

Exhibit B

Sonoma Developmental Center Specific Plan Update and EIR on Specific Plan/Eldridge Renewal

A: Scope of Work

This attachment outlines our proposed work program for all phases of the Specific Plan Update and Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Sonoma Developmental Center (SDC) Specific Plan and Eldridge Renewal Project. Work products are outlined at the end of each task, and are also summarized on the Timeline table on page 23.

The task-by-task descriptions that follow represent our approach to data collection, analysis of impacts, and preparation of the EIR document. Initials in parentheses following the sub-section heading identify the lead firm for each sub-task.

- D&B: Dyett & Bhatia
- F&P: Fehr and Peers, Transportation
- CAS: CAS Safety Consulting, Wildfire Evacuation
- WRA: WRA, Inc., Biological Resources
- P&T: Page & Turnbull, Historic Resources
- FW: Far Western, Archaeological Consultants
- VMWP: Van Meter Williams Pollack, Architects
- CSA: Charles M Salter Associates Inc., Noise Analysis

Project Understanding

In December 2022, the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors adopted a specific plan to guide development and conservation on the site of the now shuttered Sonoma Developmental Center (SDC) and certified an accompanying Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (SCH #2022020222). The SDC Specific Plan envisions a vibrant community of 750 homes and 230,000 square feet of commercial/office space in a walkable setting, with new and adaptively reused buildings, enhanced open spaces and creek setbacks, and vibrant community gathering spaces. One month later, Sonoma Community Advocates for a Livable Environment, or SCALE, filed a lawsuit alleging that the plan's environmental impact report failed to comply with CEQA. In October 2024, Sonoma County Superior Court ruled for SCALE and subsequently, the Board of Supervisors voted to decertify the EIR and repeal the approval of SDC Specific Plan, but also directed staff to update these to reflect the court's decision.

In August 2023, the County received a Senate Bill (SB) 330 Preliminary Application for project involving major subdivision, design review, and density bonus applications for a mixed-use housing development across three parcels on the SDC campus. The applicant, Eldridge Renewal, proposes to construct and operate 990 new homes (attached and detached residential homes, apartments, cohousing, and independent living residences) and 350,000 square feet of commercial space including office, retail, research and development, and micro-manufacturing uses and a 150-guest room hotel and conference space, as well as community facilities. This development would be located within the Core Campus area on the SDC site together with approximately 70 acres of outdoor public parks, active recreational areas, and open space areas including

walking trails, sports fields, children's playgrounds, dog parks. Under State law, the County is restricted in its ability to deny, reduce, or render infeasible the density of the project, even if it conflicts with the General Plan or an adopted Specific Plan. However, the project is still subject to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.

Accordingly, this scope of work has been prepared to address the Board's decision relating to updating the Specific Plan and the EIR, as well as conduct environmental review of the developer's project. The SDC Specific Plan will be updated to reflect changes in circumstances since December 2022. A new EIR will be prepared to address the findings of the Superior Court ruling and to assess the environmental impacts of both the SDC Specific Plan Update and the Eldridge Renewal Project. The EIR will be a combined program EIR on the SDC Specific Plan Update and project EIR on the Eldridge Renewal Project.

Scope Assumptions

Specific Plan

The Specific Plan will be updated to reflect any changes in circumstances since December 2023 as well as other considerations. These include:

- Bolster policies relating to historic preservation, updating policies that “encourage” with “require” and adding more definitiveness in terms of outcomes, which will be reconciled with the developer's proposal.
- Replace the housing range by neighborhood with a fixed program for each neighborhood.
- Exclude the 750 acres of open space that have been transferred to State Parks. The Specific Plan introductory chapter will provide the context and background for this, and the change since the prior Specific Plan was adopted.

EIR

- There will be one combined EIR on the updated Specific Plan and the developer's proposal (“Eldridge Renewal”). For each topic (such as biological resources and transportation) the EIR will provide a setting section and then discuss impacts of the Specific Plan and the development proposal.
- The EIR will be a Program EIR on the SDC Specific Plan and a Project EIR on the developer's proposal (“Eldridge Renewal”). The EIR will analyze the impacts of implementing the Specific Plan at a programmatic level and can provide a basis for exemption or tiering for subsequent individual development projects. The EIR will also analyze the impacts of constructing and operating the Eldridge Renewal Project at a project level, based on information provided by the developer.
- The Specific Plan development program analyzed in the EIR will generally be consistent with the program outlined in the updated 2025 Specific Plan (the previous EIR had a larger program, as the number of housing units was reduced by the Board of Supervisors during the adoption hearings).
- The EIR Planning Area will be consistent with the prior Specific Plan area. Because the surrounding open spaces have now been transferred to State Parks, County staff will need to provide direction if the Highway 12 Connector, which is part of the previous Specific Plan and was analyzed in the 2022 EIR on that plan may be included as part of the Project.
- Standard conditions of approval that serve as environmental mitigation, such as those that were previously included in the Specific Plan appendix, will be included as mitigation within the EIR.

- In the event of impacts that are significant at the project-level but not at the Plan level, Dyett & Bhatia will consult with County staff on appropriate and feasible development-project specific mitigation that should be included in the EIR to ensure that the overall EIR is certifiable by the Board.
- The EIR will consider four alternatives for the Proposed Project that will analyze impacts of both the Sonoma Developmental Center Specific Plan as well as the Eldridge Renewal Project, including the No Project Alternative. One of these alternatives will be an Enhanced Building Preservation Alternative, which would build on the Specific Plan's previous Historic Preservation Alternative with bolstering of the analysis pertaining to historic resources. D&B will incorporate input from County staff and prepare fully fleshed out alternatives. County staff will provide direction and approve the alternatives for EIR analysis to be undertaken. The alternatives will be prepared at a level of detail sufficient to undertake EIR analysis but will not be highly detailed with all land use, urban design, and other features fully delineated.
- Budget Assumptions are listed at the end of the scope. These include a robust allowance for Final EIR Response to Comments.

Scope of Work

TASK 1: PROJECT INITIATION AND ONGOING MANAGEMENT

This task provides for project kickoff and ongoing project management.

- 1-A: Review Background Materials (Team).** Together with Notice to Proceed, County staff will provide the consultants with background information including an overview of proposed Eldridge Renewal Project, the project application, and related studies prepared by the Applicant. The consultants will review these materials and other pertinent documents, provided by County staff or otherwise available, including the previous Specific Plan and EIR, updated water supply and utility information, and any other relevant documentation. Based on this review, a matrix comparing salient features of the Specific Plan and Eldridge Renewal Project will be prepared for review and discussion at the kick-off meeting.
- 1-B: Kick-Off Meeting with County Staff (Team).** The consultant team will meet with County staff to discuss Specific Plan Update and EIR approach. Roles and responsibilities will be clarified, communication protocols will be established, sites for more detailed biological analysis will be discussed, and a detailed work schedule will be developed. Additionally, details of the proposed Eldridge Renewal Project and the project horizon year will be confirmed. Because many impacts—such as transportation, noise, air quality and greenhouse gases—will be cumulative in nature, the horizon year will need to be established at the outset of the process.
- 1-C: Project Files/GIS/CAD Drawings (D&B).** The County will obtain needed information on the project—such as proposed buildings—in native digital format (such as CAD or GIS) from the developer to be used for analysis and any additional maps that may need to be created for the EIR. D&B will use the basemap and other maps used previously in preparation of the SDC Specific Plan EIR.

<i>Meetings</i>	<i>Products</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kick-off Meeting with County Staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A

TASK 2: ADAPTIVE REUSE ASSESSMENT UPDATE

An assessment will be undertaken to provide a more substantial footing for historic resources policies, EIR analysis, and mitigation measures. An Adaptive Reuse Assessment was prepared in 2021 for the Specific Plan. However, that study did not specifically focus on Contributing historic resources. As part of this effort, the assessment would focus on determining the level of alterations needed for the “swing” Contributing buildings (that may or may not be retained); buildings that are likely to be retained (Main Building, Sonoma House, residences along Arnold Drive will not be studied. Also not studied will be Thompson/Baine and Residences 126, 138, and 139, that are proposed to be removed as part of the Wildlife Corridor expansion.

This analysis could be folded into an updated Adaptive Reuse Assessment or be produced as a standalone report included as an appendix to the EIR.

2-A: Analysis of Historic District and Contributing Buildings (VMWP, P&T). VMWP will evaluate the physical impacts of rehabilitation needed for reuse to housing or commercial uses for the following 16 buildings:

- Hatch
- Walnut
- Hill
- Osborne
- Oak Lodge
- McDougall
- Chamberlain Hospital
- Jensen
- King
- Finnerty
- Wagner
- Dumbar
- Wright
- Workshop
- Goddard
- Paxton

An additional 2 buildings may be added in the future if needed without adding scope.

VMWP will review the existing material on each building, material to be provided by D&B, for these listed buildings only. VMWP will then develop a use scenario for each building and describe

the general required scope of work of work for Architectural, Structural and Mechanical, Electrical and Plumbing (MEP) Engineering and assumed systems required for standard construction. VMWP will diagram areas of anticipated physical modifications for each building which might impact the appearance, thus the buildings' contribution to the Historic Assets.

