated qualitatively. This scope assumes that the City/Project Sponsor will provide justification for dismissing offsite alternatives.

#### **Deliverables:**

- Other CEQA Considerations chapter to be submitted with Administrative Draft EIR
- Alternatives chapter to be submitted with Administrative Draft EIR

**City Involvement:** Participate in discussions to develop list of projects for cumulative analysis and project alternatives. Review and augment the alternatives analysis.

### Task 6. Screencheck Draft

The purpose of this task is to prepare the Screencheck Draft EIR for City staff review. ICF will prepare a Screencheck Draft EIR to respond to the City's and Project Sponsor's comments on the Administrative Draft EIR. This scope assumes that comments from multiple reviewers will be consolidated with any conflicting comments resolved, and that comments do not result in substantial revisions or additional analyses. The Screencheck Draft EIR will include an Executive Summary section, which will summarize the project description, impacts and mitigations, and alternatives. Impacts and mitigations will be presented in a table that identifies each impact, its significance, and proposed mitigation as well as the level of significance following adoption for the mitigation measures.

#### **Deliverables:**

- Five hard copies of Screencheck Draft EIR
- One electronic copy of Screencheck Draft EIR in MS Word
- One electronic copy of Screencheck Draft EIR in PDF format



**City Involvement:** Review and comment on the document.

## Task 7. Public Draft EIR

The purpose of this task is to prepare and submit the Draft EIR to the City for distribution to the public. ICF will revise the Screencheck Draft to incorporate modifications identified by the City and Project Sponsor. The revised document will be a Draft EIR, fully in compliance with State CEQA Guidelines and City guidelines, and will be circulated among the public agencies and the general public as well as specific individuals, organizations, and agencies expressing an interest in receiving the document. During this task, ICF will also compile the appendices that will be distributed with the Draft EIR and produce a version of the full document that can be uploaded onto the City's website. ICF will also prepare a Notice of Completion (NOC) to accompany the copies that must be sent to the State Clearinghouse. This scope of work and budget assumes that ICF will send the required documents to the State Clearinghouse and that the City will distribute the Draft EIRs to all other recipients.

### **Deliverables:**

- Thirty five hard copies of the Draft EIR
- Two unbound hard copies of the Draft EIR
- Electronic copies of the Draft EIR in MS Word and in PDF format
- Notice of Completion
- Fifteen hard copies of the Executive Summary, along with 15 electronic copies of the entire Draft EIR on CD, for the State Clearinghouse

**City Involvement:** Review the Notice of Completion. Prepare and file the Notice of Availability with the County Clerk. Distribute the NOA and Draft EIRs (other than to the State Clearinghouse), and handle any additional noticing (e.g., newspaper, posting at site).

## Task 8. Public Review and Hearing

The City will provide for a 45-day period during which the public will have an opportunity to review and comment on the Draft EIR. During the 45-day review period, the City will hold a public hearing to receive comments on the Draft EIR. ICF key team members will attend and participate as requested. This scope of work does not include preparing meeting materials (e.g., PowerPoint presentations and handouts) or providing meeting transcript/minutes; but the scope can be amended to include these items.

**City Involvement:** Coordinate the public hearing – prepare and distribute any meeting materials, accept comments, and hold public meeting.

## Task 9. Draft Responses to Comments and Administrative Final EIR

The purpose of this task is to prepare responses to the comments received on the Draft EIR, and incorporate these responses into an Administrative Final EIR for City review. The Administrative Final EIR will include:



- Comments received on the Draft EIR, including a list of all commentors and the actual comment letters and public meeting transcripts with individual comments marked and numbered;
- Responses to all comments; and
- Revisions to the Draft EIR in errata format as necessary in response to comments.

All substantive comments for each written and oral comment will be reviewed, bracketed, and coded for a response. Prior to preparing responses, ICF will meet with staff to review the comments and suggest strategies for preparing responses. This step is desirable to ensure that all substantive comments are being addressed and that the appropriate level of response will be prepared. This scope of work and budget assumes ICF will prepare responses for up to 100 comments and will coordinate integrating the responses prepared by other consultants. However, the number and content of public comments is unknown at this time. Therefore, following the close of the Draft EIR public review period and receipt of all public comments, ICF will meet with the City to revisit the budget associated with this effort to determine if additional hours are needed.

