

## Exhibit A: Shoreline Gateway Scope of Work

*April 30, 2019*

The following is the scope of work for the R+A team for the Shoreline Gateway Master Plan. This area is assumed to include the Gateway area as defined in the North Bayshore Precise Plan (NBPP), but it may also include properties located to the west that are owned by Google (1555 Plymouth), which are included in the NBPP Core area.

### Task 1: Project Initiation and Background Review

In this task, Raimi + Associates (R+A) and Seifel Consulting (Seifel) will initiate the project, collect and review background information and meet with property owners.

#### Task 1.1: Team Meeting #1: Project Kick Off

Raimi + Associates (R+A) and Seifel Consulting (Seifel) will meet with City staff to define the parameters of the study, finalize the study area (which may include the additional Google property to the West at 1555 Plymouth), finalize the schedule and come to agreement on all of the project assumptions and parameters.

#### Task 1.2: Physical, Regulatory and Economic Conditions

R+A and Seifel will review relevant background materials on the site's development and create a comprehensive summary of the physical, regulatory and economic conditions of the Shoreline Gateway area. This will provide a common understanding of the starting point for the Master Plan process. Topics to be included are:

- Existing site conditions including property lines, buildings, topography, transportation network, and other conditions
- North Bayshore Precise Plan (NBPP) guidelines, policies and NBPP Master Plan requirements
- Infrastructure conditions and needs (based on NBPP infrastructure plan and review with Schaaf & Wheeler) on the site and in the area
- Zoning Standards
- Design Standards and Guidelines
- Past development proposals including the original 2015 proposal for the site's development, the approved Program based on 2015 Proposal, updated proposals submitted by each property owner in November 2018
- Residential/office proportionality for each complete neighborhood in North Bayshore including the Gateway
- Potential location of school
- Maximum theoretical buildout based on zoning in the NBPP
- Bonus FAR tiers
- Health and safety considerations including the Moffett ALUC, noise contours, air quality conditions, flooding, etc.

In addition, R+A will create a base map for the area, develop the base model in SketchUp and set up the study views that can be replicated for the various site test fits and alternatives.

The result of this task will be a technical memorandum or PPT summarizing the findings. The team will create a draft memo/PPT for review by staff and then a final memo/PPT incorporating City staff's comments.

### Task 1.3: Property Owner Meetings

R+A and Seifel will meet separately with Google and Sywest to review their proposed programs, including public infrastructure, transportation measures, community benefits, implementation components, and other financial considerations. The purpose of the meetings will be to understand each property owner's approach to the development of their property, identify and summarize key programmatic, financial and implementation considerations and identify and summarize opportunities and challenges related to development phasing and implementation among two property owners. These meetings will occur during Task 1.2 (above) and non-proprietary information will be included in the memo/PPT described above.

## Task 2: Preliminary Analysis of Financial and Implementation Considerations

In this task, Seifel will conduct a preliminary analysis of the financial and implementation considerations of developing the Gateway site based on information provided in the NBPP and obtained from City staff, team members and the property owners. This will include:

- Evaluating the potential phasing and potential costs of public infrastructure, circulation, open space, school, environmental mitigation, and other obligations/community benefits to develop the Shoreline Gateway area
- Evaluating how best to meet the affordable housing goals of the NBPP
- Developing initial estimates of revenue potential from key land uses at alternative FAR levels
- Developing initial estimates of potential construction costs associated with key land uses at alternative FAR levels
- Exploring the financial trade-offs among various development program options and obligations

The information from this task will feed into the conceptual site test fits being conducted by R+A in Task 3.

## Task 3: Conceptual Design

In this task, the team will analyze the maximum buildout of the Master Plan area, understand financial trade-offs and begin the process of narrowing down the range of alternatives to study.

