

## REVISED SCOPE OF WORK

---

The following scope of work has been prepared based on our experience with projects with similar natural resource issues, knowledge of the project area and the Sierra Nevada, field review of Lake Van Norden and its dam, and review of the following technical studies and materials:

- ▶ Balance Hydrologics, September 26, 2012, Initial Reconnaissance Site Visit and Implication of Division of Safety of Dams Jurisdiction at Lake Van Norden
- ▶ Balance Hydrologics, February 6, 2015, Van Norden Dam 100-year Flood Attenuation Evaluation
- ▶ Balance Hydrologics, July 15, 2015, Van Norden Dam Hydraulic Evaluation
- ▶ Balance Hydrologics, July 17, 2015, Groundwater monitoring and interpretation of initial conclusions, Lake Van Norden and Van Norden Meadow Assessment Update
- ▶ Balance Hydrologics, February 9, 2016, Measured Groundwater Conditions in Van Norden Meadow during Drawdown of Lake Van Norden in October 2015
- ▶ Balance Hydrologics, August 1, 2016, Impacts of the proposed spillway modification on the 200-year flood and spatial and temporal inundation patterns upstream of Van Norden Dam
- ▶ Dokken Engineering, May 2016, Bridge Design Hydraulic Study Report for the Soda Springs Road Bridge at South Yuba River Project (State Bridge No. 17C-0010) [related report for nearest downstream bridge facility]
- ▶ GEOSUAS, Inc. (Lori Carpenter), August 2016, Onsite Management Plan for Revegetation of Historic Van Norden Reservoir Unconsolidated Bottom Area
- ▶ Lori Carpenter, June 2015 Desktop Waters of the United States & Wetland Delineation for the Van Norden Dam Spillway Modification Project
- ▶ Lori Carpenter, February 22, 2016, Project Information Questionnaire (for County permit application)
- ▶ C.S. Ecological Surveys and Assessments, August 2015, Lake Van Norden Special-status Plant Survey
- ▶ Dudek, February 17, 2014, Biological Resources Assessment for the 721-acre Lake Van Norden Study Area
- ▶ Holdredge & Kull, November 2015, Specifications for Lake Van Norden Spillway Modifications
- ▶ Susan Lindstrom, Ph.D. January 2014, Lake Van Norden/Meadow Work Book: A Conceptual Overview of Human Land Use and Environmental Conditions
- ▶ NCIC, October 19, 2015, Truckee Donner Land Trust, Lake Van Norden Records Search
- ▶ Truckee Donner Land Trust, August 2016, Proposed Van Norden Spillway Modification Project [Project Description]

In addition to the above documentation, we are aware that TDLT is expected to submit the following additional information:

- ▶ Anticipated responses and possible changes to hydrology analysis that address Caltrans and Placer County comments and concerns regarding downstream flooding.
- ▶ Additional monitoring data and mapping of the lake area and South Yuba River channel related to erosion/downcutting and revegetation.
- ▶ Groundwater elevation monitoring that supplements data from Balance Hydrologics Feb 9, 2016 study.
- ▶ Further documentation and background on water rights associated with the Yuba River.

Ascent will also review and use, as appropriate, information generated by the Save Van Norden Lake group, including its report "Opposition Response Report to Nevada County Project Application (U16-003; MGT16-010): Van Norden Dam Spillway Modification by Truckee Donner Land Trust".

While Nevada County has initially indicated that the appropriate level of environmental review for the project is a mitigated negative declaration (MND) or an environmental impact report (EIR), it is not clear at this point in the what level of environmental review will be needed. In order to determine the proper scope of the project-specific analysis and type of environmental document to be prepared, we have proposed the following two-phased approach to the scope of work:

- ▶ **Phase 1:** Review of project materials and technical studies and preparation of an Environmental Checklist to determine the scope of the project-specific analysis and type of environmental document to be prepared.
- ▶ **Phase 2:** Preparation of the environmental document.

## PHASE 1 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS SCOPING

### TASK 1 PROJECT INITIATION, KICK-OFF MEETING, AND SITE VISIT

The Ascent management team (Sydney Coatsworth, project director, and Pat Angell, project manager) will attend a kick-off meeting with the County and TDLT that will address various topics that will assist in the final approval of the contract such as points of contact, communication protocols, project description updates that may require scope/schedule/budget refinement, transfers of data/reports, provision of updated monitoring data and other materials from TDLT, and suitability of available data. Ascent will also complete a site visit in combination with the kick-off meeting to gain familiarity with the project site.

We will also generate template consultation request letters for use by the County to send to California Tribes that have requested notice pursuant to Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52). This scope of work assumes that all AB 52 consultation will be undertaken by the County and that consultant assistance will not be required. We can amend our scope and budget to provide assistance on AB 52 consultation if requested by the County.

## DELIVERABLES/ MEETINGS

Attendance at kick-off meeting at the County offices, project site, or similar location  
Agenda outlining the issues for discussion at kick-off meeting  
Memo documenting the results of the meeting and the specific direction and approach for topics discussed  
Final refinements to scope of work, schedule, and budget for final contract approval (if required)  
Template consultation request letters for AB 52 compliance

## TASK 2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

One of the most important elements for the environmental review process is a complete project description, as it forms the basis of the impact analysis. Ascent will prepare, based on TDLT plans and documents, a detailed project description for review by the County. The Project Description will include exhibits, as necessary, to illustrate project location and proposed project plans for both options (concrete and boulder). Based on County and TDLT comments, Ascent will revise the project description. Preparation of the Environmental Checklist (Task 5) will not commence until we receive approval on the project description from County staff.

## DELIVERABLES

Draft and final project description (electronic files sent via email)

## TASK 3 PEER REVIEW OF TECHNICAL STUDIES

Ascent team will review, objectively evaluate, and report on the TDLT-provided project materials and technical studies listed above. The Ascent team is experienced and highly qualified to review technical studies for quality and completeness, and has technical expertise in biological resources, hydrology and groundwater, water quality, cultural resources, soils, and overall environmental planning. We will review each technical report to for use of appropriate methods, consistency of assumptions with the proposed project, technical adequacy, and sufficiency for use in the identification of impacts and mitigation.

We have conducted a preliminary review of the Management Plan and its technical studies and have identified the following areas that will require additional information and/or further analysis:

- ▶ Hydrologic Studies: Caltrans and Placer County have identified downstream flooding concerns in regards to increased flows. Caltrans noted that a backwater analysis on the impact to downstream bridges and culverts should be conducted. Balance Hydrologics will need to review and address these comments. MBK Engineers will review the Balance Hydrologics reports and subsequent information generated to address the comments. This scope of work assumes that Balance Hydrologics will make required changes to the technical studies identified by MBK Engineers.
- ▶ Erosion: The Balance Hydrologics Sept 26, 2012 Initial Reconnaissance Site Visit and Implication of Division of Safety of Dams Jurisdiction at Lake Van Norden notes potential erosion and sedimentation impacts from headwater incision and remobilization of sediment from the change of hydrologic conditions. Both dam spillway modification options include scour protection at the dam, and the Management Plan includes monitoring of upstream stream channel conditions. MBK Engineers will review the technical studies and monitoring data, assess their adequacy for evaluating erosion impacts,

and determine the need for mitigation measures/modifications to the design to address any erosion issues.

- ▶ **Groundwater:** Technical materials prepared by Balance Hydrologics appear to provide sufficient information for the evaluation of changes in groundwater conditions from draining the lake and from reduced pool size during the winter months. The Management Plan refers to continued groundwater monitoring that will provide additional data to address changes in surface/groundwater interactions (e.g., remainder of 2016 and 2017). MBK Engineers will review this information, assess its adequacy, and identify any additional information needed to support the EIR analysis.
- ▶ **Biological Resources:** The 2014 Dudek biological analysis, 2015 C.S. Ecological Surveys and Assessments report, and the Management Plan appear to provide sufficient information for the evaluation of potential biological resources impacts from hydrologic modifications. However, the conclusions of the 2014 Dudek report do not correspond to the currently proposed project. It is anticipated that monitoring data on the natural revegetation of the lake bottom since draining of the lake by TDLT, as identified in the Management Plan, will be useful in the EIR analysis. This material will confirm the effectiveness of the Management Plan to create the habitat conditions proposed.
- ▶ **Cultural Resources:** Based on our recent field review of the lake, potential cultural resource sites may now be exposed as a result of draining the lake (though not in the area of the dam). We recommend that TDLT identify these resources and determine whether further documentation and/or protection is required. Natural Investigations will peer review the TDLT cultural resource reports noted above.