P&T will provide VMWP with a list of character-defining historic features for each building to be studied, which P&T recommends using as baseline information for their residential fit studies. P&T will compile the character-defining features list using previous documentation, including JRP Historical Consulting's Historic Resources Inventory and Evaluation Report for Sonoma Developmental Center and Page & Turnbull's Master Building and Structure Inventory, both produced in 2017, and will add further detail, as necessary.

2-B: Draft Updated Adaptive Reuse Assessment (D&B, P&T, VMWP). Following the analysis of the Historic District and Contributing Buildings, D&B with assistance from P&T and VMWP will produce an updated Adaptive Reuse Assessment or an additional memo that incorporates the additional analysis and provides conclusions regarding the potential effects of adaptive reuse.

2-C: Final Adaptive Reuse Assessment (D&B, P&T, VMWP). Following receipt of one consolidated set of County comments on the draft updated Adaptive Reuse Assessment, D&B will produce a final updated Adaptive Reuse Assessment, laid out and formatted with revised maps and graphics as necessary.

<i>Meetings</i>	<i>Products</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Draft Adaptive Reuse Assessment</i> <i>Final Adaptive Reuse Assessment</i>

TASK 3: SPECIFIC PLAN UPDATE

The Specific Plan will be updated to reflect scope assumptions outlined previously.

3-A: Reconcile Specific Plan/Developer Project Land Use and Buildout Assumptions (D&B). In order to provide a stable project for the EIR, the land use plan and development program and other features of the two must be reconciled. This would need to happen early in the process to enable the environmental work and the Specific Plan update work to proceed.

3-B: Confirm Other Changes (D&B). D&B will review the court ruling in and draft a memo for County staff review outlining further changes the team will make to the Specific Plan.

3-C: Updated Draft Specific Plan (D&B, Team). Following confirmation of the development program and changes, D&B will update the Specific Plan to respond to the court ruling and the County's feedback. Anticipated changes include the following:

- Redefining the Planning Area to focus on the Core Campus and reflect the transfer of surrounding open space from the State to Sonoma County Regional Parks.
- Revision of housing unit caps for all districts and reflect a limit of 620 units, excluding state density bonus units.

- Reflecting historic preservation policies and strategies consistent with the outlined agreed upon development program from sub-task A.
- Revision of Specific Plan policies throughout to ensure objectivity and clarity.

3-D: Public Review Draft Specific Plan (D&B). Following receipt of one consolidated set of County comments on the draft updated Specific Plan, D&B will produce a final updated Specific Plan, laid out and formatted with revised maps and graphics as necessary.

3-E: Adopted Specific Plan (D&B). D&B will make any changes to the Specific Plan reflecting the Board of Supervisors' adoption.

<i>Meetings</i>	<i>Products</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Reconciled Land Use Map and Development Program</i> • <i>Additional Changes Memo</i> • <i>Draft Specific Plan</i> • <i>Final Specific Plan</i>

TASK 4: DRAFT EIR

The purpose of the Draft EIR is to do a combined EIR to fix some of the deficiencies of the previous Specific Plan EIR, as outlined in legal findings, and assess the environmental impacts of the developer's proposed Eldridge Renewal Project. As such, the Draft EIR serves as both a programmatic EIR on the Specific Plan and a project EIR on the Eldridge Renewal Project proposal.

4-A: Project Description and Alternatives

- (1) **Project Description (Staff; D&B).** Based on discussions at the kick-off meeting and information provided by County staff, including a concise EIR-level project description and forward the developer's description, D&B will prepare a preliminary draft project description. The project description will include a description of both the Specific Plan and Eldridge Renewal Project, as well as a description of their precise location and boundaries, purpose and objectives, general characteristics, potential areas of controversy, issues to be resolved, a list of agencies that are expected to use the EIR in their decision making, and a list of permits or other approvals required to implement the project. The project description will clearly lay out the development program for both the Specific Plan and the Eldridge Renewal Project, including projections for population, housing units, and non-residential square footage in the horizon year that are consistent with both the Plan and the Project. The preliminary draft project description will be circulated to County staff and the Applicant for review and then revised once based on a consolidated set of comments for use of the consultants in preparing the Draft EIR.
- (2) **Alternatives (D&B).** The EIR will consider four alternatives for the Proposed Project that will analyze impacts of both the Sonoma Developmental Center Specific Plan as well as the Eldridge Renewal Project, including the No Project. One of these alternatives will be an Enhanced

Building Preservation Alternative, which would build on the Specific Plan's previous Historic Preservation Alternative with bolstering of the analysis pertaining to historic resources. After technical analysis on the EIR is complete and significant impacts of the Plan and Project are known, alternatives will be developed to reduce or avoid significant impacts. A memo will be produced with buildout numbers for each alternative and circulated to County for review and comment prior to analyzing the alternatives in the Admin Draft EIR. D&B will incorporate input from County staff and prepare fully fleshed out alternatives. County staff will provide direction and approve the alternatives for EIR analysis to be undertaken. The alternatives will be prepared at a level of detail sufficient to undertake EIR analysis but will not be highly detailed with all land use, urban design, and other features fully delineated.

4-B: Project Scoping

- (1) **Notice of Preparation (Staff, D&B).** Drawing on the project description prepared in Task 4-A, D&B will prepare, and staff will circulate the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of the EIR for the Sonoma Developmental Center/Eldridge Renewal Project ("Proposed Project"). Because it has already been determined that an EIR will be needed, an Initial Study need not be conducted. CEQA Guidelines Section 15082 allows lead agencies to narrow the scope of the EIR based on the scoping process. As such, the NOP may scope out some topics—such as Agricultural Resources—that are not present on the core campus. D&B will review comments received on the NOP and ensure that comments are addressed in the EIR. Many public comments are expected to be received on the NOP.
- (2) **Tribal Consultation (Staff, FW).** Pursuant to SB 18 and AB 52, Far Western will assist with supplemental government-to-government consultation (follow-up letters/maps and meetings). The County will provide Far Western with copies of completed consultation logs, correspondence, and consultation results for inclusion in the Archaeological Inventory Report. If these materials are not made available, Far Western will summarize consultation outreach efforts to date. No additional tasks beyond drafting supplemental consultation letters/maps are included. The County of Sonoma is responsible for all consultation efforts and preparation of the Tribal Cultural Resources section in the EIR. Far Western will participate in two meetings (virtual) and one field meeting with Graton Rancheria and the County to discuss the Cultural Resources Management Plan and incorporate any cultural and tribal resources input and recommendations from the tribe.
- (3) **Scoping Meeting (Staff, D&B).** County staff will coordinate a scoping meeting, including sending out meeting notices and reserving a conference room at the County, unless the County prefers that this meeting be conducted on Zoom. D&B will facilitate the meeting and take notes on comments made by those attending. A summary record of comments will be created using these notes and D&B will determine how to address these comments in the EIR.
- (4) **Summary of Scoping Comments (D&B).** D&B will prepare a memo summarizing oral and written scoping comments will be prepared and circulated to consultants to ensure all scoping comments are addressed in the EIR. The memo and comments will be included as an appendix to the EIR.

<i>Meetings</i>	<i>Products</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Scoping Meeting (Staff, D&B)</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Notice of Preparation</i> • <i>Tribal Consultation Letters</i> • <i>Summary of Scoping Comments Memo (D&B)</i> • <i>Project Description and Alternatives (Staff)</i>

4-C: Administrative Draft EIR (ADEIR) Preparation

The ADEIR will include:

1. Executive Summary;
 2. Project Description;
 3. Environmental Setting;
 4. Impact Analysis;
 5. Comparative Assessment of Alternatives; and
 6. CEQA-Required Conclusions.
- (1) **Executive Summary (D&B).** The Executive Summary will explain the purpose and scope of the EIR, EIR organization, study approach, project background, areas of controversy, issues to be resolved, environmentally superior alternative, and summary of impacts and mitigation.
 - (2) **Project Description (D&B).** Prepared as part of Task 4-a above, the Project Description will address the Sonoma Developmental Center Specific Plan/Eldridge Renewal Project (“Proposed Project”) proposal, as well as a describe their precise location and boundaries, purpose and objectives, general characteristics, anticipated buildout, potential areas of controversy, issues to be resolved, a list of agencies that are expected to use the EIR in their decision making, and a list of permits or other approvals required to implement the project.
 - (3) **Environmental Setting (Team).** The environmental setting will provide a general description of existing conditions and geography of the SDC core campus, suitable to support a programmatic and project-level EIR analysis. Using the SDC Specific Plan EIR setting as the basis, D&B and Team will review information for any change in existing conditions since publication of the SDC Specific Plan EIR. This section will incorporate the most up-to-date literature, maps, databases, and other resources, including site reconnaissance findings from WRA on biological resources and Far West on archaeological resources. The regulatory settings will also be updated to reflect any changes and updates since the Specific Plan EIR publication.
 - (4) **Environmental Impact Analysis.** D&B and team will build upon our extensive experience preparing programmatic EIRs, particularly for the SDC Specific Plan. The analysis will consider general impacts associated with buildout as part of both the Sonoma Developmental Center

