NAPA SANITATION DISTRICT

GHD - TASK ORDER No. 48

Browns Valley Trunk Project – CEQA (CIP #14703)

Date: _____

Issued under Professional Services Agreement dated 8/5/14.

To: GHD

Project Description:

Hazmat and CEQA Services

Description of Scope of Services to be performed by Consultant under this Task Order:

See Attachment 'A' – Scope of Services

Description of Services to be Provided by District:	See Attachment 'A' – Scope of Services
Deliverables:	See Attachment 'A' – Scope of Services
Consultant Project Manager:	Matt Winkelman, PE
Consultant Quality Control Manager:	Ted Whiton, PE
Schedule to Perform Services:	See Attachment 'A' – Scope of Services
Time & Materials Not-to-Exceed Cost Limit:	$147,792
	See Attachment 'A' – Scope of Services

APPROVALS:

GHD

By: _____ _____

Authorized Representative Date

NAPA SANITATION DISTRICT

By: _____ _____

Purchasing Agent Date

NSD Account No.: CIP 14703

ATTACHMENT 'A'

June 18, 2015

Mr. Andrew Damron, PE
Capital Program Manager
Napa Sanitation District
1515 Soscol Ferry Road
Napa, CA 94558

Our Ref: 840900569

RE: Proposal for Hazmat and CEQA Services – Browns Valley Trunk Predesign, Napa Sanitation District, Napa, CA

Dear Andrew:

GHD is pleased to submit this proposal and scope of work for professional environmental services related to a hazardous materials investigation and CEQA review for the Browns Valley Trunk Project. This scope of work is based on our understanding of the District's interest to complete the CEQA process during the project's predesign phase and prior to final selection of the trunk sewer alignment. The CEQA review will be based on the alignment study completed by the District in 2014. The scope of work and project team members noted herein will coordinate with the predesign project team.

Project Understanding

The Browns Valley Trunk (BVT) Project involves the construction of approximately three miles of 18- to 48-inch diameter gravity sewer pipeline between Browns Valley Road at Thompson Avenue and the West Napa Pump Station located on Coombs Street north of Imola Avenue. GHD prepared an Alignment Study for the BVT in September 2014 that evaluated various alignment alternatives, as well sub alternatives within each alternative. The recommended alternative was presented to the City of Napa for advanced planning of the sewer work ahead of planned City road work. Anticipated timing for sewer construction is 2017-18. Detailed design for the BVT is planned for 2016, following CEQA review and completion of the predesign phase.

While many factors were considered during the preparation of the alignment study, a detailed CEQA review has not yet been completed. Performing the CEQA review and a hazardous materials investigation during the predesign phase will provide the District with a more complete analysis of temporary and permanent impacts of the alternative alignments and also serve to refine the estimated cost of the project for budgeting purposes. The additional information and review resulting from the CEQA process will inform the final selection of the project alignment for the detailed design phase. Permitting for the project (i.e., Caltrans encroachment permit for Highway 29 crossing) will take place during the detailed design phase.

A detailed scope of work is provided below.

Project Approach

GHD is proposing a fast start for the hazardous materials investigation and initiation of the early stages of the CEQA evaluation to assist in screening the alternatives for the recommended alignment. GHD's approach to the hazardous materials and CEQA process are described below.

Hazardous Materials

The costs of managing contaminated materials can be significant and the cost of encountering contamination unexpectedly can result in project delays and even higher construction costs. GHD is proposing both a hazardous materials corridor study (desktop study) and limited soil boring investigation. The corridor study is completed using existing publicly available information to identify sites and areas where contamination is known or potentially present in the proposed alignment. The limited soil boring investigation will augment the desktop study to confirm groundwater levels in critical areas along the alignment and estimate likely pumping rates required to control groundwater in excavations. In reaches where contamination is suspected the anticipated construction methods will be evaluated for best practices with respect to handling of contaminated soils and/or groundwater.

CEQA Review

GHD will prepare an Initial Study for the Browns Valley Trunk pipe alignment alternatives. For the purpose of evaluation, we propose to divide the alignment into four reaches as described below. Reference Figure 4 in GHD's September 2014 Alignment Study.