Frequently raised comments of a substantive nature may be responded to in a Master Response, which allows for a comprehensive response to be presented upfront for all interested commentors. ICF will identify and recommend possible Master Responses for City consideration during the initial meeting to discuss strategies for preparing responses.

Following the strategy session, ICF will prepare Master Responses (as appropriate) and individual responses to the bracketed and coded comments. Individual responses to each comment letter will be placed immediately after the comment letter. As necessary, responses may indicate text revisions, in addition to clarifications and explanations. All text changes stemming from the responses to the comments, as well as those suggested by City staff, will be compiled into an errata included as part of the Final EIR.

Following City's review of the Administrative Final EIR, ICF will address all comments received and prepare a Screencheck Final EIR for City review to ensure that all comments on the Draft were adequately addressed.

***Deliverable:***

- Five hard copies of the Administrative Final EIR and an electronic copy in Word format.
- One electronic copy of the Screencheck Final EIR

***City Involvement:*** Participate in strategy session to provide guidance on the responses to comments. Assist with response to comments on process, procedures, and City policy. Review and comment on the administrative Final EIR and screencheck Final EIR.

## Task 10. Final EIR

The Final EIR will consist of the Draft EIR, comments received on the Draft EIR, responses to the comments, and any revisions to the Draft EIR in errata format. The



purpose of this task is to prepare a Final EIR for discussion by the Planning Commission and subsequent certification by the City Council.

***Deliverables:***

- Twenty hard copies of the Final EIR
- One electronic copy of the Final EIR in MS Word
- One electronic copy of the Final EIR in PDF format

## Task 11. Certification Hearings and MMRP

The purpose of this task is to attend meetings to certify the EIR. Team members will attend and participate in up to three meetings to certify the EIR. If requested by City staff, ICF will present the conclusions of the EIR and a summary of the comments and responses.

In addition, as part of this task, ICF will prepare a draft and final Mitigation and Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the project, as required by Section 15097 of the State CEQA Guidelines. The MMRP will be in a tabular format and include:

- The mitigation measures to be implemented
- The entity responsible for implementing a particular measure
- The entity responsible for verifying that a particular measure has been completed
- A monitoring milestone(s) or action(s) to mark implementation/completion of the mitigation measure

***Deliverables:***

- Five hard copies and an electronic copy (in Word format) of the Draft MMRP.
- Five hard copies and electronic copies (in Word and pdf format) of the Final MMRP.

***City Involvement:*** Review and comment on the draft Mitigation and Monitoring and Reporting Program. Coordinate any meetings. Prepare the Notice of Determination and Findings of Fact.

## Task 12. Meetings

The purpose of this task is to attend meetings to accomplish the above tasks. Team members will attend and participate in meetings on an as-needed basis. For purposes of the cost estimates, ICF has assumed four staff and/or Project Sponsor face-to-face meetings, up to three meetings (including public hearings), and 10 phone conference calls. Additional meetings may be appropriate during the course of this effort, and will be invoiced on a time-and-materials basis. The estimated cost for additional meetings is included in the discussion of the project budget.

***City Involvement:*** Organize, announce, conduct, and prepare any materials for public meetings.



### Task 13. Project Management

The purpose of this task is to effectively manage the above tasks, and maintain communication with City staff. ICF project management will be responsible for project coordination activities, will maintain QA/QC requirements for document preparation, and will monitor schedule and performance for all EIR work tasks. Project management subtasks also include maintaining internal communications among ICF staff and subconsultants and with City staff and other team members through emails and frequent phone contact, as well as the preparation of all correspondence. The project manager will coordinate internal staff, project guidance, and analysis criteria.

We understand the Project Sponsor submitted revised site plans on July 23, 2012, and that Atkins reviewed the site plans, provided comments and a data needs list, and started on a draft of the NOP and the Project Description. With submittal of the revised plans, we will review the plans, compare them with the previously-submitted data needs list, revise the NOP, and edit the Project Description.