Specific Plan and Elridge Renewal Project (“Proposed Project”), as well as cumulative effects of buildout of projects in the county plus the Proposed Project to the established horizon year. Where possible, impacts will be quantified, and their level of significance established. If existing data does not allow definitive quantification, reasonable assumptions will be used to qualitatively approximate potential impacts. The impact analysis will be comprehensive in scope, covering all CEQA requirements. Significance criteria will be identified for each impact topic, largely based upon thresholds of significance established in the SDC Specific Plan EIR. Impact analysis will account for the potential mitigating effect of existing County plans and policies. Issues to be addressed are expected to include:

- *Aesthetics (D&B)*. Key visual and open space resources in and around the core campus include Arnold Drive, which is a Scenic Corridor, and the westernmost portion of the SDC site nearest to the Sonoma Mountain, which is a Scenic Landscape Unit. Programmatic analysis will draw upon resource evaluation in the SDC Specific Plan EIR and evaluate buildout changes, such as height increases or different building footprints in the core campus, for potential impacts, including potential loss or obstruction of identified scenic qualities. Project-level analysis will draw from site plans, architectural plans, design guidelines, building elevations, and landscape plans provided by the developer. Such materials will be used to evaluate project-specific impacts on scenic qualities. Visual modeling is not assumed as part of this analysis; impacts to these resources will be evaluated objectively using approaches and methodologies accepted by the County in the SDC Specific Plan EIR to permit the community and decision-makers to ascertain the impacts of development under the Proposed Project.
- *Agricultural and Forestry Resources (D&B)*. Forest land, Farmland of Local Importance, and Grazing Land now fall outside of the core campus, and thus there will not be an impact to these resources on a programmatic or project-level. This topic will be screened out as part of the NOP and discussed briefly in the EIR.
- *Air Quality (D&B)*. For the both the programmatic and project-level analysis, operational air quality impacts associated with buildout will be evaluated by determining whether it is consistent with the most recently adopted Air Quality Plan prepared by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), as well as with their recommended analysis thresholds. Both construction and operational emissions from the buildout of the project will also be assessed using the CalEEMod emissions model. To calculate construction emissions, the developer must provide more detailed project information, including but not limited to, construction phases, off-road equipment, vehicle trips, vehicle miles traveled (VMT), and architectural coatings. In determining significance, project emissions will be compared with the Air District’s thresholds of significance and incorporate all feasible mitigation measures for the project. D&B will also quantitatively evaluate potential health risks associated with the project, which involves comparison with BAAQMD project-level thresholds that address the potential for an individual project to significantly elevate existing risks or hazards. A project would have a cumulatively considerable impact if it resulted in 1) An excess cancer risk level of more than 10 in a million; or 2) A non-cancer hazard index greater than 1.0 (acute or chronic); or 3) An incremental increase of

greater than 0.3 µg/m³ annual average PM_{2.5}. Impacts related to odor will be identified using the developer-provided odor report.

- *Energy, Greenhouse Gas and Climate Change (D&B)*. D&B will prepare a programmatic GHG analysis to address the potential net increase of GHG emissions during construction and operation activities associated with additional buildout resulting from the Specific Plan. This section will refer to and update the SDC Specific Plan overview of the current regulatory framework regarding GHGs/climate change, including but not limited to the California's Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32), Senate Bill (SB) 97, SB 375, SB 32, Executive Order B-55-18, the CEQA Guidelines, and any of the County's applicable policies or regulatory measures. The analysis will quantify carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e) units associated with operational emissions attributable to the net change of buildout that may be associated with the proposed project. Emission factors and methodologies will use the SCTM19 travel demand model version to calculate GHG emissions utilizing VMT data and the CalEEMod emissions model (for non-transportation related emissions). The evaluation of potential construction-related impacts resulting from implementation of the Proposed Project will be conducted qualitatively in and assessed against applicable BAAQMD criteria. This analysis will utilize the established SDC Specific Plan EIR thresholds; if any significant impacts are determined by our analysis, Dyett & Bhatia will prepare appropriate mitigation measures to reduce impacts.

For the project-level analysis, D&B will prepare a GHG analysis to address the potential net increase of GHG emissions during construction and operation activities associated with additional buildout resulting from the Eldridge Renewal Project. The analysis will quantify carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e) units associated with both the operational and construction emissions attributable to the net change of buildout that may be associated with the proposed project. Emission factors and methodologies will use the SCTM19 travel demand model version to calculate GHG emissions utilizing VMT data and the CalEEMod emissions model (for non-transportation related emissions). Because construction emissions are temporary and variable, BAAQMD has not developed a quantitative threshold of significance for construction-related GHG emissions. Our team will assess whether the Eldridge Renewal Project adequately incorporates BMPs from BAAQMD Guidance and will propose mitigation measures as appropriate. For a project to have a less-than-significant impact related to operational GHG emissions, it must include, at a minimum, the project design elements identified by BAAQMD or be consistent with a local GHG reduction strategy that meets CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5(b) requirements. If any significant impacts are determined by our analysis, Dyett & Bhatia will prepare appropriate mitigation measures to reduce impacts.

- *Biological Resources (WRA)*. For program-level and project-level analysis, WRA will review the Proposed Project and evaluate its potential for significant impacts to biological resources. The evaluation will build upon the 2022 EIR to ensure all analysis is current. For previously ascertained as well as new impacts, WRA will write mitigation measures (building upon measures in the previous EIR/Specific Plan) that would bring impacts to a less than significant level with mitigation as feasible. A focus of the analysis will entail

potential impacts related to migration corridors from both the Specific Plan and the Eldridge Renewal Project proposal. WRA will review the developer provided Biological Resources Assessment prepared by Monk Associates, and where appropriate, incorporate its findings. In addition, WRA will evaluate tree removal in the Eldridge Renewal Project proposal in relation to the County Tree Protection Ordinance and other applicable regulations. WRA will also conduct a half day field reconnaissance in support of the analysis.

- *Cultural, Historic, and Tribal Cultural Resources (P&T, FW, D&B).* Based on updates to the Specific Plan, Page & Turnbull will prepare a revised analysis associated with the potential impact caused by removal of contributing buildings and landscape features to the historic district as well as the potential impact of new construction within the historic district boundaries. P&T will reorganize the built environment section so that historic resources-related Conditions of Approval are listed as mitigation measures. In addition, Page & Turnbull will review the Eldridge Renewal Project proposal and will prepare an analysis of impacts on built environment and landscape contributing resources that would likely to result, preparing mitigation measures for the Eldridge Renewal Project proposal within the framework of the Specific Plan EIR mitigation measures. Even so, the Eldridge Renewal Project proposes to demolish and modify more extensively than envisioned in the Specific Plan which may result in significant and unavoidable impacts even after implementation of all feasible mitigation measures. The findings of the Adaptive Reuse Assessment prepared in Task 2 will be referenced in the analysis as appropriate.

Far Western will conduct cultural and archaeological studies for both the Specific Plan and Eldridge Renewal Project proposal. In order to do so, Far Western will (1) develop an Area of Direct Impacts (ADI); (2) conduct a records search and archival review; (3) assist with supplemental Native American outreach and coordination; (4) assess of the potential for buried archaeological resources; (5) conduct a pedestrian survey of the ADI; and (6) prepare of an Archaeological Inventory Report. With the results of the cultural and archaeological studies, Far Western will assess the cultural and tribal cultural resource impacts on both a programmatic and project level. To inform development of mitigation measures, Far Western will prepare a Cultural Resources Management Plan (CRMP) that will document the records search and background review findings, consultation with Graton Rancheria, survey and testing methods, and avoidance and treatment measures for identified cultural resources and culturally sensitive areas. Far Western anticipates preparation of a Draft, Revised Draft, and Final CRMP.

- *Geologic, Soils, and Mineral Resources (D&B).* For program-level analysis, evaluation of geologic, soils, seismic hazard conditions, and mineral resources will be completed using published geologic, soils, seismic, and mineral land classification maps and studies from USGS, CGS, and USDA. This analysis will utilize the established SDC Specific Plan EIR thresholds largely using the analysis previously completed. For project-level analysis, geological studies and soils reports provided by the developer will be used to evaluate project-specific impacts. A particular focus of the project-level analysis will involve the northwestern portion of the site where the grade changes more substantially than the rest

of the Core Campus and is where the hotel is also proposed.