### Task 3.1: Conceptual Site Test Fits

As a preliminary step in the master plan design phase, R+A's urban design team will create a number of site test fits to understand the maximum allowable development and site configurations in the Shoreline Gateway project area. The site test fits will explore how characteristics such as massing, FAR, building heights, parking, housing unit size, open space and circulation impact the development program. For each test fit, R+A will create a basic massing model showing spatial relations and a development program table. This information will be summarized in a PPT slide deck and will be discussed with City staff and the consultant team. The intent is to begin to narrow down the range of land use and site configuration options.

- Create a number of test fits to understand max buildout under different scenarios and begin to understand how massing, allowable FAR, parking, housing unit size, open space, circulation, etc. impacts the development program.
- Circulation hierarchy, pedestrian/vehicle/service
- Develop basic massing models showing spatial relations
- Develop development program table

### Task 3.2: Evaluate Financial Trade-offs

Leveraging information and analysis prepared in prior tasks, Seifel will review the financial and implementation considerations of the site test fits, which will take into account the following considerations:

- Public infrastructure, circulation, open space, school, environmental mitigation, and other obligations/community benefits, and their potential cost implications
- Potential phasing of development and associated obligations, with a focus on evaluating what obligations can be phased over time to minimize upfront costs
- Construction costs, taking into account construction type based on height/FAR and parking configuration
- Revenue potential, with a focus on relative revenue generation from alternative land use options
- Other requirements and considerations that could significantly affect financial feasibility.

Seifel will perform a high-level financial analysis to inform the formation of development program alternatives. Summary tables and graphs, as well as a set of findings, will be prepared to summarize the results of this financial evaluation.

The information from this task will feed into the conceptual site test fits being conducted by R+A in Task 3.

### Task 3.3: Team Meeting #2: Conceptual Site Test Fits

At the end of this phase, R+A and Seifel will meet with City staff to review the conceptual site test fits and the financial evaluation. The purpose will be to review the site test fits, discuss trade-offs between different options and narrow down a range of alternatives.

### Task 3.4 Define Maximum Program and Program Alternatives to Study

Following Team Meeting #2, R+A and Seifel will summarize the maximum program and define the program to be studied and evaluated in Task 4. This program should be sufficient for initial traffic and infrastructure analysis for a “worst case” analysis of total development and mix of uses at the site. The outputs from the infrastructure and traffic analysis will feed into the conceptual design and financial model.

## Task 4: Develop, Analyze and Refine Alternatives

In this task, the team will develop and then analyze a range of alternatives for the site. The alternatives will be presented to the EPC, City Council and Planning Commission for direction and then a final alternative created. The final alternative will undergo a detailed analysis (for CEQA, infrastructure and traffic) and this will be submitted to the EPC and City Council for review and adoption.

### Task 4.1: Create Site Design Concepts

Based on the results of the team working meeting in Task 3.3, R+A will develop site design concepts. This is the next step in the process of narrowing down the range of site alternatives. The site design concepts will be more

refined versions of the site test fits and will add detail to the development program (total build-out and based on property ownership), design strategies and other site-defining characteristics, such as parking, open space and circulation. R+A will develop up to 6 design concepts each of which will include massing, development program, plan view and (if needed) aerial perspective/axonometric.

### Task 4.2: Team Meeting #3: Review of Site Design Concepts

The consultant team, including R+A, Seifel, Schaaf and Wheeler, David J. Powers and TJKM, will participate in a team working meeting to review the site design concepts and identify the advantages and issues with each. At the end of the meeting, the team will narrow down the alternatives to three (3), which will be detailed later in this phase.

### Task 4.3: Create Alternatives

Based on the result of the team meeting, R+A will create three detailed site design alternatives. Each alternative will be able to result in an exemplary project for the Gateway area from an urban design standpoint. Each alternative will include the following:

- Land use plan and block diagram
- Urban design strategy
- Site plan in plan view
- Detailed development program table, including the mix of office, residential and entertainment uses by sub-area
- Roadway configuration and design
- Aerial Perspective/Axonometric in SketchUp
- Design diagrams (including parking strategy, mobility strategy, open space strategy, retail location, affordable housing strategy, context map)
- An understanding of how development at the Gateway will impact land use proportions for the rest of North Bayshore.