**City Involvement:** Coordination with ICF Project Manager.

Attachment B

Table 1. Cost Estimate for Preparing a CEQA EIR for Commonwealth Corporate Center Phase II - January 10, 2012

Task	Consulting Staff											Subcontractor		Production Staff					Direct Expenses	Total Price
	Employee Name	Walter R	Efner E	Chapman K	Yoon L	Kuo K	Grant J	Christensen E	White H	La Plante A	Roberts D	DKS Associates	Traffic	Greenman J	Jew D	Messick T	Subtotal	Labor Total		
	Project Role	Project Director	Project Manager	Project Coordinator, Planner	Air Quality, GHG	Noise, Traffic	Cultural Resources	Biology	GIS	Hydrology, Water Quality	Haz Mat, Geo			Editor	Publication Specialist	Graphic Artist				
Labor Classification	Proj Dir	Proj Mgr	Assoc Consult II	Assoc Consult II	Sr Consult II	Assoc Consult III	Assoc Consult III	Assoc Consult II	Sr Consult I	Assoc Consult III	Subtotal	Subconsultant	Subtotal	Editor	Publication Specialist	Graphic Artist	Admin Tech	Subtotal	Labor Total	
Task 4. Administrative Draft EIR											\$0.00		\$0					\$0.00	\$0.00	
<i>Impacts Found to be Less Than Significant</i>											\$4,467.44		\$0					\$0.00	\$4,467.44	
<i>Aesthetics</i>		4		16				24			\$2,637.04		\$0					\$0.00	\$2,637.04	
<i>Transportation/Traffic</i>		4		24					20		\$3,049.84	\$50,488	\$50,488					\$0.00	\$53,537.84	
<i>Air Quality</i>		4			60						\$5,933.44		\$0					\$0.00	\$5,933.44	
<i>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</i>		4			40						\$4,188.24		\$0					\$0.00	\$4,188.24	
<i>Noise</i>		4				40					\$5,401.84		\$0					\$0.00	\$5,401.84	
<i>Cultural Resources</i>		2					40				\$4,762.52		\$0					\$0.00	\$4,762.52	
<i>Geology/Soils</i>		2								24	\$3,145.88		\$0					\$0.00	\$3,145.88	
<i>Hydrology/Water Quality</i>		4								30	\$4,481.14		\$0					\$0.00	\$4,481.14	
<i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i>		2								20	\$2,679.72		\$0					\$0.00	\$2,679.72	
<i>Population/Housing</i>		2		24							\$2,288.12		\$0					\$0.00	\$2,288.12	
<i>Public Services</i>		3		32							\$3,108.98		\$0					\$0.00	\$3,108.98	
<i>Utilities/Service Systems</i>		3		32							\$3,108.98		\$0					\$0.00	\$3,108.98	
<i>Production</i>		10		20					16		\$4,776.76		\$0	40	20	12	6	\$7,420.56	\$12,197.32	
Task 5. Project Alternatives and Other CEQA Considerations	2	10		30	6	6	4	2		4	\$7,446.12		\$0					\$0.00	\$7,446.12	
Task 6. Screencheck Draft		14		40	8	8	4	2		4	\$9,164.76		\$0	16	10	4		\$2,884.44	\$12,049.20	
Task 7. Prepare Draft EIR		4		16	2	2				2	\$2,633.44		\$0	8	16	4	8	\$3,291.04	\$5,924.48	
Task 8. Public Review and Hearing	2	8		8							\$2,472.08		\$0					\$0.00	\$2,472.08	
Task 9. Draft Responses to Comments and Administrative Final EIR	4	40		40	8	8	2	2		4	\$14,573.12		\$0	16	16		4	\$3,217.28	\$17,790.40	
Task 10. Final EIR		8		24							\$3,334.88		\$0	10	16		4	\$2,678.36	\$6,013.24	
Task 11. Certification Hearings and MMRP		8		8							\$2,042.08		\$0		8		4	\$1,030.88	\$3,072.96	
Task 12. Meetings	8	16		16							\$5,804.16		\$0					\$0.00	\$5,804.16	
Task 13. Project Management		40		20							\$8,594.40		\$0					\$0.00	\$8,594.40	
Total hours	16	200		350	124	84	50	30	16	42				90	86	20	26			
Billing Rates	\$215.00	\$174.46		\$80.80	\$87.26	\$117.60	\$110.34	\$103.20	\$88.51	\$126.11				\$89.82	\$93.66	\$127.68	\$70.40			
Subtotals	\$3,440.00	\$34,892.00		\$28,280.00	\$10,820.24	\$9,878.40	\$5,517.00	\$3,096.00	\$1,416.16	\$5,296.62	\$7,458.56	\$110,094.98	\$50,488	\$50,488	\$8,083.80	\$8,054.76	\$2,553.60	\$1,830.40	\$20,522.56	\$181,105.54
<b>Direct Expenses</b>																				
523.02 Reproductions																				\$6,200
523.04 Postage and Delivery																				\$500
523.05 Travel, Auto, incld. Mileage at current IRS rate (.555/mile)																				\$50
523.07 Surveys and Reports																				\$800
Mark up on all non-labor costs and subcontractors:		10%																		\$5,804
Direct expense subtotal																				\$13,354
Total price (before rounding down)																				\$194,459.34
<b>Total Price</b>																				<b>\$194,457.00</b>