- *Hazards and Hazardous Materials (D&B)*. The EIR will evaluate programmatically and on a project level the potential for new development to be exposed to contaminant releases per CEQA Appendix G Guidelines. In the SDC Planning area, there is one Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) site which received Case Closure in 2013. The Upper Disposal Area is listed as a land waste disposal site. In addition, a variety of hazardous and potentially hazardous materials have historically been used and stored in the Planning Area. Site assessments will also be referenced from the SDC Specific Plan EIR. The analysis will assess the impact of these hazards on future site development/redevelopment. On a project level, analysis will rely on a Phase 1 ESA and any other due diligence studies provided by the applicant. See the Wildfire section below for a discussion on risk and evacuation.
- *Hydrology and Water Quality (D&B)*. D&B will utilize existing information within the SDC Specific Plan EIR and other information such as the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps (with any available updates) along with the project-level groundwater/hydrogeologic studies provided by the applicant to describe and analyze potential impacts on watershed conditions, drainage patterns, flood hazards, and water quality.
- *Land Use and Planning (D&B)*. This section of the EIR will describe potential physical and policy conflicts related to proposed land uses in the Planning Area, for both the SDC Specific Plan and the Eldridge Renewal Project. The EIR will evaluate the consistency of the Proposed Project with other potential applicable plans and policies, such as the Plan Bay Area 2050 and the Sonoma County General Plan.
- *Population and Housing (D&B)*. D&B will evaluate the effect of the Proposed Project on dividing an established community. There will not be any displacement effects for the SDC Specific Plan nor the Eldridge Renewal Project, as the campus is largely unoccupied. Further, the County General Plan 2020 Housing Element specifies that future re-use of the SDC facility should include affordable housing which would be consistent with both the Specific Plan and Project. D&B will include the discussion of growth inducing impacts of the project under a separate chapter which discusses all CEQA required conclusions required under CEQA Guidelines §15126.
- *Noise (CSA, D&B)*. Building upon work conducted for the 2022 SDC Specific Plan EIR, CSA will update future noise information and future contours map based on new traffic data associated with the Proposed Project. CSA will review updated traffic volume data from the transportation consultants; calculate traffic noise levels based on future traffic volumes, speeds, and truck percentages for each roadway segment to be included in the model; and provide the results the traffic noise analysis in electronic spreadsheet format, which D&B will use to update both the programmatic and project-level noise sections. The EIR will also evaluate mitigation strategies for potential future development and existing sensitive receptors, such as special-status species and their habitat, that may be impacted by future development. Mitigation requirements will be identified, and potential development standards suggested, if necessary. No new noise monitoring will be conducted,

and the existing noise environment would be assumed to be similar to that in the previous EIR.

- *Public Utilities, Facilities and Services (D&B).* Our team will review existing available information, including new information from the Valley of the Moon Water District and other agencies, to identify existing capacity and constraints for public utilities, services and infrastructure, including schools, parks and recreation, water, wastewater, solid waste service, utilities, fire safety and emergency response, and police services. Using this information and projected demand, Dyett & Bhatia will evaluate potential impacts associated with potential buildout as part of the Proposed Project until the horizon year, as well as any increased associated demand for public utilities, services, and infrastructure. On a programmatic level, analysis will utilize existing SDC Specific Plan EIR thresholds, and the Water Supply Assessment (WSA) prepared for the Specific Plan. On a project level, our team will review the developer provided solar proposals and the Water and Wastewater Feasibility Study prepared by HydroScience Engineers, Inc. and where appropriate, incorporate its findings. In addition, the Specific Plan WSA is applicable to the Eldridge Renewal Project since it evaluated water supply of up to 1,000 proposed housing units for the Specific Plan.
- *Transportation and Traffic (F&P).*

Task T1 - CEQA VMT Analysis. Fehr & Peers will prepare base year (2019) and Cumulative year (2040) No Project and Plus Project estimates of CEQA VMT efficiency metrics; runs will be completed for up to two Project alternatives (assumed to be one preferred Project description and one alternative). The estimates will be prepared using model runs from the newest version of the Sonoma County Transportation Authority (SCTA) travel demand model. It is highly encouraged that new model runs be prepared for the VMT analysis as the proposed Project is large enough (in aggregate) to potentially result in a County-wide effect on VMT, and thus, per the OPR Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA, new model runs are highly encouraged. The Year 2040 model land use file will be updated for No Project-scenario background land use projects (e.g., Kenwood Winery and the Springs Specific Plan). The Plus Project model runs will include proposed modifications to the land use and transportation system to reflect the Project description.

The relevant VMT per capita and/or total VMT metrics results for the two development scenarios will be compared to CEQA thresholds of significance developed using guidance from the OPR Technical Advisory. Countywide VMT by speed bin outputs will be provided to the County staff and Dyett & Bhatia Project team (Project team). If significant CEQA impacts are found, Fehr & Peers will propose VMT mitigation, likely consisting of transportation demand management (TDM) strategies for the program that could also be applied at the Project level as applicable. The efficacy of these strategies will be based, in part, on Fehr & Peers' published research conducted in conjunction with the California Air Resources Board (CARB) which supplements the TDM effectiveness data published by CAPCOA.

Task T2 - Other Required Multimodal Analyses. Fehr & Peers will review one Project site plan to evaluate multimodal site access and on-site circulation. Specifically, Fehr & Peers will review the site plans in terms of:

- Site access and interface with public roadway network including adequacy of turn-pocket lengths, driveway throat lengths, sight distance and operations
- Emergency vehicle access and circulation
- Vehicular circulation within the site
- Public parking layout within the site
- Pedestrian access and circulation within and adjacent to the site
- Bicycle access and circulation within and adjacent to the site

Fehr & Peers will also qualitatively evaluate the off-site pedestrian, bicycle and transit network to determine if the proposed Project would result in CEQA impacts to these facilities.

Task T3 – CEQA Evacuation Time Effect Analysis. Recent court decisions in Lake, Placer, Sonoma, Contra Costa, and San Diego Counties have established a clear need to quantitatively evaluate the Project's effect on evacuation travel times for the surrounding area given the Project's scope and location. This need has been affirmed by the Attorney General (AG)'s office in its recently published guidance on the topic; the AG's office was a party to several lawsuits in the State regarding deficiencies in CEQA documents related to evacuation travel time estimate analysis.

Evacuation travel time analysis requires the study of supersaturated traffic operating conditions not typically modellable by traditional tools such as travel demand models and isolated, peak-hour intersection analysis (e.g. Synchro/SimTraffic). While these traditional methods could be used to inform the analysis, they have clear limitations that would open the door for CEQA challenges as they would not represent a good faith effort at full disclosure of CEQA impacts as other tools and methods are available that would alleviate the limitations. A similar situation pre-2020 existed when multi-hour analysis would be required for corridor studies and Caltrans projects where a project's effect would need to be analyzed beyond a peak hour horizon; these analyses frequently used VISSIM or other microsimulation techniques that were sensitive to very high congestion levels and multi-hour considerations. Therefore, meso-scale techniques such as Dynamic Traffic Assignment (DTA) models provide balance between network analysis (such as that performed in using a travel demand model network) and congestion analysis will be used; the DTA technique is currently being used throughout the North Bay to respond to the need to produce defensible evacuation travel time effect analysis.

The tasks included below do not provide guarantees as to the adequacy of the multimodal circulation system nor can it guarantee that the findings are applicable to any or all situations. Moreover, as emergency evacuation assessment is an emerging field (both as a standalone field and in CEQA), there is no established Statewide standard methodology. Fehr & Peers have adopted existing methodologies used in transportation planning that, in

our knowledge and experience, Fehr & Peers believe are the most appropriate. Nevertheless, such methodologies are limited by the tools and data available, as well as the budgetary and time constraints in the scope of work, and by the current knowledge and state of the practice.

Subtask T3.1 – Emergency Event Identification and Evacuation Response Due Diligence. Our understanding is that the County has not undertaken the establishment of evacuation time standards of significance and thus the Project team (in coordination with County staff) will need to develop ad hoc CEQA thresholds of significance related to a Project's effect on emergency evacuation time.

Fehr & Peers will review the County's General Plan Circulation and Safety Elements, and other relevant evacuation planning documents to identify emergency events that have the most realistic chance of requiring an evacuation of the Study Area. These potential emergency events could include natural events, such as fires, flooding, and earthquakes, as well as person-made events, like chemical accidents, toxic gas releases, and fire from industrial accidents. Fehr & Peers understands that the event of greatest concern in the study area is wildfire.

It is understood that due to the complexities and unique challenges of the Study Area, and the lack of codified standards and/or formal design guidance for evacuation studies (i.e., required evacuation times), the Project team will provide recommendations on the emergency event(s) that have the most realistic chance of requiring an evacuation of the study area as well as the appropriate response for each emergency event (e.g., shelter in place, evacuate only the building/facility, evacuate to a specified distance, or evacuate study area immediately). The Project team will coordinate with County staff and local emergency response personnel to make a value judgement on what is considered the appropriate emergency/hazard as the basis for design.

After completion of the previously described work, Fehr & Peers will prepare a description of potential CEQA standards of significance related to a project's effect on evacuation times. It is anticipated that these proposed standards of significance will be presented to County staff for review and comment prior to undertaking Task 3.2 noted below. The draft CEQA standards of significance and other high-level findings will be summarized in a brief technical memorandum. Fehr & Peers will attend up to two conference calls to discuss the technical memorandum, and Fehr & Peers has allocated 8 hours of staff time for responses to comments on the technical memorandum.

Subtask T3.2 – Establishing Project Effect on Evacuation Times. This scope item makes the following assumptions:

- Study area defined as the area generally bounded by SR 12/Melita Road in the north, SR 121 south of SR 116 in the south, SR 121-12 east of Napa Road in the east, and SR 116 west of Watmaugh Road in the west. These are general boundaries based on the recent Safety Element update of an evacuation study area within which the Project is located and will be refined based on discussions with County

staff.

