June 6, 2016

City of Menlo Park
Community Development Department
Attn: Kyle Perata, Associate Planner

Re: Budget Amendment 4 for the Facebook Expansion Project Environmental Impact Report

Dear Mr. Perata,

ICF Jones & Stokes, Inc. (an ICF International company hereafter "ICF") submitted a Scope of Work (scope) for the environmental review of the Facebook Expansion Project Environmental Impact Report (EIR) on April 29, 2015, with Budget Amendment 1 (also known as Phase II) submitted on June 11, 2015; Budget Amendment 2 submitted on October 19, 2015; and Budget Amendment 3 submitted on February 29, 2016. As outlined in Appendix A, this budget amendment is for $71,928. ICF proposes to invoice costs monthly, on a time and materials basis.

ICF shall provide services, as outlined in the attached, under the terms and conditions of its existing contract number 1718 with the City of Menlo Park dated May 18, 2015. If you agree to authorize the tasks and costs associated with these items, please indicate your acceptance of this notice to proceed by signing this letter and returning it to me. If you have any questions, please contact Kirsten Chapman at 415-537-1702 or at kirsten.chapman@icfi.com.

Sincerely,

Trina L. Prince
Contracts Administrator
City of Menlo Park Approval

Name and Title

8/3/16

Date

OK

8/2/16
Scope of Work

Task 2. EIR Project Description

Our scope of work assumed one administrative draft submittal of the Project Description and one final version. The level of effort assumed in our scope of work assumed the Project Description would be based on one set of stable site plans and that revisions between the draft and final version would be somewhat minor in nature. Due to ongoing and multiple changes to the site plans and associated information, the level of effort associated with the Project Description is as beyond what was assumed in our original scope of work.

- The first draft of the EIR Project Description was submitted to the City on August 31, 2015. ICF addressed comments from the City/applicant and resubmitted the Project Description on December 18, 2015. The December 18 draft required a major overhaul due to significant changes to the Project.

- ICF received multiple iterations of the site plans, data needs responses, and development program information. Several versions of the data needs lists were received piecemeal in July, August, September, and October. In addition, ICF received revisions to the site plans on July 1, October 5, November 4, and November 19.
  - Each time the information was received, ICF needed to organize, review, distribute changes to the Project team, and update the Project Description and applicable EIR sections. In addition, tables and figures in the Project Description were updated several times.
  - Most recently, revised site plans that show changes to Building 22 and landscaping were submitted on March 4, 2016. ICF updated the Project Description and resource topic sections to account for the revisions.

Task 6. Administrative Draft EIR

After reviewing Project data needs responses and materials from the transportation analysis, additional, previously unknown, Project features required supplementary analysis for the Administrative Draft EIR. Additional tasks associated with the revised Project information include updating the Administrative Draft EIR sections per the revised Project Description (as described above), conducting further analysis for the Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emissions sections, and the senior review and editing associated with these tasks. Additional tasks conducted for Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emissions are described in more detail, below.
and not within the anticipated schedule. Multiple rounds of discussion, comment, and review of TJKM’s VMT traffic data was required before we could incorporate the data into the analysis.

ICF first received VMT by analysis scenario. There was some back-and-forth that occurred to determine what these scenarios represented and how to figure out the effect from the project only. ICF also had to request further disaggregation of the data, because the data-by-speed-bin that was provided did not correspond to what we requested. After further discussion with the team, it was determined that the first set of VMT data, which included indirect VMT from the project’s effect on the city-wide jobs/housing balance, would not be appropriate for the analysis. TJKM reevaluated the project VMT analysis to only include the direct effects from the project. The revised direct-effect-only VMT was provided by TJKM as singular values for 2020 and 2040 and not by speed bin as was requested. Back-and-forth correspondence was required with TJKM to determine that they could not provide data by speed bin, and that using the speed bin ratios from the first set of VMT would be the best option to apply to the revised VMT. It is ICF’s preference to wait until all data is received before including it in the model and analysis, but due to schedule constraints from the applicant, ICF needed to incorporate the data as it was received. To keep the analysis on track to meet the schedule, ICF needed to incorporate the data as it came in, which resulted in the need to revise the transportation component of the AQ analysis when the second set of VMT data (direct-effect only) were provided.

- **Construction data.** ICF received multiple iterations of construction data, which required us to revise our emissions assumptions and analysis as updated data was made available. Due to the amount of data that was received, it took more effort than would typically be required since the data had to be cataloged and models updated multiple times.

- **Cumulative analysis.** The approach to the cumulative analysis was a novel approach that was developed after the Project was initiated that required additional effort not anticipated in the original SOW. Specifically, the approach to the cumulative analysis required that the demolition of Buildings 307 – 309 be modeled independently of the Project. Thus, two full construction-related impact analyses were necessary.

**Task 7. Project Alternatives and Other CEQA Considerations**

- ICF wrote an alternatives memo and submitted it to the City on February 5, 2016. ICF determined the Reduced Intensity Alternative based on VMT reduction. The original scope of work assumed that TJKM would conduct the sensitivity analysis. The memo required additional Air Quality modeling and a write-up that were beyond the original scope of work.
average") modeling methodology. If those findings were still elevated, ICF would then implement a more refined approach.

- ICF reran all modeling phases (revised emissions approach; existing dispersion and HRA approaches) for the Project level impacts. This revised the emissions modeling to represent the newly provided emissions and construction schedule. Dispersion and HRA modeling used the previous methodology but were updated to incorporate the revised schedule information.

- Those runs showed health risk results that were significant, but near the threshold. ICF presented the results to the City per our arrangement. ICF then implemented the much more involved "multi-child" HRA analysis methodology.

- The refined approach showed less than significant health risks. ICF then completed all remaining modeling (project and cumulative dispersion and HRA) that was incorporated into the EIR.

**Task 9. Public Draft EIR**

- Updated Mitigation Measure AQ-3b, per comments from the City. The changes required further discussion and research. The ICF air quality specialists and project managers attended a conference call to discuss the changes to the mitigation measure.

- Additional formatting and editing of the Transportation section.

**Task 12. Project Management and Meetings**

- The original scope of work did not include weekly conference calls with the City and transportation team. We have attended these calls since July. Through the Draft EIR (end of May) the ICF Project Director, Project Manager, and Deputy Project Manager attended 39 weekly meetings.

- This scope assumes 10 additional weekly conference calls from June to the end of the Project.

- Additional coordination both internally and with the subconsultants due to the changes in the scope of work, as outlined above.

**Attachments**

A. Budget