## Scope of Work – Phase 1

The following tasks will provide a transportation impact analysis report that meets current City of Menlo Park and San Mateo County Congestion Management Program (CMP) requirements, and provide focused information on the proposed project.

### ***Task 1: Data Collection and Field Reconnaissance***

There are 29 study intersections and 12 roadway segments assumed in this analysis and are shown in Figure 1. These are:

#### Intersections:

1. Marsh Road and Bayfront Expressway
2. Marsh Road and Independence Drive
3. Marsh Road and US 101 NB Off-Ramp
4. Marsh Road and US 101 SB Off-Ramp
5. Marsh Road and Scott Drive
6. Marsh Road and Bay Road
7. Marsh Road and Middlefield Road
8. Independence Road and Constitution Drive
9. Chrysler Drive and Bayfront Expressway
10. Chrysler Drive and Constitution Drive
11. Chrysler Drive and Jefferson Drive
12. Chrysler Drive and Independence Drive
13. Jefferson Drive and Constitution Drive
14. Chilco Street and Bayfront Expressway
15. Chilco Street and Constitution Drive
16. Chilco Street and Terminal Avenue
17. Willow Road and Bayfront Expressway
18. Willow Road and Hamilton Avenue
19. Willow Road and Ivy Drive
20. Willow Road and O'Brien Drive
21. Willow Road and Newbridge Street
22. Willow Road and Bay Road
23. Willow Road and Durham Street
24. Willow Road and Coleman Avenue
25. Willow Road and Gilbert Avenue
26. Willow Road and Middlefield Road
27. University Avenue and Bayfront Expressway
28. Middlefield Road and Ravenswood Avenue
29. Middlefield Road and Ringwood Avenue

Residential and Non-Residential Roadway Segments:

1. Marsh Road between Bohannon Drive and Scott Drive
2. Marsh Road between Bohannon Drive and Bay Road
3. Chrysler Drive between Constitution Drive and Bayfront Expressway
4. Chrysler Drive between Jefferson Drive and Constitution Drive
5. Chilco Street between Constitution Drive and Bayfront Expressway
6. Constitution Drive between Independence Drive and Chrysler Drive
7. Constitution Drive between Chrysler Drive and Jefferson Drive
8. Constitution Drive between Jefferson Drive and Chilco Street
9. Jefferson Drive between Chrysler Drive and driveway
10. Jefferson Drive between driveway and Constitution Drive
11. Independence Drive between Constitution Drive and Chrysler Drive
12. Commonwealth Drive between Chrysler Drive and end of public roadway section of Commonwealth Drive

***Field Reconnaissance***

DKS staff will conduct field visits during the AM and PM peak periods on a typical weekday (Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday). DKS will observe:

- Traffic patterns and circulation in the site vicinity
- Study intersection lane geometrics
- Traffic control
- Pedestrian circulation and facilities/amenities
- Proximity of public transit service
- Sight distance issues at study intersections
- Potential access issues

***Task 2a: Transportation Impact Analysis***

Task 2 will be distributed between Task 2a (Phase 1) and Task 2b (Phase 2). Task 2a will include the initial tasks for the Transportation Impact Analysis, which could include a combination of the following:

**Background Trip Generation and Distribution**

Background related traffic will be based on planned and approved projects based on the most current list provided by the City of Menlo Park. Several projects on the City's most current list may not be included in the most recent CSA, and may need to be added to the background scenario. DKS will use standard trip generation rates published in the most recent edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual. The distribution and assignment of the background trips will be based on the City's TIA Guidelines and CSA documents.