- The evacuation analysis will consider four wildfire/road closure scenarios for one common time of day/day of week/period of year (i.e. Friday before Labor Day). These scenarios will be run for the following scenarios:
 - No Project scenarios: Existing Year 2025 and Cumulative Year 2040
 - One Project development scenario under Horizon Year 2030, without the Highway 12 connector; this will serve as the “near term” analysis scenario
 - One Project scenario under Cumulative Year 2040, without the Highway 12 connector
- The assessment of the Project's impact on evacuation times will be based on data from the 2019 base year and Year 2040 versions of the Sonoma County Transportation Authority (SCTA) travel demand model. Analysis will be completed for the 2019 and 2040 model horizon years to establish baseline Year 2025 and Horizon Year 2030 results via interpolation. The Year 2040 version of the SCTA model will be updated for background Projects as part of Task 1.

Fehr & Peers will complete a quantitative analysis (using Fehr & Peers EVAC+ tool) of evacuation patterns for the evacuation scenarios noted above. It is anticipated that these scenarios would include different wildfire approach patterns resulting in four different evacuation demand loading patterns.

Based on the defined evacuation scenarios, the first step in the operations analysis will focus on estimating the number of vehicle trips during each evacuation event. Fehr & Peers will utilize the SCTA travel demand model socio-economic data and trip generation information for the evacuation zone to estimate travel demand. This data includes a variety of information based on Census. The travel demand will also consider time of day.

The during-evacuation traffic operations analysis will utilize Fehr & Peers' EVAC+ tool. This tool will be customized to reflect the County's evacuation roadway network and traffic demand data extracted from the SCTA travel demand forecasting model. The tool references trip tables for areas outside of the Study Area to form the "background" traffic estimates on the roadways not affected during an evacuation event. Areas affected by the evacuation event are processed through the EVAC+ tool trip estimator to estimate the number and sequencing of trips that occur due to the event.

The sub-area extracted network and new trip tables are input into a Dynamic Traffic Assignment (DTA) model. A DTA model estimates traffic and levels of congestion in 15-minute intervals and, as link congestion builds (roads fill with cars), the model dynamically reassigns traffic to less-congested routes, if available. This is a more accurate way of estimating trip assignment and identifying congested locations on the network that should be considered during an evacuation event. The results of this modeling effort will be used to identify bottlenecks in the County's roadway network during each evacuation sub-scenario.

The results of the traffic operations analysis will be illustrated in figures and metrics will be summarized in tables to highlight the key findings, including evacuation travel times and congestion bottlenecks. Fehr & Peers anticipates two meetings with the Project team as part of this task.

The change in evacuation patterns and times would be compared against a threshold of significance to be derived as part of Task 3.1. If significant impacts are identified, mitigation measures (e.g. the contemplated Highway 12 connector roadway) will be developed to alleviate the impact. Recommendations will also be developed to aid egress from the Plan Area e onto the local roadway network.

The quantitative evaluation described in this task is conceptual in nature as the historical wildfire pattern in Sonoma County shows that wildfires are unpredictable in nature and can be sparked by any number of causes. The purpose of the analysis is to assess for a given set of assumptions (which may not reflect an actual fire event in the future) how evacuation times could potentially change after completion of the proposed Project. As such, the County should take care in planning and implementing any potential evacuation strategy.

Task T4 – Documentation. Fehr & Peers will prepare a transportation impact analysis (TIA) report that will document the data, analysis, calculations and results of the work in Tasks 1-3. Fehr & Peers will prepare the following reports:

- Draft TIA
- Final TIA

This scope of work assumes moderate editorial and technical comments on the Draft TIA, and Fehr & Peers has assumed up to 16 hours of staff time to respond to comments on the Draft TIA and to prepare a Final TIA. This scope task also assumes up to 40 hours of staff time to assist the Project team in responses to public comments on the Draft EIR for the Project.

Task T5 – Informational (Non-CEQA) Circulation System Analysis and Memorandum.

Fehr & Peers will complete an informational, non-CEQA circulation system analysis per the County's Guidelines for Traffic Studies. It is assumed that 12 study intersections would be included in the analysis. Traffic volume data will be requested from the County of Sonoma and City of Santa Rosa, but for the purposes of this scope it is assumed that Fehr & Peers would need to collect 12 traffic counts at study intersections for the circulation system analysis. Pre-pandemic counts are generally not allowable to pass Caltrans District 4 review; if improvements are identified on the State Highway System, Caltrans District 4 review will eventually be required as part of Project implementation.

Intersection operations Levels of Service (LOS) will be calculated for the study intersections for the weekday AM peak hour and weekday PM peak hour using methodologies from the Highway Capacity Manual, 6th Edition as applied in the Synchro software analysis package. The circulation analysis will include an analysis of Existing, Existing plus Project, Cumulative (Year 2040) and Cumulative plus Project Conditions. This scope includes LOS

calculation for one Plus Project condition.

Cumulative conditions volumes will be based on information from the SCTA travel demand model updated as part of Task 1. Plus Project scenario traffic volumes will be based on trip generation calculations (using data from the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 11th Edition and the MXD+ trip generation tool); these estimated Project trips will be distributed through the roadway system and assigned to turning movements at the study intersections. Plus Project scenario operations will be compared against the relevant No Project scenario to assess if the Project results in new deficiencies using criteria identified in the Guidelines for Traffic Impact Studies; if new deficiencies are found to occur, improvement measures will be identified to remedy the deficiencies.

A stand-alone technical memorandum will be prepared to document the data, analysis, calculations, and results of the informational (non-CEQA) circulation system analysis. This includes one draft memo and one final memo responding to one round of consolidated comments (up to 8 hours of staff time to respond to comments).

Task T6 –Meetings/Conference Calls. Fehr & Peers will participate in up to four team conference calls as part of this Project. Fehr & Peers will also attend up to two four-hour evening meetings as part of the Project entitlement process.

- *Wildfire (D&B).* Outside of the SDC core campus, there are areas of high to very high Fire Hazard Severity Zones west of Highway 12, areas of high fire hazard severity in the hills, and areas of moderate fire hazards severity zones in the vicinity of Suttonfield Lake and Fern Lake. D&B will build upon analysis in the SDC Specific Plan EIR and review the developer's site plans to analyze impacts for wildfire. Further, the developer's Memorandum on Emergency Preparedness and Evacuation Plan prepared by Kittelson & Associates will also inform the project-specific impact analysis on emergency response and evacuation.

Wildfire Evacuation Analysis (CAS). To support the wildfire analysis, CAS Safety Consulting will analyze the Proposed Specific Plan and Eldridge Renewal Project's impact on evacuation and emergency access. The team will perform the following:

- Review the project description, tentative map, and scope.
- Collaborate with traffic and fire experts to validate assumptions and conclusions.
- Review the Sonoma County Evacuation Plan, and the Alert and Warning Annex.
- Assess the adequacy of emergency access, including the project's proximity to existing fire and public safety services.
- Identify alternative evacuation plans based on the location and dynamics of potential emergencies.
- Analyze evacuation zones within the project's sphere of influence.
- Evaluate maps and personally conduct site visits to observe and assess viable evacuation routes, constrained evacuation areas, and other hindered areas such as schools, business parks, etc.
- Assess the project's potential impacts on existing County of Sonoma emergency

and evacuation plans.

- Review any additional reports, documents, or presentations that may guide our evaluation.

In addition, CAS Safety will collaborate with decision-makers, stakeholders, and other experts to develop feasible mitigation measures and alternatives to avoid or reduce evacuation and emergency access impacts, including:

- Review of traffic modeling, fire hazard, and EIR reports.
- Consultation with local public safety officials to ensure evacuation risk assessments are grounded in verified data.
- Adherence to the California Attorney General's Best Practices for Analyzing and Mitigating Wildfire Impacts of Development Projects Under CEQA.

Deliverables include a report with recommendations for emergency evacuation planning and a report on construction evacuation measures to ensure safety and compliance. For any reasonably foreseeable hazard scenarios not analyzed, justification based on substantial evidence will be provided in the report.