Reach A would include the trunk sewer along Browns Valley Road between Thompson Avenue and Freeway Drive. No alternative route would be evaluated for Reach A.

Reach B would include the trunk sewer along Freeway Drive between Browns Valley Road and Old Sonoma Road. An alternate route would be along the west side of the shopping center off of Freeway Drive, then along Kilburn Avenue. The alternate route may also include a crossing beneath Highway 29 between Kilburn Avenue and Laurel Street, as well as trunk sewer along Laurel Street, Pine Street, and Walnut Street.

Reach C would include a crossing beneath Highway 29 at Old Sonoma Road, and trunk sewer east of Highway 29 along Old Sonoma Road, Jefferson Street, and Sycamore Street. An alternate route would include an extension of the trunk sewer along South Freeway Drive, with a crossing of Highway 29 near Colina Court, and trunk sewer east of Highway 29 along Locust Street, South Seymour Street, and Spruce Street.

Reach D would include the trunk sewer along South Franklin Street from Sycamore Street to South Coombs Street, and then along South Coombs Street from South Franklin Street to the West Napa Pump Station. An alternate route would be along Spruce Street between Franklin Street and Coombs Street, and then along South Coombs Street.

Each reach will be described and evaluated in the Initial Study. GHD will describe each reach as accurately as possible and provide flexibility in the project description to accommodate future changes.

Three technical studies will be prepared by GHD's subcontractors in support of the Initial Study to address trees, biological and cultural resources. GHD has an ongoing and long-standing relationship with the firms that will complete the technical studies and has successfully collaborated on numerous projects with them over recent years.

This scope of work assumes that the Initial Study will not evaluate potential future upgrades at the West Napa Pump Station. The need for such upgrades would be identified in a future Long Term Planning Study, which the District has identified as a separate CIP Project. Because the project would not serve new areas, would not induce growth, and can be operated independent of future changes to the pump station, the two projects are considered to each have independent utility.

Scope of Work

The detailed scope of work for the hazardous materials investigation (Tasks 1 and 2) and the CEQA Initial Study (Task 3) is provided below.

Task 1 – Hazardous Materials Corridor Study

Task 1.1 Screening Level Corridor Study

The corridor study is a desktop analysis of available information to identify sites and properties along the alignment where hazardous materials have historically been in use. GHD will order and evaluate an Environmental Data Resources (EDR) report for the alignment area. This report compiles all of the major regulatory lists of businesses that handle or use hazardous materials. It includes the investigation and cleanup sites typically found on the State of California's tracking system (GeoTracker). The EDR report also includes other sites were hazardous materials are, or have been, used but no investigation or cleanup is in process. The EDR listing will be used to identify potentially contaminating activities that have occurred along the alignment. These potentially contaminated sites are then mapped along the alignment. The types of sites that could affect the construction are automotive repair facilities, gasoline service stations, drycleaners, and the former industrial areas along Coombs Avenue.

The EDR report and GeoTracker database often contain enough groundwater elevation information for the preparation of a generalized groundwater elevation contour map. This information can be helpful when evaluating subsurface construction work to determine where the project excavations will intersect groundwater. This allows for evaluating the costs associated with dewatering trenches, managing contaminated groundwater, and managing soil which has been impacted by contaminated groundwater. As part of the screening level corridor study, GHD will prepare a figure overlying the groundwater elevation contours, ground surface contours, and the alignment.

Deliverables: A map of the alignment identifying contaminated and potentially contaminated sites, groundwater elevation contours, and ground surface elevation contours. The EDR report will be provided to the District in electronic format (pdf) upon request.

Task 1.2 Potential Soil Contamination Affecting Construction

GHD will review the data available for each of the contaminated or potentially contaminated sites to determine if soil contamination is likely to be found in the material that will be excavated during the project. For this project,

the primary concern is likely to be sewer laterals that have been used for the disposal of automotive fluids or dry cleaning chemicals. Soil may also be contaminated where it has come in contact with contaminated groundwater. In addition, in the Coombs Avenue area, some of the material used for fill has been found to contain hazardous materials at various concentrations. This information will be used to create estimates of the amount of soil that may require disposal to a landfill. The waste classification may be difficult to infer from the information that will be available. Because of this uncertainty a range of disposal costs will be provided.