**Project Trip Generation and Distribution**

DKS will estimate trip generation rates for the proposed project based standard trip

September 6, 2012

generation rates published in the most recent edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) *Trip Generation Manual*.

The distribution and assignment of the project trips will be based on the assumptions used in the City of Menlo Park's TIA Guidelines as well as recently conducted traffic studies, the prevailing travel patterns on the adjacent roadway network, abutting land uses, travel time characteristics and our knowledge of the study area.

### **Study Intersection Traffic Analysis**

The AM and PM peak hour operational Levels of Service (LOS) will be analyzed at the study intersections. The analysis will include the following scenarios:

- Existing Condition
- Near Term Condition
- Near Term Plus Project Condition
- Long Term Condition
- Long Term Plus Project Condition

All study intersections will be evaluated during the AM and PM peak hours using the TRAFFIX software and the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual methodology. This traffic analysis will permit estimates of average vehicle delays on approaches that experience LOS "F" conditions. For any impact found to be significant, we will determine the traffic contribution from the proposed project.

The exact scenarios will be determined in conjunction with City staff after the close of the comment period of the Notice of Preparation of the EIR. This proposal assumes a maximum of 5 scenarios (see attached). Additionally, the analysis will include Menlo Gateway-related project trips and suggested mitigation measures as detailed in the EIR and the mitigation measures suggested in the Facebook EIR.

### **Project Alternatives**

DKS will quantitatively analyze up to two project alternatives. The assessment will include a comparison of trip generation potential and a narrative regarding the potential for differences in project-generated near term and long term impacts.

### **Arterial and Collector Streets Assessment**

DKS will estimate the daily traffic on nearby minor arterials and collector streets and estimate whether the proposed project will result in a significant impact under the City's significance criteria. There are 11 roadway segments assumed to be included in the daily traffic analysis (as listed above).

For any study intersections or roadway segments not in Menlo Park, DKS will apply the local agency's adopted analysis methods and significance criteria.

### **Site Plan and Parking Evaluation**

September 6, 2012

To the extent that the site plan has been developed, DKS will review the site plans for the project site, and access locations with respect to on-site traffic circulation, proposed site access and operational safety conditions. Particular attention will be given to the spacing of traffic signals and access intersections, parking structure layout, on-site queuing along drive aisles and at parking access locations, and queuing at the main project access points from Bayfront Expressway and Marsh Road.

We will also review the proposed parking supply in light of the anticipated demand, and compare these figures to the requirements of the City of Menlo Park Parking Code. Feasible traffic and parking modifications will be evaluated and suggested in the study report.

### **Circulation Element Conformance**

DKS will review the proposed project with respect to the existing General Plan Circulation Element polices.

### **Pedestrian Conditions, Bicycle Access and Transit Impacts Analysis**

DKS will review the proposed project with respect to the potential effects on pedestrian and bicyclist facilities. This includes sidewalks, bicycle lanes, and amenities to promote the safe use of alternate modes of transportation, and connections to the existing bicycle and pedestrian network and Bay Trail. The analysis will consider the project's proposed elements with respect to the City's Bicycle Plan and Sidewalk Master Plan.

DKS will estimate the potential number of additional transit riders that may be generated by the proposed project, and qualitatively assess whether they would constitute an impact on transit load factors.

### **San Mateo County CMP Analysis**

The proposed project will be subject to review by the San Mateo County Congestion Management Program (CMP) and its requirements. As such, DKS will evaluate the following Routes of Regional Significance as shown in Figure 1:

1. SR 84: US 101 to Willow Road (NB)
2. SR 84: Willow Road to University Avenue (NB)
3. SR 84: University Avenue to County Line (SB)
4. SR 109: US 101 to Bayfront Expressway (EB)
5. SR 114: US 101 to Bayfront Expressway (EB)
6. US 101: North of Marsh Road (NB)
7. US 101: Marsh Road to Willow Road (SB)
8. US 101: Willow Road to University Avenue (NB)
9. US 101: South of University Avenue (SB)

The identification of the potential impacts of adding project-generated trips to these routes will be examined. This will include the volume of project-generated traffic added to the

US 101/Willow Avenue and US 101/Marsh Road interchange ramps and adjacent freeway segments. Evaluation of the CMP routes will be based on the most recently approved CMP Traffic Impact Analysis guidelines in the Land Use section of the CMP.