The above information will be summarized to allow for a comparison between the alternatives. The analysis will include both qualitative and quantitative information such as land use mix, height, density, intensity, etc. As timing allows, traffic and infrastructure impacts will also be included. This will allow the EPC and CC to understand the pros and cons of each approach. Further, the presentation of alternatives will show the division of use by property ownership to allow for comparison between property owners.

This information will be provided to TJKM to run the traffic model and Schaaf & Wheeler to evaluate potential impacts and costs to the infrastructure/utility system.

### Task 4.4: Financial Evaluation of Alternatives

Leveraging the findings and analysis from prior tasks, Seifel will evaluate the financial and implementation implications of each alternative in terms of the following components:

- Revenue generation from the proposed development program by land use, as well as the potential allocation of development rights and/or revenues among property owners.
- Public infrastructure, circulation, open space, school, environmental mitigation and other obligations/community benefits, and their potential cost allocations among land uses and/or property owners.

- Potential phasing of these obligations, with a focus on evaluating how they may be phased over time to minimize upfront costs.
- Affordable housing obligations and implementation strategies.
- Use of Transferable Development Rights or other strategies to fairly allocate development rights, obligations, and implementation responsibilities among property owners.

The components of this financial evaluation may be further refined based on input from City staff. Seifel will prepare a summary of findings that summarizes the financial trade-offs among alternatives and helps to inform the R+A team's recommendations regarding a preferred land use alternative. Summary tables and graphs, as well as a set of findings, will be prepared to summarize the results of this financial evaluation.

The information from this task will help inform recommendations regarding the Preferred Alternative.

***Note: The scope and budget do not include a fiscal impact analysis of the alternatives or the preferred direction. This work can be added as an optional task.***

#### Task 4.5: Meetings with Property Owners and Community Stakeholder/Public Open House

After the alternatives have been developed, the R+A team will meet with the two property owners to review the alternatives.

In addition, R+A will work with City staff to create a public open house for residents and community groups. R+A will prepare boards summarizing the alternatives and the pros and cons of each alternative. Up to 6 boards will be created (two boards for each alternative). The open house will occur approximately 1 week prior to the EPC workshop in Task 4.6. Two R+A staff members will attend a 3-hour open house in Mountain View.

#### Task 4.6: EPC and CC Workshop on Alternatives

R+A and Seifel will prepare for and attend workshops before the EPC and City Council. This will include preparing a PPT presentation, reviewing the City-prepared staff report, and attending each of the EPC and City Council meetings. At the Workshops, three alternatives will be presented however City staff may recommend one approach.

#### Task 4.7: Team Meeting #4: Review and Select Preferred Alternative

R+A and Seifel will meet with City staff to review the results of the EPC and CC workshops and select a preferred approach to the Shoreline Gateway. R+A will prepare a summary memo that includes diagrams and other information to document the agreed-upon approach.

### Task 5: Prepare Master Plan

In this task, the team will prepare the master plan for the Shoreline Gateway area based on comments and direction from the EPC and City Council in Task 4. The sub-tasks include the Administrative Draft, the 2<sup>nd</sup> Administrative Draft, and the public draft of the Master Plan.

#### Task 5.1: Administrative Draft Master Plan

The R+A team will prepare the administrative draft Master Plan based on the requirements identified in the North Bayshore Precise Plan. This will include the following:

- Materials such as maps, surrounding and proposed uses, proposed building locations, circulation plan, total square footage, open space, and other materials that demonstrate compliance with the purpose and intent of the Precise Plan.
- Parking approach, including but not limited to, shared parking or district parking facilities.
- Urban design strategy, including a conceptual architecture plan, building frontage recommendations, pedestrian urban design strategies, including how the location, intensity, and uses of planned and future buildings function and relate to each other, the project site and surrounding area.
- Phasing and implementation strategy, including the timing and plans for any public improvements. The Master Plan shall identify an initial, intermediate, and final phase.