The Ascent team will prepare draft technical memoranda documenting the results of the peer review, summarizing our assessment of the analyses, and identifying any additional information needed to prepare the environmental document. We expect that any substantive and technical issues on the studies will be corrected by TDLT. Upon receiving comments on the peer reviews, we will revise and finalize the technical memoranda for use by the County.

**DELIVERABLES/  
MEETINGS**

Draft and final technical memorandums on peer review opinion (electronic files sent via email)

## **TASK 4 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT DETERMINATION**

This task will include preparation of the Environmental Checklist for the project that will be used as substantial evidence supporting the preparation of the appropriate environmental document. Specifically, this Environmental Checklist will be used to determine whether the project could result in significant environmental impacts and whether these impacts can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. The result of this checklist will inform the County and the TDLT on whether an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) or Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) should be prepared.

### **Introduction**

An introduction to the checklist review will be prepared that describes a summary of the project, organization of the checklist review, other documents used in preparation of the review, and identification of responsible and trustee agencies (if necessary).

## Project Description

The project description prepared under Task 2 will be used in the Environmental Checklist.

## Analysis of Project

The environmental analysis will include an Environmental Checklist to organize the discussion. The checklist will include the full range of environmental topics, determine if any potentially significant environmental impacts would occur, and whether there are mitigation measures available to reduce identified significant environmental impacts to less-than-significant levels. The Environmental Checklist will project technical studies as appropriate to address project impacts.

Based on initial review, there is sufficient information is available to eliminate the following environmental issues from detailed analysis:

- ▶ Agricultural and Forestry Resources
- ▶ Energy
- ▶ Geologic Stability and Seismic Hazards
- ▶ Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- ▶ Mineral Resources
- ▶ Population and Housing
- ▶ Public Services and Utilities
- ▶ Operational Transportation Impacts

The following environmental issue areas will be evaluated.

### Land Use

The general consistency of the project with Nevada County General Plan, Land Use and Development Code, and natural resource standards will be described. The analysis will focus on whether the project would be inconsistent with policies adopted for the purposes of avoiding or reducing significant environmental impacts, as required by CEQA.

### Terrestrial and Aquatic Biological Resources

The biological resources analysis will focus on direct impacts resulting from modifications to the dam and hydrologic modification of Lake Van Norden and the South Yuba River on species and habitat conditions based on TDLT's technical studies, Management Plan, Ascent's peer review, field review, public comments and input to date, and monitoring results provided by TDLT. The environmental setting will describe common and sensitive vegetation, wildlife, and aquatic resources known or with potential to occur on the project site for both existing conditions and pre-drained lake conditions. Issues that will be addressed include special-status species, sensitive habitats (i.e., wetland, montane meadow, and riparian habitats), and the potential for the spread of noxious weeds. Exhibits will show the location and extent of potential sensitive biological resources in the project area. The analysis will also address whether further conversion of open water habitat to montane meadow habitat and other impacts related to the alteration of hydrology would be significant. The Management Plan identifies that prior to draining, the lake offered 102.9 acres of open water habitat. After draining, habitat would be restored to historic conditions, including

6.1 acres of open water habitat, 42.5 acres of seasonal freshwater habitat (consisting of overbank flooding area and high alpine meadow wetlands), 50.2 acres of high alpine wet meadow willow dominated wetlands, and 3.7 acres of potentially high alpine forested wetlands. The impact analysis will address both the immediate area addressed by the Management Plan as well as upstream in the eastern portion of the existing meadow of Lake Van Norden. The effectiveness of the Management Plan will also be addressed.

### **Cultural Resources and California Tribal Cultural Resources**

The cultural resources section will be based on the technical studies provided by TDLT. The section will identify the presence and significance of prehistoric and historic sites, features, artifacts, and traditional cultural properties within and in the immediate vicinity of the project area. The analysis will also address potential impacts to California tribal cultural resources consistent with the requirements of AB 52. Impacts will be identified and mitigation measures provided, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 and tribal input.

### **Transportation and Traffic**

Project traffic impacts will be limited to temporary effects during construction (four to six-week construction period). Ascent will prepare the traffic analysis and will coordinate with Nevada County and Placer County staff regarding any requirements for construction traffic controls that need to be identified in the EIR. Level of Service (LOS) analysis of intersections and roadway segments is assumed not to be required. A qualitative evaluation of bicycle, pedestrian (including hikers), and transit facilities will be provided. Exhibits will be included to display the existing roadway system and bicycle/pedestrian/transit facilities.

### **Air Quality**

The air quality analysis will be focused on construction activities for the project and will include coordination with the Northern Sierra AQMD on the assumptions for the modeling of construction air pollutant emissions and impact analysis. The EIR will discuss applicable local, state, and federal air quality regulatory framework. Regional and local air quality, including attainment status for criteria pollutants will be described. The potential exposure of sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminants (TAC) and odor sources (none expected, may be scoped out) from construction activities will be assessed qualitatively. Increases in criteria air pollutants, precursors, and exposure to TACs during construction of the proposed project will be identified.

### **Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions and Climate Change**

The GHG analysis will quantify GHG emissions from construction activities and will qualitatively evaluate changes in carbon sequestration associated with habitat changes. The analysis will include a brief discussion on the current state of the science (e.g., Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [IPCC] Fourth Assessment Report) along with applicable regulatory framework and relevant guidance (e.g., Assembly Bill [AB] 32, Senate Bill [SB] 32, and draft Air Resources Board 2017 Scoping Plan). The analysis will evaluate the project in terms of its consistency with California's GHG reduction goals, recommendations contained in the draft 2017 Scoping Plan, and other recent guidance documents for determining whether project-generated GHG emissions would be a cumulatively considerable contribution to the global impact of climate change. Carbon dioxide will be used as a proxy for all GHGs potentially emitted during construction of the proposed project.

### **Noise**

The noise analysis will be focused on the potential effect of construction activities on sensitive noise receptors and recreational users in the project area. The analysis will describe potential short-term construction-related noise (e.g., use of heavy-duty equipment for construction activities). The degree to which this will affect nearby sensitive land

uses will be documented. The significance of short-term noise impacts will be determined based on comparison to applicable regulations.

### **Hydrology and Water Quality**

This analysis will be prepared by both Ascent and MBK Engineers and will evaluate potential changes in flooding conditions, hydrology, streambed erosion, groundwater and water quality associated with the modification of the dam and its analysis will be coordinated with the biological resources analysis noted above. The analysis will use the hydrologic and groundwater technical studies prepared by Balance Hydrologics and subsequent monitoring data, our peer review, field review, and public input to date. The analysis will include background information and mapping for pre- and post-lake draining watershed and hydrologic conditions such as drainage topography, drainage tributary areas, soils information, flow volumes, water impounded behind the dam, groundwater levels, and related information. A discussion of the site topography, stream channel stability, soil characteristics, and erosion potential will be presented that addresses both the immediate area addressed by the Management Plan as well as upstream in the eastern portion of the existing meadow of Lake Van Norden.

A description of existing water quality conditions will be prepared based on information provided by TDLT and site reconnaissance. The existing conditions description will include an assessment of existing pollutant sources (erosion and sedimentation), surface water quality, and groundwater levels. Water quality impacts from both construction and operation of the project will be evaluated and temporary and permanent best management practices will be described to address associated impacts.

### **Recreation**

The analysis will evaluate the recreational impacts associated with the project. While the project would not result in direct physical impacts on any recreational facility in the Lake Van Norden area and would not affect winter recreation activities in the area (such as cross-country skiing and snow play), the altered condition of the reduced impounded water and habitat conditions may be perceived as affecting hiking, wildlife viewing and other recreational activities. This impact analysis will be closely coordinated with the biological resources and visual impact analyses.

### **Aesthetics/Visual Resources**

The analysis will describe the appearance of the project site from key vantage points, including off-site areas with public access from which the site is visible, including nearby roads and hiking trails, as well as visual conditions of the project area prior to the lake being drained. Photos from representative locations will be included in the analysis to assist in describing existing conditions. The analysis will describe if and/or how implementation of the proposed project would change the view of the site from key viewpoints, as compared to existing conditions. This will include an evaluation of how revegetation and habitat modification would modify the current character of the lake during the spring, summer, and fall months.

We will conduct two visual simulations of the Lake Van Norden with implementation of the dam modification and revegetation with from key viewpoint(s) identified by the County.