Deliverables: Estimates of volume, tonnage, and costs associated with contaminated soil disposal.

Task 1.3 Potentially Contaminated Groundwater Affecting Construction

GHD will identify those sections of the alignment where dewatering may be required. Within these areas the concentration of contamination (if any) and flow rate will be estimated. This information will be used to assess the dewatering discharge options. The options that will be considered are:

- Discharging the uncontaminated water as construction dewatering under a general NPDES permit;
- Discharging low level contaminated water to the sanitary sewer; or
- Pre-treating (carbon) contaminated dewatering discharge to either the sanitary sewer or under a general NPDES permit.

Permitting for dewatering discharge is not included in this scope of services. The District will need to provide allowable limits for contaminated water that is discharged to the collection system and that reaches the WWTP.

Deliverables: A map identifying where dewatering is likely to be required along the alignment with a color coding key identifying the likely treatment requirement.

Task 1.4 Corridor Study Report

GHD will summarize the findings of the desktop evaluation in a report. This report will contain the following:

- A summary of the data reviewed and key findings of the study.
- A map of the alignment identifying contaminated and potentially contaminated sites, groundwater elevation contours, and ground surface elevation contours.
- Tabulated estimates of volume, tonnage, and costs associated with contaminated soil disposal.
- A map identifying where dewatering is likely to be required along the alignment with a color code key identifying the likely treatment requirement.

Deliverables: Three (3) bound hard copies and an electronic copy (pdf) of the draft and final Corridor Study.

Task 2 – Limited Soil Boring Investigation

This task includes fieldwork to confirm and refine the estimates developed under Task 1.

Task 2.1 Soil and Groundwater Field Investigation

The fieldwork will be conducted in specific locations where significant contamination is expected or the elevation of groundwater requires confirmation because of its potential impact on the project. GHD has estimated three days of drilling and sampling of soil and groundwater. The level of effort for the fieldwork will be confirmed with

the District prior to commencing. This confirmation will include the location of soil borings, number and type of samples, and the analysis to be conducted. The scope described here is provided for budgetary purposes.

- One day would be spent in the Coombs Avenue area where potentially contaminated fill material and industrial contamination is known to exist. The Coombs Avenue area also has relatively shallow groundwater, and groundwater salinity may be a factor for disposal under either a general NPDES permit or to the sanitary sewer.
- One day of fieldwork would be required to perform soil and/or groundwater sampling around other contaminated site(s) along the alignment.
- One day of fieldwork has been allocated for soil borings to evaluate groundwater elevation in one or more areas where groundwater may impact constructability along the alignment.
- The scope of work includes utility locating by a private company at each proposed boring, obtaining encroachment permits from the City of Napa, and obtaining drilling permits from the County of Napa and analytical cost which are expected to average $500 per sample.

This scope of services assumes that fieldwork can be conducted with a direct-push geoprobe rig and that the work will be performed in a public right-of-way using a traffic control subcontractor. For the purpose of preparing the fee estimate, GHD is assumes that soil and groundwater samples will be collected during all three days of fieldwork, which is anticipated to yield a total of 15 borings. Two soil samples and one groundwater sample will be collected from each of the soil borings. The analysis performed on the samples will depend on the suspected contamination that will be determined during the corridor study. For the purpose of establishing a budget for analytical work, a cost per sample has been used in the attached fee table.

Task 2.2 Soil and Groundwater Investigation Report

This report will be similar in format to the Corridor Study Report. The report will contain the following:

- A summary of the fieldwork methods and the key findings.
- A revised map of the alignment identifying contaminated and potentially contaminated sites, groundwater elevation contours, and ground surface elevation contours.
- Revised tabulated estimates of volume, tonnage and costs associated with contaminated soil disposal.
- A revised map identifying where dewatering is likely to be required along the alignment with a color code key identifying the likely treatment requirement.

Deliverables: Three (3) bound hard copies and an electronic copy (pdf) of the draft and final Soil and Groundwater Investigation Report.