### **Planned Transportation Improvements**

DKS will incorporate any planned transportation improvements as part of the EIR analysis. We will consider the timing and funding for any improvements prior to its inclusion in the analysis.

### **Development of Mitigation Measures**

DKS will discuss specific mitigation measures to address project traffic impacts. We will provide a table comparing analysis results before and after mitigation, and follow the TIA guidelines for mitigation measure preparation. While a TDM program may be recommended as a mitigation measure, a detailed TDM program is not part of the EIR report.

Should significant impacts be identified, DKS will recommend the mitigation measures needed to alleviate such impacts and improve operational conditions. Potential impacts may include those to intersections, roadways, on-site circulation and access, as well as parking, bicyclist, pedestrian and transit operations. The analysis shall first concentrate on short-term strategies that can be implemented by the applicant, and then longer-term joint effort strategies.

Mitigation measures identification and selection process will be coordinated with City staff. As part of this task, DKS will provide conceptual drawings and corresponding construction cost estimates for recommended improvement measures, up to the budget resources available.

#### ***Task 6: Meetings (1)***

This work scope for Phase 1 includes up to one meeting related to this project.

## **BUDGET**

The estimated not-to-exceed budget for the Phase 1 proposed work scope is \$24,992, which includes all data collection, overhead/expenses. A spreadsheet showing the key project personnel, their hourly rates and expected time to be spent on the project is included with this proposal (Exhibit 1). Present workload of all assigned DKS personnel will allow them to complete the planned work within the identified project schedule.

Following review of this work scope by City staff, DKS will make any necessary changes and prepare a revised work scope and budget estimate.

## **Scope of Work – Phase 2**

The following tasks will be conducted in Phase 2 to meet current City of Menlo Park and San Mateo county Congestion Management Program (CMP) requirements and provide focused information on the proposed project.

### ***Task 2: Transportation Impact Analysis***

#### **Background Trip Generation and Distribution**

Background related traffic will be based on planned and approved projects based on the most current list provided by the City of Menlo Park. Several projects on the City's most current list may not be included in the most recent CSA, and may need to be added to the background scenario. DKS will use standard trip generation rates published in the most recent edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) *Trip Generation Manual*. The distribution and assignment of the background trips will be based on the City's TIA Guidelines and CSA documents.

#### **Project Trip Generation and Distribution**

DKS will estimate trip generation rates for the proposed project based standard trip generation rates published in the most recent edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) *Trip Generation Manual*.

The distribution and assignment of the project trips will be based on the assumptions used in the City of Menlo Park's TIA Guidelines and C/CAG travel demand model as well as recently conducted traffic studies, the prevailing travel patterns on the adjacent roadway network, abutting land uses, travel time characteristics and our knowledge of the study area. The C/CAG travel demand model will be used to determine the vehicle trip path choice by running a future year analysis with and without the project increment. The running of the model will be performed by the VTA and DKS will analyze the model outputs to determine the likely vehicle trip path choice.

#### **Study Intersection Traffic Analysis**

The AM and PM peak hour operational Levels of Service (LOS) will be analyzed at the study intersections. The analysis will include the following scenarios:

- Existing Condition
- Near Term Condition
- Near Term Plus Project Condition
- Long Term Condition
- Long Term Plus Project Condition

All study intersections will be evaluated during the AM and PM peak hours using the TRAFFIX software and the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual methodology. This traffic analysis will permit estimates of average vehicle delays on approaches that experience LOS "F" conditions. For any impact found to be significant, we will determine the traffic contribution from the proposed project.

The exact scenarios will be determined in conjunction with City staff after the close of the comment period of the Notice of Preparation of the EIR. This proposal assumes a maximum of 5 scenarios (see attached). Additionally, the analysis will include Menlo

Gateway-related project trips and suggested mitigation measures as detailed in the EIR and the mitigation measures suggested in the Facebook EIR.