#### **DELIVERABLES/ MEETINGS**

Administrative draft of Environmental Checklist (Electronic Submittal – MS Word)

Revised draft of Environmental Checklist (Electronic Submittal – MS Word)



## TASK 5 PHASE 1 PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND MEETINGS

Ascent will manage the preparation of the Environmental Checklist and maintain close communication with County and applicant project team. Ascent will participate in up to two (2) conference calls to discuss the status of the project. It is assumed that the project director will participate in these meetings. The anticipated purpose of the meetings would be to discuss comments on the Environmental Checklist review and to determine the appropriate environmental document. The purpose and scheduling of the meetings may change.

## PHASE 2 ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

The results of Phase 1 will determine whether an MND or EIR or should be prepared. The scope of work for Phase 2 is divided into two options (preparation of an MND or EIR).

### *MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION SCOPE OF WORK OPTION*

#### TASK MND-1 DRAFT MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Ascent will prepare a Draft MND that will based on the results of the Environmental Checklist prepared under Phase 1. The MND will utilize the County's preferred format. The Draft MND will be submitted to the County for review and comment.

**DELIVERABLES/  
MEETINGS**

Draft MND (seven [7] hard copies and an electronic submittal in MS Word and pdf formats)

#### TASK MND-2 SCREENCHECK MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Based on comments from County staff on the Draft MND, Ascent will prepare a screencheck MND for County review. This scope of work assumes that comments will not require analysis of new issues or substantially revised analysis of issues already addressed in the administrative draft.

**DELIVERABLES/  
MEETINGS**

Screencheck MND (Electronic submittal – MS Word)

#### TASK MND-3 PROPOSED MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Based on final comments from County staff on the screencheck MND, Ascent will prepare the proposed MND for the County to release for public and agency review. This scope of work assumes that comments will not require analysis of new issues or substantially revised analysis of issues already addressed in the print check document. Ascent will submit the proposed MND to the State Clearinghouse along with the Notice of Completion (NOC) and the Notice of Intent (NOI) to Adopt the MND.

**DELIVERABLES/  
MEETINGS**

Proposed MND (twenty-five [25] hard copies and an electronic submittal in MS Word and pdf formats; 15 CDs and 15 hard copies of Executive Summary to be delivered by Ascent to OPR)



---

Notice of Completion (NOC) and Notice of Intent (NOI) (electronic submittal in MS Word and pdf formats)

#### TASK MND-4      RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS ON MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Ascent will coordinate with the County, who will assemble public and agency comments received on the MND. The responses are assumed to require only clarification and/or explanation of the conclusions in the MND without the need to revise analysis, elaborate substantially, or add new issues.

While not specifically required pursuant to CEQA, Ascent will prepare draft response to comments in a technical memorandum and will submit it to the County for review. Written responses are recommended as a best practice and to support the project record. Ascent will incorporate changes in response to County staff comments and will prepare final technical memorandum.

---

**DELIVERABLES/  
MEETINGS**

Draft and final response-to-comments technical memorandum (electronic submittal in MS Word and pdf formats)

#### TASK MND-5      MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

A draft and final Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) will be provided. The MMRP will include all mitigation measures in the MND and will identify timing, responsible party, timing, and performance standards.

---

**DELIVERABLES/  
MEETINGS**

MMRP (electronic submittal in MS Word and pdf formats)

#### TASK MND-6      MEETINGS, PUBLIC HEARINGS, PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Ascent's management team will devote effort each month to ensure an efficient and timely process for project execution. This includes close coordination with Ascent's subconsultants, the County, and TDLT (either directly or through the County as directed by County staff) about project issues, as they arise. Ascent will maintain close communication with County staff to ensure the County's objectives are met, the schedule is maintained, and the project is implemented within established budget parameters.

The project principal (Sydney Coatsworth) and/or project manager (Pat Angell) from Ascent will attend meetings with County staff and participate (including comment gathering) in public workshops, meetings, and hearings. An assistant project manager and technical staff may also attend meetings, as appropriate. The list below outlines the meetings that are included within the scope of work and that are not already identified and budgeted for in tasks above. Ascent will attend additional meetings, subject to a budget modification, if requested.

## MEETINGS

One (1) Public Hearing on MND  
Up to two (2) Planning Commission Public Hearings on Project  
One (1) Board of Supervisor's Public Hearing on Project (if appealed)  
Eight (8) Conference Calls

## EIR SCOPE OF WORK OPTION

### TASK EIR-1 NOTICE OF PREPARATION AND SCOPING MEETING

Ascent will prepare draft and final versions of the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the County's review. The NOP will describe the project and the anticipated environmental issue areas to be evaluated in the EIR. While not required, we recommend that the NOP include a request for input on the range of alternatives to be evaluated in the EIR. We will generate draft NOP for County staff review and comment. Upon receiving comments, we will generate the final NOP for County location and will submit the NOP to the State Clearinghouse on behalf of the County.

The Ascent project management team will attend both NOP scoping meetings, one for public agencies (Caltrans suggested a meeting to discuss the hydrology impacts of the project) and one before the Planning Commission). Ascent will assist with preparation of a PowerPoint presentation and comment cards for the scoping meeting and will collect and record comments received during the meeting. Ascent will compile written and oral scoping comments into a scoping summary report that will contain a contact list of residents and stakeholders interested in the project. Ascent will also identify if issues raised in scoping comments (including comments on the NOP) require an amendment to the scope of work and budget.

## DELIVERABLES/ MEETINGS

Electronic version of the draft NOP for County review (electronic files sent via email)  
Twenty-five (25) hard copies of the final NOP for County distribution  
Submittal of the NOP to the State Clearinghouse  
PowerPoint presentation and comment cards for the scoping meetings  
Attendance at up to two (2) scoping meetings (collect and record comments received)  
Scoping summary report (electronic file sent via email)

### TASK EIR-2 ADMINISTRATIVE DRAFT EIR

Ascent will prepare an administrative Draft EIR, in accordance with CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines, for submittal to the County. For those resources that would not be affected by the project, the EIR will provide the rationale as to why no impact would occur based on the analysis provided in the Environmental Checklist, and note that the issue is not discussed further in the EIR. Resource categories anticipated to be scoped out include agricultural and forestry resources, geologic stability and seismicity, hazards and hazardous materials, mineral resources, population and housing, public services and utilities, and operational transportation impacts.

The EIR will adhere to all CEQA requirements and is anticipated to focus on resource categories for which significant impacts could occur. Each environmental resource section will include a description of the environmental setting (i.e., the baseline environmental conditions), regulatory setting (i.e., federal, state, and local regulations), criteria used to

determine the significance of impacts, analysis methodology and assumptions, and detailed discussion of the potential environmental effects of the project. Impact conclusions will be based on substantial evidence and mitigation measures will be recommended for significant or potentially significant impacts. The impact analysis will utilize the results of the Environmental Checklist. References will be provided as necessary to the supporting technical studies, which will be included as appendices to the EIR.

The EIR will adhere to all CEQA requirements and is anticipated to focus on resource categories for which significant impacts could occur. The EIR will include the following chapters:

### **Introduction**

The Introduction will describe the purpose of the EIR and the outline of the EIR contents.

### **Executive Summary**

The Executive Summary will provide an overview of the project, alternatives evaluated, areas of controversy and issues to be resolved, and project impacts and mitigation measures.

### **Project Description**

The Project Description will utilize the project description provided in the Environmental Checklist.

### **Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures**

Each environmental resource section will include a description of the environmental setting (i.e., the baseline environmental conditions), regulatory setting (i.e., federal, state, and local regulations), criteria used to determine the significance of impacts, analysis methodology and assumptions, and detailed discussion of the potential environmental effects of the project. Impact conclusions will be based on substantial evidence and mitigation measures will be recommended for significant or potentially significant impacts. References will be provided as necessary to the supporting technical studies, which will be included as appendices to the EIR.

### **Other Sections Required by Statute**

CEQA provides very specific requirements for the contents of an EIR. Ascent will provide the County with a complete EIR, containing all sections required by CEQA. Sections required by CEQA not mentioned above include table of contents, executive summary, introduction, effects not found to be significant (including some of those described above), references, and a list of individuals and agencies consulted. The EIR will include maps and graphics, as appropriate, to clearly present the environmental analysis to the decision makers, responsible agencies, and the public. The executive summary will include a summary table of all impacts and mitigation measures identified in the EIR.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

Ascent will evaluate the impacts of cumulative development and activities on all of the resource issues evaluated in the EIR. Ascent will work closely with County planning staff to establish the cumulative setting, which involves identification of reasonably foreseeable projects and activities in the region and an accurate list of cumulative projects (proposed, approved, under construction).