As an optional task, the R+A team can work with a renderer to prepare photo-realistic renderings of the study area.

### Task 5.2: Meetings with Property Owners and Community Open House

After the preferred alternative has been revised, the R+A team will meet with the two property owners to review the preferred direction.

In addition, R+A will prepare for a community open house (for the public, stakeholders and community groups) to review the final direction. For the open house, R+A will prepare up to 3 boards summarizing the proposed alternative using materials developed during other tasks. Two R+A staff members will attend a 3-hour open house in Mountain View.

### Task 5.3: 2<sup>nd</sup> Administrative Draft Master Plan

City staff will review the Administrative Draft Master Plan and provide a single set of consolidated and non-conflicting comments. Based on the comments, the R+A team will prepare a 2<sup>nd</sup> Administrative Draft Master Plan.

### Task 5.4: Public Draft Master Plan

Based on City comments, R+A will prepare a Public Draft Master Plan. As part of this process, R+A will provide a “proofcheck” version to confirm that all edits requested in the review of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Administrative Draft area included.

### Task 5.5: Cost Estimates

R+A will contract with a cost estimator to provide cost estimates for transportation and, if needed, infrastructure improvements.

## Task 6: CEQA and Analysis of Preferred Alternative

DJP&A will complete CEQA environmental review for one alternative – the preferred Master Plan.

DJP&A will prepare a CEQA Compliance Checklist to evaluate the Master Plan’s conformance with the NBPP EIR, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15183 (Projects consistent with a Community Plan or Zoning). The checklist will include a complete project description, including any discretionary actions required to implement the Master Plan.

This review will determine whether the environmental effects of the project were adequately covered in the NBPP EIR, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15183. To be eligible for the tiering checklist, this scope assumes the preferred Master Plan will be consistent with the overall envelope of development established in

the NBPP and evaluated in the certified NBPP SEIR. In addition, the document will reference the 2012 Mountain View 2030 General Plan and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program EIR, where applicable.

### Task 6.1: Preparation of the CEQA Compliance Checklist

DJP&A will prepare a CEQA Compliance Checklist consistent with the requirements of CEQA Guidelines Section 15183 and the City of Mountain View. This scope assumes the Master Plan will be consistent with the development densities established in the NBPP and certified NBPP SEIR. Additional review will only be necessary to address environmental effects meeting the following:

- Peculiar to the project or the parcel on which the project will be located.
- Were not analyzed as significant effects in the NBPP SEIR;
- Potentially significant off-site impacts and cumulative impacts which were not discussed in the NBPP SEIR
- Previously identified significant effects, which as a result of substantial new information that was not known at the time the SAEIR was certified are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the prior NBPP SEIR.

If an impact is not particular to the property or the proposed project has been addressed as a significant effect in the NBPP EIR or can be substantially mitigated by the imposition of uniformly applied standards, then no additional CEQA review is required.

#### *Project Description*

Based on information provided to DJP&A by the City and Master Plan team, the checklist will include a detailed description of the proposed Master Plan, including any proposed changes to the adopted NBPP that would require discretionary actions by the City.

#### *Environmental Setting, CEQA Checklist, and Mitigations*

A brief overview of the existing environmental setting will be provided, including a description of the land use characteristics of the Master Plan area. The document will include a checklist based on the form recommended by the CEQA Guidelines and the NBPP EIR. Each impact identified in the NBPP EIR will be addressed, including the potential significance and corresponding measures to reduce the impact, if warranted. For most environmental issues, the evaluation of impacts will be based upon the NBPP SEIR and the program-level mitigation measures in the SEIR will be sufficient for the Master Plan. This scope assumes project-specific SSTAs, air quality and noise impact assessments, and hazardous materials assessments will be completed when future development applications are considered, and the Master Plan will depend upon the NBPP SEIR program-level mitigation measures and City's standard conditions of approval.