Task 3 – CEQA Review

Task 3.1 Prepare Draft Initial Study

Project Description

GHD will review existing documentation for the project and develop a draft Project Description. The Project Description will contain the detail needed to allow a proper analysis of potential environmental impacts, including a summary of the project location, figures, objectives, characteristics, construction methods, schedule,

and required permits/approvals. The draft Project Description will be submitted to the District for review, and upon receipt of comments, will be finalized.

Technical Studies

In addition to the hazardous materials investigation described above, three technical studies will be prepared by GHD's subcontractors in support of the Initial Study.

Biological Study - GHD will contract with Jane Valerius Environmental Consulting for completion of a reconnaissance-level survey of the Browns Valley alignment to confirm that there are no wetlands or waters along the alignment that would potentially be affected. The survey will also be used to ensure that no other sensitive habitats are located along the alignment. A summary report will be provided and used in support of the Initial Study.

Tree Study - John C. Meserve Consulting Arborist will provide an inventory of potentially impacted trees for the proposed alignment and sub-alternatives (est. 200 trees). This will include an evaluation of potential impacts on affected trees, including trees that may need to be removed, a review and evaluation of alternate routes that may reduce tree impacts, a summary of the species, size, and condition of potentially impacted trees, and specifications for preservation or pruning of select trees.

Cultural Resources Study – The Sonoma State University, Anthropological Studies Center will conduct a cultural resources review for the project. This will include a search and summary of the records, maps, and documents on file for the project area at the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System, as well as contacting the Native American Heritage Commission and listed Native American communities and individuals regarding the project. As part of this effort, GHD will provide the District with a list and contact information of the appropriate tribal communities, as well as a draft letter, in order to facilitate consultation compliance under Assembly Bill 52, which goes into effect on July 1, 2015.

Administrative Draft Initial Study

GHD will prepare an Administrative Draft Initial Study for District review, which will include the Project Description, as well as a summary of existing conditions, analysis of potential environmental impacts associated with the project, and recommended mitigation measures to avoid or reduce potential significant impacts where necessary. Each environmental resource area included in the CEQA Guidelines Appendix G Environmental Checklist Form will be evaluated, including:

Aesthetics	Land Use and Planning
Agriculture and Forest Resources	Mineral Resources
Air Quality	Noise
Biological Resources	Population and Housing
Cultural Resources	Public Services
Geology and Soils	Recreation
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Transportation/Traffic
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Utilities and Service Systems
Hydrology and Water Quality	Mandatory Findings of Significance

In identifying potential impacts to the environment, GHD will take into account applicable laws and regulations that are protective of the environment. In many instances, the existence of such laws and regulations work to lessen potential impacts to levels that are not significant. Because compliance with applicable laws would be mandatory for the project, compliance with the requirements of such laws and regulations will generally not be identified separately as mitigation.

Public Review Draft

Following District review of the Administrative Draft Initial Study, GHD requests one annotated copy that provides consolidated comments. GHD will then revise the Initial Study and submit an electronic screen check draft for review prior to publication. After any additional minor changes, this version of the document will constitute the Initial Study / Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration to be printed and circulated for a 30-day public review under Task 3.2.

Deliverables: Draft Project Description; Administrative Draft Initial Study; Screen Check Draft Initial Study;

Task 3.2 Circulate Draft Report for Public Review

GHD will prepare required public notices for review, including a Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration and a Notice of Completion. GHD will develop a draft mailing list for District review, and will then print and distribute the Initial Study/Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration and required notices to the State Clearinghouse and applicable responsible and trustee agencies. GHD will also develop a notice for publication in a local newspaper of the District's choice. It is assumed that the District will be responsible for the newspaper posting fee.

Deliverables: Draft Initial Study/Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration (up to 15 hardcopies and 25 CDs); Notices and Mailing List

Task 3.3 Prepare Final Initial Study/MND

Following the 30-day public review period, GHD will prepare an Administrative Draft Final MND and Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP) for District review. The Administrative Draft will include written responses to agency and public comments received, and the MMP will identify assignments of responsibility and time frames for implementation of any mitigations measures. For purposes of calculating the budget for this task, we assume no more than 30 comments will be received. Following receipt of District comments, GHD will finalize the document. Copies of the Final Initial Study/MND will be prepared for District Board and District staff.