### **Alternatives**

CEQA requires that an EIR describe a range of reasonable alternatives to a project (or project location) that feasibly attain most of the objectives, but could avoid or reduce at least one environmental impact (Section 15126.6). Ascent assumes that up to four alternatives, including the No-Project Alternative will be evaluated in the EIR. The three

action alternatives will be determined through consultation with the County and TDLT, the technical memorandum on alternatives, and on the ability of each to reduce environmental impacts. The alternatives will be analyzed at a comparative level of detail, less than that of the proposed project, but sufficient to allow a comparison of impacts

### Growth Inducing Impacts

This section will qualitatively evaluate the project's potential to induce growth and any subsequent environmental impacts that would occur (pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126[d]). Projects generally induce growth by removal of an existing obstacle to growth (e.g., extending infrastructure to new areas).

### Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

This section will clearly and succinctly summarize any significant and unavoidable environmental effects of the proposed project and alternatives as evaluated in the EIR.

#### DELIVERABLES/ MEETINGS

Seven (7) copies of the Administrative Draft EIR (plus one electronic copy) for County review  
Attendance at comment review meeting (by up to two Ascent staff)

## TASK EIR-3 SCREENCHECK AND PUBLIC DRAFT EIR AND NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY

Ascent will revise the administrative Draft EIR and prepare a screencheck Draft EIR in accordance with review comments from the County. The screencheck Draft EIR will be provided in track-changes format so that the County and the TDLT can quickly identify document revisions. It is assumed that only minor comments will need to be addressed following screencheck review

Following approval of the screencheck Draft EIR, the Public Draft EIR will be prepared. Ascent will deliver the Draft EIR to State Clearinghouse along with a Notice of Completion. Ascent will send 25 hard copies and CD copies of the Public Draft EIR to the County for distribution, as well as a web-ready (searchable) pdf file for the County to post to its website.

#### DELIVERABLES/ MEETINGS

Seven (7) copies of the screencheck Draft EIR and Notice of Availability (plus one electronic copy) for County review  
25 copies of the Public Draft EIR and Notice of Availability (plus one electronic copy and 25 CDs) for County distribution  
Public Draft EIR to the State Clearinghouse and Notice of Completion

## TASK EIR-4 RESPONSE TO COMMENTS AND FINAL EIR

The level of effort required to prepare the response to comments on the Draft EIR and the associated Final EIR is directly related to the number and complexity of agency and public comments received on the Draft EIR. It is not possible to predict the number and nature of comments that may be received; however, for the purposes of this scope of work and cost estimate, 124 hours of Ascent staff time has been allocated to preparing responses to comments. This estimate is based on review of the comments received to date on the application (comments from the Save Van Norden Lake group) and anticipation of the extent of comments that will likely be received on the Draft EIR.

Ascent will review and respond to comments received during the Draft EIR comment period and provide responses to the County for review. This task includes Ascent management team attendance at one meeting with the County to review comments received and confirm strategies for preparing responses. Following receipt of County comments on the responses to comments, Ascent will incorporate the responses into an administrative Response to Comments/Final EIR document that will consist of edits and revisions to the Draft EIR, comments on the Draft EIR, and responses to those comments. Ascent will respond to the County's comments on the Response to Comments/Final EIR document and will prepare a screencheck Response to Comments/Final EIR. Upon the County's approval of the screencheck Response to Comments/Final EIR, Ascent will prepare the Public Final EIR. Upon certification of the Final EIR, the document will be amended to include the minutes of the Final EIR certification.

|                                   |   |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| <b>DELIVERABLES/<br/>MEETINGS</b> | <p>Five (5) copies of Administrative Draft Response to Comments/Final EIR (plus one electronic copy) for County review</p> <p>10 copies screencheck Response to Comments/Final EIR (plus one electronic copy) for County review</p> <p>15 copies of the Public Final EIR (plus one electronic copy) to the County for its distribution</p> <p>15 copies of the certified Final EIR that includes the minutes of the Final EIR certification</p> <p>Attendance at one comment review meeting</p> |
|-----------------------------------|---|

## TASK EIR-5 CEQA FINDINGS AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP)

In coordination with County staff, Ascent will prepare CEQA Findings of Fact (Findings) and, if necessary, a Statement of Overriding Considerations for use by the County. The Findings will specify mitigation measures that have been incorporated into the project, and will explain why other measures, if any, have been found to be infeasible. If applicable, the Findings will also identify feasible project alternatives that could reduce adverse environmental effects but are not being implemented, with an explanation as to why they are considered to be infeasible. Ascent will prepare an administrative draft of the Findings and will submit (electronically) to the County for review and comment. Once comments are received, Ascent will incorporate comments and deliver an electronic file of the final Findings to the County.

A draft and final MMRP will be provided. The MMRP will include all mitigation measures in the EIR and will identify timing, responsible party, timing, performance standards, etc.

|                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| <b>DELIVERABLES</b> | <p>One (1) electronic copy of the administrative draft Findings and MMRP</p> <p>15 copies of the final Findings and MMRP and one electronic copy</p> |
|---------------------|--|

## TASK EIR-6 MEETINGS, PUBLIC HEARINGS, PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Ascent's management team will devote effort each month to ensure an efficient and timely process for project execution. This includes close coordination with Ascent's subconsultants, the County, and TDLT (either directly or through the County as directed by County staff) about project issues, as they arise. Ascent will maintain close communication with County staff to ensure the County's objectives are met, the schedule is maintained, and the project is implemented within established budget parameters.

The project principal (Sydney Coatsworth) and/or project manager (Pat Angell) from Ascent will attend meetings with County staff and participate (including comment gathering) in public workshops, meetings, and hearings. An assistant project manager and technical staff may also attend meetings, as appropriate. The list below outlines the meetings that are included within the scope of work and that are not already identified and budgeted for in tasks above. Ascent will attend additional meetings, subject to a budget modification, if requested.

**MEETINGS**

- One (1) Public Hearing on Draft EIR
- Up to two (2) Planning Commission Public Hearings on Final EIR and Project
- One (1) Board of Supervisor's Public Hearing on Final EIR and Project (if appealed)
- 12 Monthly Conference Calls on EIR Preparation

## SCHEDULE

Ascent has an excellent reputation for efficiently managing project budgets and maintaining schedules even under challenging deadlines. The Ascent team will proactively manage the project so that the schedule established at the beginning is maintained to the degree that it is under our control. We offer the following proposed schedule based on our understanding of the scope and complexity of the project. We would be happy to discuss how we can best modify this schedule to meet the County's needs.

Two schedules are provided to match each environmental document option. These schedules assume that TDLT studies are sufficient for use, or that revisions can be made in such a manner that they do not affect our ability to meet the schedule below.

### MND OPTION SCHEDULE

| WORK PRODUCT/MILESTONE   | DURATION (WEEKS) |
|--|------------------|
| <b>Phase 1 Environmental Analysis Scoping</b>  |                  |
| <b>Task 1 – Project Initiation, Kick-Off Meeting and Site Visit</b>  |                  |
| Receive notice to proceed, conduct project kick-off meeting, and receive all project description materials and technical studies | n/a              |
| <b>Task 2 – Project Description</b>  |                  |
| Ascent submits draft EIR project description to County   | 1                |
| County provides comments on draft EIR project description to Ascent  | 1                |
| Ascent submits final EIR project description to County   | 0.5              |
| <b>Task 3 – Peer Review of Technical Studies</b>   |                  |
| Ascent submits of draft technical memoranda on peer reviews to County  | 4                |
| County provides comments on technical memoranda to Ascent  | 2                |
| Ascent submits of final version technical memoranda on peer reviews to County  | 1                |
| <b>Task 4 – Environmental Checklist and Environmental Document Determination</b>   |                  |
| Ascent submits administrative draft of Environmental Checklist to County   | 6                |
| County provides comments on administrative draft of Environmental Checklist to Ascent  | 2                |
| Ascent submits revised draft of Environmental Checklist to County  | 1                |
| <b>Task 5 – Phase 1 Project Management and Meetings</b>  |                  |
| Coordination and conference calls with County on environmental document determination  | 1                |



| Phase 2 Environmental Documentation                                       |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Task MND-1 – Draft MND</b>   |   |
| Ascent submits Draft MND to County  | 2   |
| County provides comments on Draft MND to Ascent                           | 2   |
| <b>Task MND-2 – Screencheck MND</b>                                       |   |
| Ascent submits Screencheck MND to County                                  | 1   |
| County provides comments on Screencheck MND to Ascent                     | 1   |
| <b>Task MND-3 – Public MND</b>  |   |
| Public released of MND  | 1   |
| End of 30-day public review period  | 5   |
| <b>Task MND-4 – Response to Comments on MND</b>                           |   |
| Ascent submits Administrative Technical Memorandum to County              | 1   |
| County provides comments on Administrative Technical Memorandum to Ascent | 1   |
| Ascent submits Final Technical Memorandum to County                       | 1   |
| <b>Task MND-5 – MMRP</b>  |   |
| Submittal of MMRP   | Submitted at same time as technical memorandum under Task MND-4 |
| <b>Task MND-6 – Meetings, Public Hearing, Project Management</b>          |   |
| Attendance at meetings, conference call, and other related actions        | As scheduled  |
| <b>TOTAL*</b>   | <b>30.5 weeks</b>   |

\*The work effort and schedule for Task 3 and 4 would overlap each other.