### **Project Alternatives**

DKS will quantitatively analyze up to two project alternatives. The assessment will include a comparison of trip generation potential and a narrative regarding the potential for differences in project-generated near term and long term impacts.

### **Arterial and Collector Streets Assessment**

DKS will estimate the daily traffic on nearby minor arterials and collector streets and estimate whether the proposed project will result in a significant impact under the City's significance criteria. There are 12 roadway segments assumed to be included in the daily traffic analysis (as listed above).

For any study intersections or roadway segments not in Menlo Park, DKS will apply the local agency's adopted analysis methods and significance criteria.

### **Site Plan and Parking Evaluation**

To the extent that the site plan has been developed, DKS will review the site plans for the project site, and access locations with respect to on-site traffic circulation, proposed site access and operational safety conditions. Particular attention will be given to the spacing of traffic signals and access intersections, parking structure layout, on-site queuing along drive aisles and at parking access locations, and queuing at the main project access points from Bayfront Expressway and Marsh Road.

We will also review the proposed parking supply in light of the anticipated demand, and compare these figures to the requirements of the City of Menlo Park Parking Code. Feasible traffic and parking modifications will be evaluated and suggested in the study report.

### **Circulation Element Conformance**

DKS will review the proposed project with respect to the existing General Plan Circulation Element polices.

### **Pedestrian Conditions, Bicycle Access and Transit Impacts Analysis**

DKS will review the proposed project with respect to the potential effects on pedestrian and bicyclist facilities. This includes sidewalks, bicycle lanes, and amenities to promote the safe use of alternate modes of transportation, and connections to the existing bicycle and pedestrian network and Bay Trail. The analysis will consider the project's proposed elements with respect to the City's Bicycle Plan and Sidewalk Master Plan.

DKS will estimate the potential number of additional transit riders that may be generated by the proposed project, and qualitatively assess whether they would constitute an impact on transit load factors.

### **San Mateo County CMP Analysis**

The proposed project will be subject to review by the San Mateo County Congestion Management Program (CMP) and its requirements. As such, DKS will evaluate the following Routes of Regional Significance as shown in Figure 1:

1. SR 84: US 101 to Willow Road (NB)

2. SR 84: Willow Road to University Avenue (NB)
3. SR 84: University Avenue to County Line (SB)
4. SR 109: US 101 to Bayfront Expressway (EB)
5. SR 114: US 101 to Bayfront Expressway (EB)
6. US 101: North of Marsh Road (NB)
7. US 101: Marsh Road to Willow Road (SB)
8. US 101: Willow Road to University Avenue (NB)
9. US 101: South of University Avenue (SB)

The identification of the potential impacts of adding project-generated trips to these routes will be examined. This will include the volume of project-generated traffic added to the US 101/Willow Avenue and US 101/Marsh Road interchange ramps and adjacent freeway segments. Evaluation of the CMP routes will be based on the most recently approved CMP Traffic Impact Analysis guidelines in the Land Use section of the CMP.

### **Planned Transportation Improvements**

DKS will incorporate any planned transportation improvements as part of the EIR analysis. We will consider the timing and funding for any improvements prior to its inclusion in the analysis.

### **Development of Mitigation Measures**

DKS will discuss specific mitigation measures to address project traffic impacts. We will provide a table comparing analysis results before and after mitigation, and follow the TIA guidelines for mitigation measure preparation. While a TDM program may be recommended as a mitigation measure, a detailed TDM program is not part of the EIR report.

Should significant impacts be identified, DKS will recommend the mitigation measures needed to alleviate such impacts and improve operational conditions. Potential impacts may include those to intersections, roadways, on-site circulation and access, as well as parking, bicyclist, pedestrian and transit operations. The analysis shall first concentrate on short-term strategies that can be implemented by the applicant, and then longer-term joint-effort strategies.

Mitigation measures identification and selection process will be coordinated with City staff. As part of this task, DKS will provide conceptual drawings and corresponding construction cost estimates for recommended improvement measures, up to the budget resources available.