- (5) **Alternatives (Team, F&P, P&T).** Our team will analyze four alternatives (including the No Project Alternative) that are capable of substantially reducing or eliminating project impacts while also attaining the key policy and planning objectives identified by the State Legislature for the site. The analysis will consider alternatives that 1) may "attain most of the basic objectives of the project," 2) reduce or avoid the project's impacts, and 3) are "potentially feasible." The analysis will also include a brief discussion of alternatives considered but not carried forward, where alternatives that do not meet this three-part test will be discussed. Although the analysis of alternatives will be less detailed than that for the project, sufficient analysis will be provided on both the programmatic and project-level magnitude of each impact to understand the consequences and tradeoffs associated with each policy approach. Fehr & Peers will provide a quantitative analysis of traffic impacts for each alternative, not including traffic impacts for the No Project Alternative which will be assessed qualitatively. Page & Turnbull will also include analysis of the Enhanced Building Preservation Alternative's feasibility, including the ability for historic buildings to be adaptively reused for residential purposes. This analysis will be based on Van Meter William Pollack's study of up to 18 buildings. The analysis will consider both the feasibility to adaptively reuse the buildings as well as the ability of potential reuse projects to retain the historic features of the buildings (and thus allow the buildings to remain contributors to the historic district). The Alternative analysis will also include discussion of the potential for new construction within historic district boundaries to affect the historic district. These analyses will feed into a broader conclusion.
- (6) **Other Required CEQA Sections (D&B).** In addition to project impacts analysis and assessment of alternatives, Dyett & Bhatia will address all standard required CEQA Sections as follows:
- *Significant and Unavoidable Impacts.* Dyett & Bhatia will describe those significant impacts that,

despite all feasible mitigation, cannot be reduced to a less than significant level. Dyett & Bhatia is familiar with different approaches to such impacts, their relationship to a potential statement of overriding considerations and findings, and that long-range planning efforts often require balancing such impacts with other social and economic benefits of the project.

- *Significant, Irreversible Environmental Changes.* As required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15126, the EIR will present information on the extent to which the Proposed Project would result in an irreversible commitment of environmental resources. Based on our recent EIR experience, such findings have become more relevant for plans when considering non-renewable energy demand and climate change.
- *Cumulative Impacts.* CEQA Guidelines define cumulative impacts as that consisting of an impact which is created as a result of the combination of the Proposed Project and other projects causing related impacts. Cumulative analysis will focus on issues such as vehicle miles traveled, regional air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, and services and utilities, etc.
- *Growth-Inducing Impacts.* As required by State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2, the EIR will assess the ways in which the Proposed Project could, either directly or indirectly, foster economic or population growth (e.g., job creation that substantially exceeds housing supply), the construction of additional housing, or the extension of arterials or infrastructure (e.g., sewer lines) in outlying areas that may contribute to or stimulate future growth.
- *Impacts Found Not to Be Significant.* Dyett & Bhatia will summarize potential environmental impact where no significant impacts were identified, including any resource categories “scoped out” in the NOP.

<i>Meetings</i>	<i>Products</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Admin Draft EIR (D&B, Team)

4-D: Draft EIR Preparation and Public Review

- (1) **Draft EIR (Team).** Dyett & Bhatia will prepare the public review Draft EIR, incorporating changes in response to the County’s comments. Dyett & Bhatia assumes that our team will receive one consolidated set of comments on the ADEIR from County staff, ideally in track changes with comments as needed. Dyett & Bhatia will then prepare and submit a Revised Draft EIR for County staff to confirm that staff comments have been adequately addressed. Following this, one electronic copy of a “screen check” will be provided for final review. Following any final revisions, Dyett & Bhatia will produce the public review Draft EIR, and provide electronic copies of Word and PDF versions.
- (2) **Notice of Completion (D&B, Staff).** D&B will prepare an electronic copy of the Notice of Completion (NOC) to accompany the required copies of the DEIR to the State Clearinghouse. The team assumes one round of County review and comment on the NOC and that D&B will be responsible for distributing the NOC and DEIR to the State Clearinghouse.
- (3) **Notice of Availability (D&B, Staff).** D&B will prepare an electronic copy of the Notice of

Availability (NOA) of the DEIR for County staff filing with the Sonoma County Clerk/Recorder. D&B assumes that one round of County review and comment on the NOA will be required. County staff will be responsible for local noticing; D&B will be responsible for distributing the NOA along with the NOC to the State Clearinghouse.

<i>Meetings</i>	<i>Products</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Revised Admin. Draft EIR (D&B, Team)</i> <i>Public Review Draft EIR (D&B, Team)</i> <i>Electronic copies: PDF and Word</i> <i>Notice of Completion (D&B, Staff)</i> <i>Notice of Availability (D&B, Staff)</i>

TASK 5: ADOPTION AND FINALIZATION

5-A: Response to Comments and Final Specific Plan and EIR (Team). Our team will prepare a Final Specific Plan Update, as well as a Final EIR that addresses all comments received on the Draft EIR. The Specific Plan updates will be modified as need to ensure accurate responses to relevant EIR comments. The final Specific Plan Update will be fully formatted and submitted to the County in a PDF format as well as a redlined Word document.

Changes to the Draft EIR text will be made in strikeout/underline formatting to permit easy tracking of all changes. The Final EIR will include appropriately detailed responses to all written and oral comments received. Each comment related to the merits of the environmental analysis will be addressed. Where comments raise common concerns or questions, master responses will be used to give a single, comprehensive response to the recurring comments and to improve readability of the document by avoiding repetition and multiple cross-references. Master responses will directly address specific comments and questions raised. Given the volume of comments on the 2022 EIR, this scope of work anticipates up to 400 hours of consultant time to prepare responses to comments and other Final EIR components; however, Dyett & Bhatia recommends that the County set aside a contingency in case the actual volume of comments is higher.

Dyett & Bhatia anticipates that responses that are within the scope of work and budget will consist of relatively detailed explanations, elaborations, or clarifications of the data contained in the Draft EIR, as well as minor corrections of background information. However, if substantive new analysis or issues that could not have been anticipated or new alternatives, or substantial project changes need to be addressed, or if the effort exceeds the budgeted amount because of the number or complexity of responses, a contract amendment may be required.

Dyett & Bhatia will provide an electronic copy of the administrative draft Final EIR in Word and PDF for County staff review. Upon receipt of one set of consolidated staff comments, if possible, in track changes with comments as needed, our team will provide a “screen check” draft in Word and PDF for final review by County staff to ensure that County comments on the Draft Final EIR have been addressed to the County’s satisfaction. Dyett & Bhatia will then incorporate final

changes and submit the Final EIR to the County.

5-B: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (D&B, Team). Dyett & Bhatia will closely coordinate with County staff on the development of mitigation measures and the required Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP). Clear lines of responsibility for implementation would also be included, along with timing. As the MMRP will be integral to tracking performance standards and achievement of programmatic mitigations, D&B will work closely with County staff on development of the MMRP and identification of appropriate tracking mechanisms.

5-C: Public Hearings (D&B). Dyett & Bhatia will present the Draft and Final EIR at up to five hearings/meetings of the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors, which may include joint meetings if appropriate. D&B will work with staff to decide how to best distribute the hearings/meetings. If staff chooses to conduct a Planning Commission meeting during the public review period, a second Planning Commission meeting will need to be held after the completion of the Draft and Final EIR for the Planning Commission to make a recommendation on the Draft and Final EIR. The Board of Supervisors will have the final authority to certify (or decline to certify) the EIR.

5-D: Notice of Determination (D&B). Upon certification of the Final EIR, staff will prepare a Notice of Determination for the Final EIR, which staff will be responsible for filing and distributing within 5 days of certification.

5-E: Findings and Statement of Overriding Consideration (D&B). D&B will prepare Findings and a Statement of Overriding Considerations as required under CEQA Guidelines sections 15091 and 15093, respectively.

<i>Meetings</i>	<i>Products</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>Planning Commission and Board of Supervisor Hearings (up to 3)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>Admin Draft Final EIR (D&B, Team)</i><i>Screen Check Draft Final EIR (D&B, Team)</i><i>Final EIR (D&B, Team)</i><i>Mitigation Measures and Monitoring and Reporting Plan, if needed (D&B)</i><i>Notice of Determination (D&B)</i><i>Findings and Statement of Overriding Consideration</i>

SCOPE OF WORK ASSUMPTIONS

Our Scope of Work and budget is based on the following assumptions:

- Invoices.* Invoices will be based on hourly costs and direct costs incurred and will be submitted monthly.
- Meeting Attendance.* The budget assumes attendance at meetings as shown in the Scope of Work. Costs of additional meeting attendance would be on a time and materials basis if requested; such

costs are not included within the guaranteed maximum fee. Bi-weekly (every two weeks) coordination phone/Zoomcalls with staff will be held.

- *Final EIR Effort.* Because the effort to prepare the Final EIR (Response to Comments on the Draft EIR) is not predictable in advance, our budget assumes up to 461 hours of team time will be sufficient for this task. Additional effort will be additional services and we recommend a contingency in case voluminous comments are received.
- *Consolidated Comments and Direction.* County staff will provide a single set of consolidated comments on the review drafts of all documents.
- *Number of Review Drafts.* Each product will be finalized following one round of staff review. For the Draft EIR, one additional round of review will be provided to review/confirm edits made in response to staff comments on the previous round; no new comments on material previously reviewed by staff are budgeted. Prior to publication, electronic Screencheck drafts of documents will be provided.
- *Electronic Documents.* Dyett & Bhatia will provide digital files of documents in InDesign (Specific Plan) and Word (EIR) and Adobe PDF formats, available by electronic transfer. Files will be provided both in high-resolution format for printing as well as low-resolution for posting on the County's website. Maps will be provided in native file formats (Illustrator or ArcGIS) upon conclusion of the project.
- *Printing.* Printing is not assumed in our budget. Dyett & Bhatia would be happy to print hard copies of documents for an additional cost.
- *Travel Expenses, Mailing Costs, and Other Direct Costs.* The budget includes direct costs related to the project, including travel expenses, database searches, and other similar reimbursable items. County staff will be responsible for any filing fee.
- *Reallocation by Task/Subconsultant.* Dyett & Bhatia reserves the right to reallocate budget by task or consultant team member, provided the overall project budget is not affected.