## EIR OPTION SCHEDULE

| WORK PRODUCT/MILESTONE   | DURATION (WEEKS) |
|--|------------------|
| <b>Phase 1 Environmental Analysis Scoping</b>  |                  |
| <b>Task 1 – Project Initiation, Kick-Off Meeting and Site Visit</b>  |                  |
| Receive notice to proceed, conduct project kick-off meeting, and receive all project description materials and technical studies | n/a              |
| <b>Task 2 – Project Description</b>  |                  |
| Ascent submits draft EIR project description to County   | 1                |
| County provides comments on draft EIR project description to Ascent  | 1                |
| Ascent submits final EIR project description to County   | 0.5              |
| <b>Task 3 – Peer Review of Technical Studies</b>   |                  |
| Ascent submits of draft technical memoranda on peer reviews to County  | 4                |
| County provides comments on technical memoranda to Ascent  | 2                |
| Ascent submits of final version technical memoranda on peer reviews to County  | 1                |
| <b>Task 4 – Environmental Checklist and Environmental Document Determination</b>   |                  |
| Ascent submits administrative draft of Environmental Checklist to County   | 6                |
| County provides comments on administrative draft of Environmental Checklist to Ascent  | 2                |
| Ascent submits revised draft of Environmental Checklist to County  | 1                |
| <b>Task 5 – Phase 1 Project Management and Meetings</b>  |                  |
| Coordination and conference calls with County on environmental document determination  | 1                |
| <b>Phase 2 Environmental Documentation</b>   |                  |
| <b>Task EIR-1 – NOP and Scoping Meeting</b>  |                  |
| Ascent submits draft NOP to County   | 1                |
| County provides comments on draft NOP to Ascent  | 2                |
| Public release of the NOP  | 1                |
| NOP scoping meetings   | As scheduled     |
| NOP comment period ends and County provides complete set of NOP comments to Ascent   | 5                |

| <b>Task EIR-2 – Administrative Draft EIR</b>                       |                                   |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Ascent submits administrative Draft EIR to County                  | 6                                 |
| <b>Task EIR-3 – Screencheck and Public Draft EIR and NOA</b>       |                                   |
| County provides comments on administrative Draft EIR to Ascent     | 4                                 |
| Ascent submits screencheck Draft EIR and NOA to County             | 2                                 |
| County provides screencheck Draft EIR comments to Ascent           | 2                                 |
| Public Draft EIR Release   | 1                                 |
| End of 45 Day Review Period  | 7                                 |
| <b>Task EIR-4 – Response to Comments and Final EIR</b>             |                                   |
| Ascent submits administrative Final EIR to County                  | 3                                 |
| County provides comments on administrative Final EIR to Ascent     | 2                                 |
| Ascent submits screencheck Final EIR to County                     | 1                                 |
| County provides screencheck Final EIR comments to Ascent           | 1                                 |
| Ascent submits Public Final EIR to County                          | 1                                 |
| Ascent submits certified Final EIR to County                       | 1 week after certification action |
| <b>Task EIR-5 – CEQA Findings and MMRP</b>                         |                                   |
| Ascent submits draft Findings and MMRP to County                   | 2                                 |
| County provides comments on draft Findings and MMRP to Ascent      | 2                                 |
| Ascent submits final version of Findings and MMRP to County        | 1                                 |
| <b>Task EIR-6 – Meetings, Public Hearing, Project Management</b>   |                                   |
| Attendance at meetings, conference call, and other related actions | As scheduled                      |
| <b>Total*</b>  | <b>54.5 weeks</b>                 |

\*The work effort and schedule for Tasks 3, 4, EIR-1, EIR-2, EIR-4 and EIR-5 would overlap.