### ***Task 3: Two (2) Administrative Draft EIR Chapters***

DKS Associates will document all work assumptions, analysis procedures, findings, graphics, impacts and recommendations in an Administrative Draft EIR Chapter for review and comments by City staff and the environmental consultant, Atkins. The Chapter will also include:

- Description of new or planned changes to the street system serving the site, including changes in driveway location and traffic control, if any
- Future Project Condition Volumes (ADTs, AM peak hour, PM peak hour)

September 6, 2012

- Project trip generation rates
- Project trip distribution
- Discussion of impact of project trips on study intersections
- Levels of service discussion and table for each study scenario
- Comparison table of Project Condition and Existing LOS along with average delay and percent increases at intersections
- Impacts of additional traffic volumes on city streets
- Intersection level of service calculation sheets (electronic and hard copy format)

We have assumed a total of two Administrative Drafts of the EIR Transportation Chapter. DKS will respond to one set of consolidated comments on the first Administrative Draft. The text, graphics and analysis will be modified as needed. The second Administrative Draft will then be prepared.

DKS will coordinate with the environmental consultant (Atkins) and provide pdf and WORD versions of the EIR Transportation Chapter to the environmental consultant, as well as intersection and roadway segment traffic data for use in air and noise analysis. Atkins will provide DKS with an outline of the format to be used for the EIR Transportation Chapter.

To support the EIR Transportation Chapter, DKS will provide a technical appendix. The appendix may include more detailed transportation analysis such as level of service calculations, technical memoranda that were developed as part of this proposal, and other supporting materials.

To expedite the review process, and if requested, DKS will provide a separate copy of the EIR Transportation Chapter with its appendix to City staff for their review.

*Deliverable: Electronic Copy of Administrative Draft EIR Transportation Chapter (pdf, WORD)*

#### **Task 4: Draft EIR Transportation Chapter**

DKS will respond to one set of consolidated comments on the second Administrative Draft EIR Transportation Chapter. The text, graphics and analysis will be modified as needed. The Draft EIR Transportation Chapter will then be prepared.

*Deliverable: Electronic Copy of Draft EIR Transportation Chapter (pdf, WORD)*

#### **Task 5: Final EIR - Response to Comments**

DKS will respond in writing to comments received on the Draft EIR Transportation Chapter. We have assumed preparation of comment responses as well as revisions to the responses based on City staff review.

*Deliverable: Electronic Copy of Comments and Responses Memo [and Comments and Responses Matrix if requested] (pdf, WORD)*

#### **Task 6: Meetings (3)**

This work scope includes up to 3 meetings related to this project. This includes two (2) project meetings and one (1) public hearings. Additional meetings beyond these two will be considered additional work.

September 6, 2012

## **BUDGET**

The estimated not-to-exceed budget for this proposed work scope is \$50,488, which includes meetings and overhead/expenses. A spreadsheet showing the key project personnel, their hourly rates and expected time to be spent on the project is included with this proposal. Present workload of all assigned DKS personnel will allow them to complete the planned work within the identified project schedule.

Following review of this work scope by City staff, DKS will make any necessary changes and prepare a revised work scope and budget estimate.

**Exhibit 1**  
**EIR TRANSPORTATION REPORT -151 COMMONWEALTH DRIVE PROJECT**  
**City of Menlo Park, CA**

**Fee Estimate Phase 2**

**Personnel & Hourly Billing Rates**

<b>Work Tasks</b>	<b>DKS Principal William Loudon \$245</b>	<b>Project Manager Paul Stanis \$120</b>	<b>Associate Engineer \$110</b>	<b>Admin/ Graphics \$100</b>	<b>Other Direct Costs</b>	<b>Total Hours</b>	<b>Total Fee</b>	
0 Project Administration	10	4		8	\$50		\$3,780	
2b Transportation Impact Analysis	2	129	12		\$2,350	143	\$19,640	
3 Admin Draft EIR Traffic Chapters (2)	4	80	8	30	\$100	122	\$14,560	
4 Draft EIR Traffic Chapter	4	30	4	4	\$100	42	\$5,520	
5 Response to Comments on DEIR (Final EIR Comment Responses)	2	24	2	2	\$100	30	\$3,890	
6 Meetings (4)	6	12			\$188	18	\$3,098	
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>\$2,888</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>\$50,488</b>	
Other Direct Costs include printing, mileage, deliveries, etc.							<b>Total Budget:</b>	<b>\$50,488</b>