Deliverables: Administrative Draft Final Initial Study/MND; Final Initial Study/MND (10 copies or CDs)

Task 3.4 Conduct Presentation to District Board and File NOD

GHD's Project Manager will attend a public meeting for review and adoption of the Initial Study / Mitigated Negative Declaration. As needed, GHD will assist with the presentation at the meeting.

Following adoption of the Initial Study / Mitigated Negative Declaration, GHD will prepare and submit a Notice of Determination for use and filing by the District with the County Clerk. It is assumed that the District will be responsible for the County Clerk and California Fish & Wildlife filing fee.

Deliverables: Notice of Determination

Assumptions

- The accuracy of opinions of probable project costs will be commensurate with predesign level of accuracy for the BVT and planning level of accuracy for I/I program projects.
- Soil borings will be in accessible public rights-of-way not subject to Caltrans encroachment requirements.
- GHD will be responsible for the safety of its employees; GHD's subconsultants will be responsible for the safety of their employees.

Use of Documents Provided by Others

The scope of services provided above relies on information to be provided by others. This information will be assumed to be accurate. If data conflicts or suspected inaccuracies are found, GHD may recommend that additional information be obtained or seek consensus for the use of assumptions.

Project Schedule

Engineering services will commence upon issuance of Notice to Proceed for this scope of work, which is anticipated to follow the District's July 1, 2015 Board meeting. The estimated milestone schedule is presented below.

Table 1 Project Schedule

	Task	Completion Date
a.	Notice to Proceed	July 2015
b.	Initiate Corridor Study	July 2015
c.	Initiate CEQA Technical Studies	July 2015
d.	Corridor Study Report	August 2015
e.	Hazmat Field Investigation	Sept 2015
f.	CEQA Technical Study Reports	Sept/Oct 2015
g.	Hazmat Field Investigation Report	October 2015
h.	Develop Draft Initial Study Project Description	October 2015
i.	Develop Draft Initial Study	December 2015
j.	Prepare Final Initial Study/MND	March 2016

Schedule Task h is planned to coincide with preparation of the Draft Predesign Report with the intent to coordinate engineering, hydraulic evaluation, and CEQA analysis findings. The detailed design phase is anticipated to begin in January 2016. Early tasks for that scope of services will include topographic survey, geotechnical field investigation, positive utility verification (potholing), and further coordination with utility purveyors and Caltrans. Timing for the Final IS/MND in March 2016 will provide the design team with confirmation for the pipe alignment as design development progresses towards the first milestone deliverable of plans, specifications, and opinion of probable construction costs (i.e., 50% submittal).

Project Team

The following GHD personnel are assigned as project or technical leads for this project:

- Project Principal – Ted Whiton, PE
- Project Manager / Senior Engineer – Matt Winkelman, PE
- Project Hydrogeologist / Hazardous Materials – Kent O'Brien, PG, CEG
- CEQA Initial Study – Brian Bacciarini
- Quality Assurance/Quality Control – Ted Whiton, PE

Engineering Fee

Compensation for services for the basic scope of services provided herein shall be on a time and materials basis, for an estimated not-to-exceed fee of $147,792. See the attached detailed fee estimate.

Closing

It is assumed that upon agreement of the scope of services for the engineering services for the Browns Valley Trunk CEQA, the District will prepare a task order amendment for the Browns Valley Trunk Predesign contract that is consistent with the terms in our Master Agreement with the District. The Notice to Proceed will be the date when the District provides the signed, agreed-upon task order.

Please don't hesitate to contact me if you have any questions regarding the scope of work. I can be reached at (707) 236-1546. Thank you for the opportunity to serve the Napa sanitation District.

Sincerely,
GHD Inc.