COST ESTIMATE

---

COST ESTIMATE

LAKE VAN NORDEN SPILLWAY PROJECT MND OPTION  
NEVADA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA



| LABOR COSTS  | Principal        | Project Director | Sr. Wildlife Bio/Hydro | Wildlife Biologist | Senior Air/GHG/Noise | Air/GHG/Noise    | Analyst / Planner II | Analyst / Planner I | GIS/ Graphics   | Word Processing/ Administrative | Total Hours | Total Dollars     |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------------|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|-------------|-------------------|
| RATE/HOUR  | \$240            | \$210            | \$160                  | \$125              | \$160                | \$125            | \$130                | \$120               | \$115           | \$95                            |             |                   |
| <b>PHASE 1 TASK 1: Project Initiation</b>  |                  |                  |                        |                    |                      |                  |                      |                     |                 |                                 |             |                   |
| Kick-off meeting   | 4                | 4                |                        |                    |                      |                  |                      |                     |                 |                                 | 8           | \$ 1,800          |
| Site visit   | 8                | 8                |                        |                    |                      |                  |                      |                     |                 |                                 | 16          | \$ 3,600          |
| <b>Subtotal, Task 1</b>  | <b>12</b>        | <b>12</b>        | <b>0</b>               | <b>0</b>           | <b>0</b>             | <b>0</b>         | <b>0</b>             | <b>0</b>            | <b>0</b>        | <b>0</b>                        | <b>24</b>   | <b>\$ 5,400</b>   |
| <b>PHASE 1 TASK 2: Project Description</b>                                       |                  |                  |                        |                    |                      |                  |                      |                     |                 |                                 |             |                   |
| Draft Project Description  | 2                | 4                |                        |                    |                      |                  | 24                   |                     | 4               | 4                               | 38          | \$ 5,280          |
| Final Project Description  |                  | 2                |                        |                    |                      |                  | 8                    |                     |                 | 2                               | 12          | \$ 1,650          |
| <b>Subtotal, Task 2</b>  | <b>2</b>         | <b>6</b>         | <b>0</b>               | <b>0</b>           | <b>0</b>             | <b>0</b>         | <b>32</b>            | <b>0</b>            | <b>4</b>        | <b>6</b>                        | <b>50</b>   | <b>\$ 6,930</b>   |
| <b>PHASE 1 TASK 3: Peer Review of Technical Studies</b>                          |                  |                  |                        |                    |                      |                  |                      |                     |                 |                                 |             |                   |
| Draft Technical Memorandums  | 4                | 8                | 8                      | 40                 |                      |                  |                      |                     |                 |                                 | 60          | \$ 8,920          |
| Final Technical Memorandums  |                  | 4                |                        | 4                  |                      |                  |                      |                     |                 |                                 | 8           | \$ 1,340          |
| <b>Subtotal, Task 3</b>  | <b>4</b>         | <b>12</b>        | <b>8</b>               | <b>44</b>          | <b>0</b>             | <b>0</b>         | <b>0</b>             | <b>0</b>            | <b>0</b>        | <b>0</b>                        | <b>68</b>   | <b>\$ 10,260</b>  |
| <b>PHASE 1 TASK 4: Environmental Checklist</b>                                   |                  |                  |                        |                    |                      |                  |                      |                     |                 |                                 |             |                   |
| Introduction   |                  |                  |                        |                    |                      |                  |                      | 2                   |                 |                                 | 2           | \$ 240            |
| Environmental Analysis   |                  |                  |                        |                    |                      |                  |                      |                     |                 |                                 |             | \$ -              |
| Land Use Compatibility   |                  | 2                |                        |                    |                      |                  | 12                   |                     | 2               |                                 | 16          | \$ 2,210          |
| Population, Employment, and Housing  |                  | 0                |                        |                    |                      |                  |                      | 1                   |                 |                                 | 1           | \$ 120            |
| Hydrology and Water Quality  | 2                | 4                | 8                      |                    |                      |                  | 30                   |                     | 2               |                                 | 46          | \$ 6,730          |
| Biological Resources   | 2                | 2                | 6                      | 40                 |                      |                  |                      |                     | 10              |                                 | 60          | \$ 8,010          |
| Cultural Resources   |                  | 1                |                        |                    |                      |                  | 12                   |                     |                 |                                 | 13          | \$ 1,770          |
| Aesthetics and Visual Resources  | 4                | 4                |                        |                    |                      |                  | 30                   |                     | 10              |                                 | 48          | \$ 6,850          |
| Transportation and Circulation   |                  | 2                |                        |                    |                      | 12               |                      |                     |                 |                                 | 14          | \$ 1,920          |
| Air Quality  |                  | 1                |                        |                    | 4                    | 32               |                      |                     |                 |                                 | 37          | \$ 4,850          |
| Climate Change   | 2                | 2                |                        |                    | 6                    | 32               |                      |                     |                 |                                 | 42          | \$ 5,860          |
| Noise  |                  | 1                |                        |                    | 4                    | 24               |                      |                     |                 |                                 | 29          | \$ 3,850          |
| Geology and Soils  |                  | 1                |                        |                    |                      |                  |                      |                     |                 | 8                               | 9           | \$ 1,170          |
| Hazards and Hazardous Materials  |                  |                  |                        |                    |                      |                  |                      |                     | 1               |                                 | 1           | \$ 120            |
| Public Services  |                  |                  |                        |                    |                      |                  |                      |                     | 1               |                                 | 1           | \$ 120            |
| Utilities  |                  |                  |                        |                    |                      |                  |                      |                     | 1               |                                 | 1           | \$ 120            |
| QA/QC and Production   | 16               | 12               |                        |                    |                      |                  |                      |                     |                 | 32                              | 90          | \$ 13,000         |
| <b>Subtotal, Task 4</b>  | <b>26</b>        | <b>32</b>        | <b>14</b>              | <b>40</b>          | <b>14</b>            | <b>100</b>       | <b>84</b>            | <b>44</b>           | <b>24</b>       | <b>32</b>                       | <b>410</b>  | <b>\$ 56,940</b>  |
| <b>PHASE 1 TASK 5: Project Management and Meetings</b>                           |                  |                  |                        |                    |                      |                  |                      |                     |                 |                                 |             |                   |
| Review of Env Checklist and Document Determination                               | 4                | 4                |                        | 2                  |                      |                  |                      |                     |                 |                                 | 10          | \$ 2,050          |
| <b>Subtotal, Task 5</b>  | <b>4</b>         | <b>4</b>         | <b>0</b>               | <b>2</b>           | <b>0</b>             | <b>0</b>         | <b>0</b>             | <b>0</b>            | <b>0</b>        | <b>0</b>                        | <b>10</b>   | <b>\$ 2,050</b>   |
| <b>PHASE 2 TASK MND-1: Draft MND</b>   |                  |                  |                        |                    |                      |                  |                      |                     |                 |                                 |             |                   |
| Draft MND  | 2                | 8                |                        | 4                  |                      | 4                | 24                   | 4                   | 8               | 24                              | 78          | \$ 9,960          |
| <b>Subtotal, Task MND-1</b>  | <b>2</b>         | <b>8</b>         | <b>0</b>               | <b>4</b>           | <b>0</b>             | <b>4</b>         | <b>24</b>            | <b>4</b>            | <b>8</b>        | <b>24</b>                       | <b>78</b>   | <b>\$ 9,960</b>   |
| <b>PHASE 2 TASK MND-2: Screencheck MND</b>                                       |                  |                  |                        |                    |                      |                  |                      |                     |                 |                                 |             |                   |
| Screencheck MND  |                  | 4                |                        | 2                  |                      | 2                | 12                   | 2                   | 2               | 4                               | 28          | \$ 3,750          |
| <b>Subtotal, Task MND-2</b>  | <b>0</b>         | <b>4</b>         | <b>0</b>               | <b>2</b>           | <b>0</b>             | <b>2</b>         | <b>12</b>            | <b>2</b>            | <b>2</b>        | <b>4</b>                        | <b>28</b>   | <b>\$ 3,750</b>   |
| <b>PHASE 2 TASK MND-3: Proposed MND</b>  |                  |                  |                        |                    |                      |                  |                      |                     |                 |                                 |             |                   |
| Proposed MND   |                  | 2                |                        |                    |                      |                  | 4                    |                     |                 | 8                               | 14          | \$ 1,700          |
| <b>Subtotal, Task MND-3</b>  | <b>0</b>         | <b>2</b>         | <b>0</b>               | <b>0</b>           | <b>0</b>             | <b>0</b>         | <b>4</b>             | <b>0</b>            | <b>0</b>        | <b>8</b>                        | <b>14</b>   | <b>\$ 1,700</b>   |
| <b>PHASE 2 TASK MND-4: Response to Comment on Mitigated Negative Declaration</b> |                  |                  |                        |                    |                      |                  |                      |                     |                 |                                 |             |                   |
| Technical Memorandum   | 2                | 2                |                        | 6                  |                      | 2                | 8                    |                     |                 | 2                               | 22          | \$ 3,130          |
| <b>Subtotal, Task MND-4</b>  | <b>2</b>         | <b>2</b>         | <b>0</b>               | <b>6</b>           | <b>0</b>             | <b>2</b>         | <b>8</b>             | <b>0</b>            | <b>0</b>        | <b>2</b>                        | <b>22</b>   | <b>\$ 3,130</b>   |
| <b>PHASE 2 TASK MND-5: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program</b>           |                  |                  |                        |                    |                      |                  |                      |                     |                 |                                 |             |                   |
| Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program                                      |                  | 1                |                        |                    |                      |                  | 2                    |                     |                 | 1                               | 4           | \$ 565            |
| <b>Subtotal, Task MND-5</b>  | <b>0</b>         | <b>1</b>         | <b>0</b>               | <b>0</b>           | <b>0</b>             | <b>0</b>         | <b>2</b>             | <b>0</b>            | <b>0</b>        | <b>1</b>                        | <b>4</b>    | <b>\$ 565</b>     |
| <b>PHASE 2 TASK MND-6: Public Meetings / Hearings and Management</b>             |                  |                  |                        |                    |                      |                  |                      |                     |                 |                                 |             |                   |
| Public Meetings / Hearings and Management  | 7                | 16               |                        |                    |                      |                  | 4                    |                     |                 |                                 | 27          | \$ 5,560          |
| <b>Subtotal, Task MND-6</b>  | <b>7</b>         | <b>16</b>        | <b>0</b>               | <b>0</b>           | <b>0</b>             | <b>0</b>         | <b>4</b>             | <b>0</b>            | <b>0</b>        | <b>0</b>                        | <b>27</b>   | <b>\$ 5,560</b>   |
| <b>TOTAL LABOR HOURS</b>   | <b>59</b>        | <b>99</b>        | <b>22</b>              | <b>98</b>          | <b>14</b>            | <b>108</b>       | <b>170</b>           | <b>50</b>           | <b>38</b>       | <b>77</b>                       | <b>735</b>  |                   |
| <b>TOTAL LABOR DOLLARS</b>   | <b>\$ 14,160</b> | <b>\$ 20,790</b> | <b>\$ 3,520</b>        | <b>\$ 12,250</b>   | <b>\$ 2,240</b>      | <b>\$ 13,500</b> | <b>\$ 22,100</b>     | <b>\$ 6,000</b>     | <b>\$ 4,370</b> | <b>\$ 7,315</b>                 |             | <b>\$ 106,245</b> |

| DIRECT COSTS   | Total Dollars    |
|--|------------------|
| <b>1. Subconsultants</b>   |                  |
| MBK (Hydrology)  | \$ 30,360        |
| Natural Resources (Cultural)   | \$ 4,615         |
| Square One Productions (Visual Simulations)                            | \$ 10,325        |
| Administrative Cost (5%)   | \$ 2,265         |
| <b>Subtotal, Subconsultants</b>  | <b>\$ 47,565</b> |
| 2. Printing  | \$ 1,500         |
| 3. Other Reproduction (e.g., CDs or jump drives, general photocopying) | \$ 125           |
| 4. Mileage/Parking/Travel  | \$ 200           |
| 5. Maps/Supplies/Photos/Miscellaneous                                  | \$ 300           |
| 6. Postage/Delivery  | \$ 150           |
| <b>TOTAL DIRECT COSTS</b>  | <b>\$ 49,840</b> |