B: Timeline

This proposal outlines about 25 weeks for preparation of the Administrative Draft of the EIR, including time to prepare the project description and confirm details with the County and the Applicant and time to complete technical modeling of traffic, air, GHG, and noise impacts as well as the emergency evacuation analysis. Accordingly, the Public Review Draft EIR would be released 32 weeks following project inception. Given the public review and the staff review periods, the total project timeline is anticipated to be about nine months.

<i>Tasks and Major Milestones</i>	<i>Responsibility</i>	<i>Duration (Days)</i>	<i>Target Completion Date</i>
Task 1: Project Initiation		1	5/12/25
Kick-Off Meeting	ALL		
Task 2: Project Description and Alternatives			
Draft Project Description Submitted	D&B	21	6/2/25
County/Applicant Review	County/Applicant	7	6/9/25
Project Description Finalized	D&B	7	6/16/25

Task 3: Scoping			
Notice of Preparation Released	D&B	4	6/20/25
Tribal Consultation Letters Sent	D&B	0	6/20/25
Scoping Meeting	D&B	0	7/17/25
End of Scoping Period	-	30	7/20/25
Task 4: Technical Input			
Technical Traffic Modeling	F&P	45	7/31/25
Emergency Evacuation Report	F&P	56	8/11/25
AQ/GHG/Noise Modeling	D&B	21	9/15/25
Task 5: Administrative Draft EIR (ADEIR) Preparation			
Administrative Draft EIR	D&B	98	9/22/25
County Review	County	21	10/13/25
Task 6: Draft EIR (DEIR) Preparation and Public Review			
Screencheck DEIR	D&B	14	10/27/25
Public Review DEIR and Notices	D&B	7	11/3/25
Public Review Starts	ALL	0	11/3/25
Planning Commission +Advisory Meeting	ALL	30	12/4/25
Public Review Ends	ALL	45	12/18/25
Task 7: Final EIR (FEIR) and Hearings			
Administrative Draft Final EIR & MMRP	D&B	35	1/22/26
County Review	County	14	2/5/26
Screencheck Final EIR & MMRP	D&B	7	2/12/26
County Review	County	7	2/19/26
Final EIR & MMRP	D&B	6	2/25/26
Final EIR Circulated for 10 Days	ALL	0	2/25/26
Final EIR Circulation Ends	ALL	10	3/7/26
Planning Commission Hearing	ALL		3/26/26
Board of Supervisors Hearing	ALL		4/26/26
Notice of Determination (within 5 days for certification)			TBD

Exhibit C

Budget

The tables following explain the proposed budget in detail: Hours by Person by Task, and Budget by Person by Task. The total budget for the project is \$913,997, inclusive of a 10 percent contingency. This is a guaranteed maximum fee and includes all items in the Scope of Work. Sub-contractors' costs and direct costs will be billed with no administrative markup or handling fee.

SDC Specific Plan Update and EIR on Specific Plan and Eldridge Renewal

HOURS BY TASK

	Task 1	Task 2	Task 3	Task 4					Task 5	TOTAL
	Project Initiation & Management	Adaptive Reuse Study Update	Specific Plan Update	EIR					Hearings (3)	
				Scoping	Project Description and Alternatives Definition	Admin. Draft EIR	Draft EIR	Final EIR		
Dyett & Bhatia										
Rajeev Bhatia, Principal	3	24	38	4	16	40	16	24	12	177
Andrew Hill, Principal			16	8	32	220	60	60	30	426
Clare Kucera, Associate	8		16	12	80	400	120	180	18	834
Helen Pierson, Associate		50	110			120	16			296
Planner/Urban Designer II		24	70		24	300	24	116		558
Planner I						120	16			136
Sr. GIS Specialist	3		50		30	60	16			159
Project Associate	3	12	40	8		40	24	20		147
Sub-Total	17	110	340	32	182	1,300	292	400	60	2,733
CAS Safety Consulting										
CAS Safety Consulting	4			20	20	20	10	10	24	108
Sub-Total	4	0	0	20	20	20	10	10	24	108
Far Western										
Cassidy DeBaker	8					69	4	2	1	84
Montserrat Osterlye	16					99	4	2	1	122
Summer Hagerty						65	4	1		70
Brooke Harder	4					6				10
Ashley Tanner	1									1
Valarie Townsend	1									1
Ozlem St. Clair	1									1
Melissa Johnson	1									1
Shannon DeArmond						11				11
Jill Bradeen						58				58
Chelsea Meredith						2				2
Kaely Colligan						6				6
Ariadna Gonzales Aguilera						16				16
Kathy Davis						4				4
Phil Kaijankoski						12				12
Michael Pardee						6				6
Elizabeth Sterling						32				32
Aileen Louie						4				4
Field Technician						10				10
Sub-Total	32	0	0	0	0	400	12	5	2	451
WRA										
Principal	1					4				5
Staff	1					40	12	18	4	75
Senior Biologist	3				1	22	15	22	4	67
Sub-Total	5	0	0	0	1	66	27	40	8	147
Charles M. Salter Associates										
Vice President							8			8
Associate							20			20
Sub-Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	0	0	28
Van Meter Williams Pollack										
Partner		20								20
Associate Principal		20								20
Job Captain/UD3		80								80
Sub-Total	0	120	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	120
Page & Turnbull										
Christina Dikas, Principal/Project Manager	8		20			14	6	2		50
Ruth Todd, Advisory Principal			3			2				5
Stacy Kozakavich, Senior Cultural Resources Planner	1					34	6	4	2	47
Greg Yanito, Planner/Urban Designer	1		16			4	2			23
Sub-Total	10	0	39	0	0	54	14	6	2	125
Fehr & Peers										
Project Manager	2					136		24		162
Principal-in-Charge	10					55		6	6	77
Forecasting Expert						18				18
Engineer/Planner						264		8		272
Admin/Graphics	2					65		2		69
Sub-Total						538				598
TOTAL HOURS	68	230	379	52	203	2,378	383	461	96	4,190

SDC Specific Plan Update and EIR on Specific Plan and Eldridge Renewal
BUDGET BY TASK