Matthew J. Winkelman, PE

Project Manager

Attachments: Fee Estimate Spreadsheet

GHD - PROJECT FEE ESTIMATING SHEET

Project Name: Browns Valley Trunk CEQA
Prepared by: Kent O'Brien/Brian Bacciarini
Reviewed by: Matt Winkelman

Client: Napa Sanitation District
Date: June 18, 2015

Job Number: 840900569

		LABOR COSTS												FEE COMPUTATION									
Task / Item	LABOR CATEGORY > RATE >	Proj. Dir. / QA/QC $265 /Hr	Proj. Mgr / Sr. Engr. $205 /Hr	Lead Proj. Geo $200 /Hr	Project Env/Geo $160 /Hr	Staff Env/Geo $140 /Hr	Scientist/ Modeler $130 /Hr	Planner $115 /Hr	Graphics GIS $135 /Hr	CAD $135 /Hr	Admin / WP $100 /Hr	PA $100 /Hr	TOTAL HOURS	OTHER DIRECT COSTS (1)	SUB EDR Report[2]	SUB Utility Locator[3]	SUB Traff. Ctrl, Easement, Permits[4]	SUB Driller[5]	SUB Laboratory[6]	SUB Arborist	SUB Biologist	SUB Cultural	TOTAL FEE
Task 1 Desktop Analysis of Costs Related to Contamination																							
1.1 Screening Level Corridor Study		4	2	6	4	25	2		12	4			59	$354	$800								$10,384
1.2 Potential Soil Contamination Affecting Construction			1	10	2	12	2		8	4			39	$234									$6,319
1.3 Potentially Contaminated Groundwater Affecting Construction			1	8		12	2		8	4			35	$210									$5,575
1.4 Corridor Study Report		3	4	10	4	20	6		10	2	8	2	69	$414									$10,869
Subtotal Task 1		**7**	**8**	**34**	**10**	**69**	**12**	**0**	**38**	**14**	**8**	**2**	**202**	**$1,212**	**$800**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**				**$33,147**
Task 2 Field Work																							
2.1 Soil and Groundwater Field Investigation		2	2	8	2	60							74	$444		$2,070	$6,555	$9,200	$8,625				$38,154
2.1 Soil and Groundwater Investigation Report		4	2	10	4	12	4		10	6	8	2	62	$372									$9,842
Subtotal Task 2		**6**	**4**	**18**	**6**	**72**	**4**	**0**	**10**	**6**	**8**	**2**	**136**	**$816**	**$0**	**$2,070**	**$6,555**	**$9,200**	**$8,625**				**$47,996**
Task 3 CEQA Review																							
1.1 Prepare Draft Initial Study			12	2		70	106	84	12		20		306	$1,836						$6,325	$2,358	$2,070	$52,309
1.2 Circulate Draft Report for Public Review							8	10			6		24	$144									$2,934
1.3 Prepare Final Initial Study/MND			4			10	16	10			12		52	$312									$6,962
1.4 Conduct Presentation to District Board		2	12				8		2				24	$144									$4,444
Subtotal Task 3		**2**	**28**	**2**	**0**	**80**	**138**	**104**	**14**	**0**	**38**	**0**	**406**	**$2,436**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$6,325**	**$2,358**	**$2,070**	**$66,649**
Contingency																							
Contingency (0%)														$0									$0
Subtotal Contingency		**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**
PROJECT TOTALS		**15**	**40**	**54**	**16**	**221**	**154**	**104**	**62**	**20**	**54**	**4**	**744**	**$ 4,464**	**$ 800**	**$ 2,070**	**$ 6,555**	**$ 9,200**	**$ 8,625**	**$ 6,325**	**$ 2,358**	**$ 2,070**	**$ 147,792**

(1) OTHER DIRECT COSTS include telephone, mileage, printing, photocopies and other miscellaneous direct expenses.
(2) EDR Report - cost of ordering environmental data report from Environmental Data Resources.
(3) Utility Locator - cost of private utility locating company to clear each boring location for underground utilites.
(4) Traffic Control, Easements, Permits - cost for traffic control for each of the three days of drilling, cost of easement fees from the City of Napa, cost of drilling permits.
(5) Driller - cost of geoprobe rig for three days of site work. Inlcusive of drilling materials.
(6) Laboratory - costs of laboratory work. Calculated based on each sample costing $500 average. Two soil samples and one groundwater sample will be collected. Analytical cost suite and cost well vary for each boring.