**TOTAL ESTIMATED COST: \$ 156,085**

COST ESTIMATE

LAKE VAN NORDEN SPILLWAY PROJECT EIR OPTION  
NEVADA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA



| LABOR COSTS  | Principal        | Project Director | Sr. Wildlife Bio/Hydro | Wildlife Biologist | Senior Air/GHG/Noise | Air/GHG/Noise    | Analyst / Planner II | Analyst / Planner I | GIS/ Graphics   | Word Processing/ Administrative | Total Hours | Total Dollars     |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------------|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|-------------|-------------------|
| RATE/HOUR  | \$240            | \$210            | \$160                  | \$125              | \$160                | \$125            | \$130                | \$120               | \$115           | \$95                            |             |                   |
| <b>PHASE 1 TASK 1: Project Initiation</b>                            |                  |                  |                        |                    |                      |                  |                      |                     |                 |                                 |             |                   |
| Kick-off meeting   | 4                | 4                |                        |                    |                      |                  |                      |                     |                 |                                 | 8           | \$ 1,800          |
| Site visit   | 8                | 8                |                        |                    |                      |                  | 8                    |                     |                 |                                 | 24          | \$ 4,640          |
| <b>Subtotal, Task 1</b>  | <b>12</b>        | <b>12</b>        | <b>0</b>               | <b>0</b>           | <b>0</b>             | <b>0</b>         | <b>8</b>             | <b>0</b>            | <b>0</b>        | <b>0</b>                        | <b>32</b>   | <b>\$ 6,440</b>   |
| <b>PHASE 1 TASK 2: Project Description</b>                           |                  |                  |                        |                    |                      |                  |                      |                     |                 |                                 |             |                   |
| Draft Project Description  | 2                | 4                |                        |                    |                      |                  | 24                   |                     | 4               | 4                               | 38          | \$ 5,280          |
| Final Project Description  |                  | 2                |                        |                    |                      |                  | 8                    |                     |                 | 2                               | 12          | \$ 1,650          |
| <b>Subtotal, Task 2</b>  | <b>2</b>         | <b>6</b>         | <b>0</b>               | <b>0</b>           | <b>0</b>             | <b>0</b>         | <b>32</b>            | <b>0</b>            | <b>4</b>        | <b>6</b>                        | <b>50</b>   | <b>\$ 6,930</b>   |
| <b>PHASE 1 TASK 3: Peer Review of Technical Studies</b>              |                  |                  |                        |                    |                      |                  |                      |                     |                 |                                 |             |                   |
| Draft Technical Memorandums  | 4                | 8                | 8                      | 40                 |                      |                  |                      |                     |                 |                                 | 60          | \$ 8,920          |
| Final Technical Memorandums  |                  | 4                |                        | 4                  |                      |                  |                      |                     |                 |                                 | 8           | \$ 1,340          |
| <b>Subtotal, Task 3</b>  | <b>4</b>         | <b>12</b>        | <b>8</b>               | <b>44</b>          | <b>0</b>             | <b>0</b>         | <b>0</b>             | <b>0</b>            | <b>0</b>        | <b>0</b>                        | <b>68</b>   | <b>\$ 10,260</b>  |
| <b>PHASE 1 TASK 4: Environmental Checklist</b>                       |                  |                  |                        |                    |                      |                  |                      |                     |                 |                                 |             |                   |
| Introduction   |                  |                  |                        |                    |                      |                  |                      | 2                   |                 |                                 | 2           | \$ 240            |
| Environmental Analysis   |                  |                  |                        |                    |                      |                  |                      |                     |                 |                                 |             | \$ -              |
| Land Use Compatibility   |                  | 2                |                        |                    |                      |                  | 12                   |                     | 2               |                                 | 16          | \$ 2,210          |
| Population, Employment, and Housing                                  |                  | 0                |                        |                    |                      |                  |                      | 1                   |                 |                                 | 1           | \$ 120            |
| Hydrology and Water Quality  | 2                | 4                | 8                      |                    |                      |                  | 30                   |                     | 2               |                                 | 46          | \$ 6,730          |
| Biological Resources   | 2                | 2                | 6                      | 40                 |                      |                  |                      |                     | 10              |                                 | 60          | \$ 8,010          |
| Cultural Resources   |                  | 1                |                        |                    |                      |                  | 12                   |                     |                 |                                 | 13          | \$ 1,770          |
| Aesthetics and Visual Resources                                      | 4                | 4                |                        |                    |                      |                  | 30                   |                     | 10              |                                 | 48          | \$ 6,850          |
| Transportation and Circulation                                       |                  | 2                |                        |                    |                      |                  |                      |                     |                 |                                 | 14          | \$ 1,920          |
| Air Quality  |                  | 1                |                        |                    | 4                    | 32               |                      |                     |                 |                                 | 37          | \$ 4,850          |
| Climate Change   | 2                | 2                |                        |                    | 6                    | 32               |                      |                     |                 |                                 | 42          | \$ 5,860          |
| Noise  |                  | 1                |                        |                    | 4                    | 24               |                      |                     |                 |                                 | 29          | \$ 3,850          |
| Geology and Soils  |                  | 1                |                        |                    |                      |                  |                      |                     |                 | 8                               | 9           | \$ 1,170          |
| Hazards and Hazardous Materials                                      |                  |                  |                        |                    |                      |                  |                      |                     | 1               |                                 | 1           | \$ 120            |
| Public Services  |                  |                  |                        |                    |                      |                  |                      |                     | 1               |                                 | 1           | \$ 120            |
| Utilities  |                  |                  |                        |                    |                      |                  |                      |                     | 1               |                                 | 1           | \$ 120            |
| QA/QC and Production   | 8                | 20               |                        |                    |                      |                  |                      |                     |                 | 32                              | 90          | \$ 12,760         |
| <b>Subtotal, Task 4</b>  | <b>18</b>        | <b>40</b>        | <b>14</b>              | <b>40</b>          | <b>14</b>            | <b>100</b>       | <b>84</b>            | <b>44</b>           | <b>24</b>       | <b>32</b>                       | <b>410</b>  | <b>\$ 56,700</b>  |
| <b>PHASE 1 TASK 5: Project Management and Meetings</b>               |                  |                  |                        |                    |                      |                  |                      |                     |                 |                                 |             |                   |
| Review of Env Checklist and Document Determination                   | 4                | 4                |                        | 2                  |                      |                  |                      |                     |                 |                                 | 10          | \$ 2,050          |
| <b>Subtotal, Task 5</b>  | <b>4</b>         | <b>4</b>         | <b>0</b>               | <b>2</b>           | <b>0</b>             | <b>0</b>         | <b>0</b>             | <b>0</b>            | <b>0</b>        | <b>0</b>                        | <b>10</b>   | <b>\$ 2,050</b>   |
| <b>PHASE 2 TASK EIR-1: NOP and Scoping Meetings</b>                  |                  |                  |                        |                    |                      |                  |                      |                     |                 |                                 |             |                   |
| NOP and Scoping Meetings   | 4                | 12               |                        |                    |                      |                  | 44                   |                     | 2               | 8                               | 70          | \$ 10,190         |
| <b>Subtotal, Task EIR-1</b>  | <b>4</b>         | <b>12</b>        | <b>0</b>               | <b>0</b>           | <b>0</b>             | <b>0</b>         | <b>44</b>            | <b>0</b>            | <b>2</b>        | <b>8</b>                        | <b>70</b>   | <b>\$ 10,190</b>  |
| <b>PHASE 2 TASK EIR-2: Administrative Draft EIR</b>                  |                  |                  |                        |                    |                      |                  |                      |                     |                 |                                 |             |                   |
| ADEIR  | 16               | 16               | 2                      | 20                 | 4                    | 12               | 58                   | 22                  | 10              | 24                              | 184         | \$ 25,770         |
| <b>Subtotal, Task EIR-2</b>  | <b>16</b>        | <b>16</b>        | <b>2</b>               | <b>20</b>          | <b>4</b>             | <b>12</b>        | <b>58</b>            | <b>22</b>           | <b>10</b>       | <b>24</b>                       | <b>184</b>  | <b>\$ 25,770</b>  |
| <b>PHASE 2 TASK EIR-3: Screencheck/Public Draft EIR and NOA</b>      |                  |                  |                        |                    |                      |                  |                      |                     |                 |                                 |             |                   |
| Screencheck Draft EIR, Draft EIR, and NOA                            | 8                | 20               | 2                      | 10                 |                      | 24               | 90                   | 20                  | 10              | 25                              | 209         | \$ 28,315         |
| <b>Subtotal, Task EIR-3</b>  | <b>8</b>         | <b>20</b>        | <b>2</b>               | <b>10</b>          | <b>0</b>             | <b>24</b>        | <b>90</b>            | <b>20</b>           | <b>10</b>       | <b>25</b>                       | <b>209</b>  | <b>\$ 28,315</b>  |
| <b>PHASE 2 TASK EIR-4: Response to Comments and Final EIR</b>        |                  |                  |                        |                    |                      |                  |                      |                     |                 |                                 |             |                   |
| Response to Comments, Admin Final EIR, Scrk Final EIR, Final EIR     | 12               | 20               | 4                      | 30                 | 4                    | 20               | 100                  | 40                  | 4               | 24                              | 258         | \$ 35,150         |
| <b>Subtotal, Task EIR-4</b>  | <b>12</b>        | <b>20</b>        | <b>4</b>               | <b>30</b>          | <b>4</b>             | <b>20</b>        | <b>100</b>           | <b>40</b>           | <b>4</b>        | <b>24</b>                       | <b>258</b>  | <b>\$ 35,150</b>  |
| <b>PHASE 2 TASK EIR-5: CEQA Findings and MMRP</b>                    |                  |                  |                        |                    |                      |                  |                      |                     |                 |                                 |             |                   |
| Findings and MMRP  | 2                | 4                |                        |                    |                      |                  | 36                   |                     |                 | 2                               | 44          | \$ 6,190          |
| <b>Subtotal, Task EIR-5</b>  | <b>2</b>         | <b>4</b>         | <b>0</b>               | <b>0</b>           | <b>0</b>             | <b>0</b>         | <b>36</b>            | <b>0</b>            | <b>0</b>        | <b>2</b>                        | <b>44</b>   | <b>\$ 6,190</b>   |
| <b>PHASE 2 TASK EIR-6: Public Meetings / Hearings and Management</b> |                  |                  |                        |                    |                      |                  |                      |                     |                 |                                 |             |                   |
| Public Meetings / Hearings and Management                            | 20               | 60               |                        |                    |                      |                  | 20                   | 14                  |                 |                                 | 114         | \$ 21,680         |
| <b>Subtotal, Task EIR-6</b>  | <b>20</b>        | <b>60</b>        | <b>0</b>               | <b>0</b>           | <b>0</b>             | <b>0</b>         | <b>20</b>            | <b>14</b>           | <b>0</b>        | <b>0</b>                        | <b>114</b>  | <b>\$ 21,680</b>  |
| <b>TOTAL LABOR HOURS</b>   | <b>102</b>       | <b>206</b>       | <b>30</b>              | <b>146</b>         | <b>22</b>            | <b>156</b>       | <b>472</b>           | <b>140</b>          | <b>54</b>       | <b>121</b>                      | <b>1449</b> |                   |
| <b>TOTAL LABOR DOLLARS</b>   | <b>\$ 24,480</b> | <b>\$ 43,260</b> | <b>\$ 4,800</b>        | <b>\$ 18,250</b>   | <b>\$ 3,520</b>      | <b>\$ 19,500</b> | <b>\$ 61,360</b>     | <b>\$ 16,800</b>    | <b>\$ 6,210</b> | <b>\$ 11,495</b>                |             | <b>\$ 209,675</b> |