		Task 1	Task 2	Task 3	Task 4					Task 5	TOTAL
	Hourly Rate	Project Initiation & Management	Adaptive Reuse Study Update	Specific Plan Update	EIR					Hearings (3)	
					Scoping	Project Description and Alternatives Definition	Admin. Draft EIR	Draft EIR	Final EIR		
Dyett & Bhatia											
Rajeev Bhatia, Principal	\$ 260	\$ 780	\$ 6,240	\$ 9,880	\$ 1,040	\$ 4,160	\$ 10,400	\$ 4,160	\$ 6,240	\$ 3,120	\$ 46,020
Andrew Hill, Principal	255	-	-	4,080	2,040	8,160	56,100	15,300	15,300	7,650	108,630
Clare Kucera, Associate	180	1,440	-	2,880	2,160	14,400	72,000	21,600	32,400	3,240	150,120
Helen Pierson, Associate	180	-	9,000	19,800	-	-	21,600	2,880	-	-	53,280
Planner/Urban Designer II	140	-	3,360	9,800	-	3,360	42,000	3,360	16,240	-	78,120
Planner I	140	-	-	-	-	-	16,800	2,240	-	-	19,040
Sr. GIS Specialist	165	495	-	8,250	-	4,950	9,900	2,640	-	-	26,235
Project Associate	105	315	1,260	4,200	840	-	4,200	2,520	2,100	-	15,435
Direct Cost		50	100	100	20		700	50		140	1,160
Sub-Total		3,080	19,960	58,990	6,100	35,030	233,700	54,750	72,280	14,150	498,040
CAS Safety Consulting											
CAS Safety Consulting	\$ 350	1,400			7,000	7,000	7,000	3,500	3,500	8,400	37,800
Sub-Total		1,400	-	-	7,000	7,000	7,000	3,500	3,500	8,400	37,800
Far Western											
Cassidy DeBaker	\$ 203	1,627			-	-	14,029	813	407	203	17,079
Montserrat Osterlye	123	1,971			-	-	12,196	493	246	123	15,029
Summer Hagerty	90	-			-	-	5,831	359	90	-	6,279
Brooke Harder	112	449			-	-	673	-	-	-	1,121
Ashley Tanner	108	108			-	-	-	-	-	-	108
Valarie Townsend	100	100			-	-	-	-	-	-	100
Ozlem St. Clair	117	117			-	-	-	-	-	-	117
Melissa Johnson	147	147			-	-	-	-	-	-	147
Shannon DeArmond	203	-			-	-	2,237	-	-	-	2,237
Jill Bradeen	105	-			-	-	6,070	-	-	-	6,070
Chelsea Meredith	85	-			-	-	170	-	-	-	170
Kaely Colligan	120	-			-	-	718	-	-	-	718
Ariadna Gonzales Aguilera	84	-			-	-	1,340	-	-	-	1,340
Kathy Davis	120	-			-	-	478	-	-	-	478
Phil Kaijankoski	203	-			-	-	2,440	-	-	-	2,440
Michael Pardee	126	-			-	-	756	-	-	-	756
Elizabeth Sterling	114	-			-	-	3,636	-	-	-	3,636
Aileen Louie	72	-			-	-	287	-	-	-	287
Field Technician	84	-			-	-	837	-	-	-	837
Direct Cost							1,808	564			2,372
Sub-Total		4,517	-	-	-	-	53,504	2,229	743	327	61,320
WRA											
Principal	\$ 301	151			-	-	1,204	-	-	-	1,355
Staff	144	144			-	-	5,760	1,728	2,592	576	10,800
Senior Biologist	262	786			-	262	5,764	3,930	5,764	1,048	17,554
Direct Cost					-	-	83	-	-	-	83
Sub-Total		1,081	-	-	-	262	12,811	5,658	8,356	1,624	29,792
Charles M. Salter Associates											
Vice President	\$ 325	-			-	-	-	2,600	-	-	2,600
Associate	225	-			-	-	-	4,500	-	-	4,500
Sub-Total		-	-	-	-	-	-	7,100	-	-	7,100
Van Meter Williams Pollack											
Partner	\$ 250		5,000								5,000
Associate Principal	\$ 200		4,000								4,000
Job Captain/UD3	\$ 155		12,400								12,400
Sub-Total		-	21,400	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21,400
Page & Turnbull											
Christina Dikas, Principal/Project Manager	\$ 265	2,120	-	5,300	-	-	3,710	1,590	530	-	13,250
Ruth Todd, Advisory Principal	\$ 305	-	-	915	-	-	610	-	-	-	1,525
Stacy Kozakovich, Senior Cultural Resource Specialist	\$ 195	195	-	-	-	-	6,630	1,170	780	390	9,165
Greg Yanito, Planner/Urban Designer	\$ 195	195	-	3,120	-	-	780	390	-	-	4,485
Direct Cost					-	-	500	-	-	-	500
Sub-Total		2,510	-	9,335	-	-	12,230	3,150	1,310	390	28,925
Fehr & Peers											
Project Manager	\$ 225	450	-	-	-	-	30,600	-	5,400	-	36,450
Principal-in-Charge	\$ 340	3,400	-	-	-	-	18,700	-	2,040	2,040	26,180
Forecasting Expert	\$ 300	-	-	-	-	-	5,400	-	-	-	5,400
Engineer/Planner	\$ 190	-	-	-	-	-	50,160	-	1,520	-	51,680
Admin/Graphics	\$ 170	340	-	-	-	-	11,050	-	340	-	11,730
Direct Cost							15,090				15,090
Sub-Total		4,190	-	-	-	-	131,000	-	9,300	2,040	146,530
TOTAL FEE		16,778	41,360	68,325	13,100	42,292	450,245	76,387	95,489	26,931	830,906

Note: Far Western's budget for preparation of a Cultural Resources Master Plan and Fehr and Peers' budget for Level of Service analysis is included within the Administrative Draft/Draft EIR budgets

10% Contingency 83,091

Total 913,997

Exhibit D

With respect to performance of work under this Agreement, Consultant shall maintain and shall require all of its subcontractors, consultants, and other agents to maintain insurance as described below unless such insurance has been expressly waived by the attachment of a *Waiver of Insurance Requirements*. Any requirement for insurance to be maintained after completion of the work shall survive this Agreement.

County reserves the right to review any and all of the required insurance policies and/or endorsements, but has no obligation to do so. Failure to demand evidence of full compliance with the insurance requirements set forth in this Agreement or failure to identify any insurance deficiency shall not relieve Consultant from, nor be construed or deemed a waiver of, its obligation to maintain the required insurance at all times during the performance of this Agreement.

1. Workers Compensation and Employers Liability Insurance

- a. Required if Consultant has employees as defined by the Labor Code of the State of California.
- b. Workers Compensation insurance with statutory limits as required by the Labor Code of the State of California.
- c. Employers Liability with minimum limits of \$1,000,000 per Accident; \$1,000,000 Disease per employee; \$1,000,000 Disease per policy.
- d. Required Evidence of Insurance: Certificate of Insurance.

If Consultant currently has no employees as defined by the Labor Code of the State of California, Consultant agrees to obtain the above-specified Workers Compensation and Employers Liability insurance should employees be engaged during the term of this Agreement or any extensions of the term.

2. General Liability Insurance

- a. Commercial General Liability Insurance on a standard occurrence form, no less broad than Insurance Services Office (ISO) form CG 00 01.
- b. Minimum Limits: \$1,000,000 per Occurrence; \$2,000,000 General Aggregate; \$2,000,000 Products/Completed Operations Aggregate. The required limits may be provided by a combination of General Liability Insurance and Commercial Excess or Commercial Umbrella Liability Insurance. If Consultant maintains higher limits than the specified minimum limits, County requires and shall be entitled to coverage for the higher limits maintained by Consultant.
- c. Any deductible or self-insured retention shall be shown on the Certificate of Insurance. If the deductible or self-insured retention exceeds \$100,000 it must be approved in advance by County. Consultant is responsible for any deductible or self-insured retention and shall fund it upon County's written request, regardless of whether Consultant has a claim against the insurance or is named as a party in any action involving the County.
- d. **County of Sonoma, its officers, agents, and employees** shall be endorsed as additional insureds for liability arising out of operations by or on behalf of the Consultant in the performance of this Agreement.
- e. The insurance provided to the additional insureds shall be primary to, and non-contributory with, any insurance or self-insurance program maintained by them.
- f. The policy definition of "insured contract" shall include assumptions of liability arising out of both ongoing operations and the products-completed operations hazard (broad form contractual liability coverage including the "f" definition of insured contract in ISO form CG 00 01, or equivalent).
- g. The policy shall cover inter-insured suits between the additional insureds and Consultant and

include a “separation of insureds” or “severability” clause which treats each insured separately.

h. Required Evidence of Insurance:

- i.** Certificate of Insurance.

3. Automobile Liability Insurance

- a.** Minimum Limit: \$1,000,000 combined single limit per accident. The required limits may be provided by a combination of Automobile Liability Insurance and Commercial Excess or Commercial Umbrella Liability Insurance.
- b.** Insurance shall cover all owned autos. If Consultant currently owns no autos, Consultant agrees to obtain such insurance should any autos be acquired during the term of this Agreement or any extensions of the term.
- c.** Insurance shall cover hired and non-owned autos.
- d. Required Evidence of Insurance:** Certificate of Insurance.

4. Professional Liability/Errors and Omissions Insurance

- a.** Minimum Limit: \$1,000,000 per claim or per occurrence.
- b.** Any deductible or self-insured retention shall be shown on the Certificate of Insurance. If the deductible or self-insured retention exceeds \$100,000 it must be approved in advance by County.
- c.** If the insurance is on a Claims-Made basis, the retroactive date shall be no later than the commencement of the work.
- d.** Coverage applicable to the work performed under this Agreement shall be continued for two (2) years after completion of the work. Such continuation coverage may be provided by one of the following: (1) renewal of the existing policy; (2) an extended reporting period endorsement; or (3) replacement insurance with a retroactive date no later than the commencement of the work under this Agreement.
- e. Required Evidence of Insurance:** Certificate of Insurance specifying the limits and the claims-made retroactive date.

5. Standards for Insurance Companies

Insurers, other than the California State Compensation Insurance Fund, shall have an A.M. Best's rating of at least A:VII.

6. Documentation

- a.** The Certificate of Insurance must include the following reference: **24-25-020 Dyett & Bhatia.**
- b.** All required Evidence of Insurance shall be submitted prior to the execution of this Agreement. Consultant agrees to maintain current Evidence of Insurance on file with County for the entire term of this Agreement and any additional periods if specified in Sections 1 – 4 above.
- c.** The name and address for Additional Insured endorsements and Certificates of Insurance is:
County of Sonoma, its officers, agents, and employees
Attn: Permit Sonoma
2550 Ventura Ave
Santa Rosa, California 95403.
- d.** Required Evidence of Insurance shall be submitted for any renewal or replacement of a policy that already exists, at least ten (10) days before expiration or other termination of the existing policy.
- e.** Consultant shall provide immediate written notice if: (1) any of the required insurance policies is terminated; (2) the limits of any of the required policies are reduced; or (3) the deductible or self-insured retention is increased.
- f.** Upon written request, certified copies of required insurance policies must be provided within thirty (30) days.

7. Policy Obligations

Consultant's indemnity and other obligations shall not be limited by the foregoing insurance requirements.

8. Material Breach

If Consultant fails to maintain insurance which is required pursuant to this Agreement, it shall be deemed a material breach of this Agreement. County, at its sole option, may terminate this Agreement and obtain damages from Consultant resulting from said breach. Alternatively, County may purchase the required insurance, and without further notice to Consultant, County may deduct from sums due to Consultant any premium costs advanced by County for such insurance. These remedies shall be in addition to any other remedies available to County.