| DIRECT COSTS   | Total Dollars    |
|--|------------------|
| <b>1. Subconsultants</b>   |                  |
| MBK (Hydrology)  | \$ 30,360        |
| Natural Resources (Cultural)   | \$ 4,615         |
| Square One Productions (Visual Simulations)                            | \$ 10,325        |
| Administrative Cost (5%)   | \$ 2,265         |
| <b>Subtotal, Subconsultants</b>  | <b>\$ 47,565</b> |
| 2. Printing  | \$ 3,650         |
| 3. Other Reproduction (e.g., CDs or jump drives, general photocopying) | \$ 500           |
| 4. Mileage/Parking/Travel  | \$ 1,400         |
| 5. Maps/Supplies/Photos/Miscellaneous                                  | \$ 300           |
| 6. Postage/Delivery  | \$ 400           |
| <b>TOTAL DIRECT COSTS</b>  | <b>\$ 53,815</b> |

**TOTAL ESTIMATED COST: \$ 263,490**

## COST ESTIMATE AND ASSUMPTIONS

The proposed price for the Lake Van Norden Spillway Project EIR is presented in the attached spreadsheet. With the objective of promoting clarity about the proposed price, the following assumptions explain the basis of the price to implement the proposed scope of work. Please note that the price is estimated based on a good faith effort and current understanding of the project needs of the Nevada County. Variations in approach, issues, and deliverables can adjust the contract price. If selected, Ascent is very interested in listening to Nevada County's needs and willing to revise the scope of work and price to meet Nevada County's expectations.

1. **Proposal Validity:** The proposed scope of work and price are valid for 120 days from the date of submittal, after which it may be subject to revision.
2. **Use of Technical Studies:** The proposed scope of work and price assumes utilization of the technical studies and data provided by TDLT for the preparation of the EIR. Any necessary revisions or corrections to this material as a result of Ascent's peer review will be made by TDLT and their consultant team.
3. **Compliance with CEQA.** The price assumes that an environmental document will be prepared in compliance with CEQA. Work related to NEPA compliance, Section 404 compliance, or other permitting processes is not included. These can be provided with a budget augment. Work concludes at the acceptance by the Nevada County staff of the final proposed deliverable.
4. **Schedule.** The price is based on the proposed schedule. Should significant delay occur (more than 60 days) for reasons beyond Ascent's control, a budget amendment may apply to the remaining work, based on labor rates in effect at that time. Ascent will consult with Nevada County about a course of action, if a significant delay occurs.
5. **Price Allocation to Tasks.** The proposed price has been allocated by tasks to determine the total budget. Ascent may reallocate budget among tasks, as needed, as long as the total budget is not exceeded.
6. **Coordination Meetings, Conference Calls, Public Meetings.** A total number of proposed meetings and conference calls is specified. If the number of meetings or conference calls or the required level of effort exceeds this total, a budget augment would be warranted. Ascent will advise Nevada County, if this circumstance arises.
7. **Public Notices:** Nevada County will be responsible for the cost of newspaper publication of notices. These costs are not included in the proposed price.
8. **Administrative Costs:** An administrative cost of 5 percent will be applied to subcontractor costs for purposes of subcontract execution and management, invoicing, and payment processing.
9. **Billing rates:** The enclosed billing rates apply to all agreements executed during the calendar year. After the current calendar year, contract amendments will be subject to the updated billing rates in effect at the time of amendment execution, unless contract provisions exclude billing rate updates.



10. **Changes to the Description of the Project or Alternatives.** After the descriptions of the project and alternatives are approved by the Nevada County for use in the environmental document, it is assumed they will not change during the course of analysis and document preparation. If changes are necessary, amendment of the budget will be warranted to the extent that already completed analysis and document preparation need to be revised or redone.
11. **Changes in the Scope of Analysis.** The proposed price assumes that no new technical issues, alternatives, field surveys, modeling, or topical areas of research or analysis will be identified through the scoping process or by other affected agencies after contract execution.
12. **Site Access.** Permission to access Lake Van Norden project area will be provided prior to the commencement of work.
13. **Document Review Cycles.** Review cycles for preliminary versions of the deliverables are specified in the enclosed scope of work. Additional review cycles or additional versions of administrative or other drafts, if desired, can be provided with a budget augment.
14. **Consolidated Comments.** The Nevada County will provide Ascent with one set of consolidated, non-conflicting comments on preliminary draft deliverables that are submitted for review to facilitate the overall schedule and promote efficiency.
15. **Responses to Public Comments.** The scope of work and budget include an estimate of responding to comments on the Draft EIR based on current information on the project. If the number or complexity of comments requires a level of effort above this estimate, Ascent and the Nevada County will coordinate about a course of action and need for a budget augment.
16. **References Cited in the Deliverables.** Ascent will maintain electronic copies of reference documents or portions of documents cited and will make the electronic files available during public review. Ascent will submit electronic copies of references to the Nevada County for project files upon completion of the authorized work.
17. **Reproduction Costs.** A proposed budget for reproduction of public documents is included in the price, based on assumptions regarding the number of copies, document length, and extent of color graphics. If the number of copies increases or the document length and color content substantially exceeds assumptions, a budget augment will be warranted.
18. **Litigation Support.** Ascent is available to assist in the lead agency's response to a lawsuit, subject to an amendment to the contract and budget. Except for electronic files of cited references, which will be provided as described above, assembly of an administrative record or project record, whether needed for litigation or other purposes, is not included in the budget, but can be provided with a budget augment.