This scope includes two technical studies, utilities and hazardous materials, and limited on-call traffic consultation, as described below.

#### *Utility Impact Study Confirmation*

The NBPP SEIR utility modeling did not include residential uses within the Gateway Master Plan area. For this reason, the checklist will include a Utility Impact Study Confirmation by Schaaf & Wheeler. Schaaf & Wheeler will complete a confirmation-level technical analysis of the City's water, recycled water, sanitary sewer, and storm drain systems, including the proposed Master Plan development in the study area. Available capacity at the project area will be identified and needed revisions to previous study findings will be determined. Schaaf & Wheeler will work with City staff to determine impacts of the Master Plan development on planned capital improvement projects to assist City staff in planning future infrastructure improvement implementation. The

analysis will include a scenario analyzing future cumulative conditions without the assumption that planned capital projects are constructed, enabling the City to determine the level of service if capital projects are not completed prior to development occurring.

The results of the utility impact confirmation study will be reflected in the CEQA Compliance Checklist. The NBPP EIR mitigation measures, standards, and guidelines that apply to the project and any additional project-specific measures and City conditions of approval will be identified, as necessary.

### *Hazardous Materials*

In the event the preferred Master Plan includes a school site, the checklist will address the site suitability for a school, based upon a Phase I environmental site assessment and evaluation of school siting criteria completed by Cornerstone Earth Group. This scope does not include the CEQA review for school development, which is assumed to occur in the future and by the School District. Other issues of hazardous materials will be based upon previous work completed for the NBPP SEIR.

### *Traffic*

This scope assumes the TJKM Shoreline Gateway Master Plan traffic analysis will be sufficient for the CEQA checklist. Fehr & Peers will be available for on-call support to City staff and/or TJKM on a time and materials basis, for a Fehr & Peers budget of \$10,000.

### *Other Impact Areas*

The checklist will evaluate the project's conformance with the NBPP and the potential for new significant, site-specific impacts for all other CEQA resource areas, including:

- aesthetics
- biological resources (e.g. habitat overlay zones, City of Mountain View Heritage trees, creek improvements maintenance practices, etc. based on a biological resources report provided by the applicant)
- cultural resources
- energy
- geology, soils, and mineral resources
- greenhouse gas emissions
- hydrology and water quality (including flood ordinance conformance)
- land use and planning
- noise
- population and housing
- public services and recreations
- tribal cultural resources

The checklist will rely on analysis from the NBPP EIR. Based on this analysis, the NBPP EIR mitigation measures, standards, and guidelines that apply to the project and any additional project-specific measures will be identified for these impact areas, as necessary.

### *Revisions to the CEQA Compliance Checklist*

DJP&A will provide up to ten printed copies and an electronic version of the checklist in Administrative Draft form to City Staff for review and comment. Revisions will be made to the checklist, based on comments received.



After revisions to the checklist are completed, ten copies of the document will be provided to the City of Mountain View for distribution, as necessary. A PDF of the technical reports will be provided for posting on the City's website.

### Task 6.2: Attendance of Meetings and Hearings

This scope of work includes DJP&A attendance at up to two project/community meetings and two public hearings (e.g., one Planning Commission hearing and one City Council hearing). This scope includes 12 hours of Project Principal and 12 hours of Senior PM time for conference calls and coordination with the project team and City staff. DJP&A can attend additional public hearings or meetings requested on a time and materials basis.

### Task 6.3: Project Management and Contract Administration

DJP&A will provide general project management, contract administration, and coordination with the City and project team. The DJP&A Project Manager will coordinate with the City on a regular basis using email and telephone communications.

## Task 7: Adoption and Final Plan

### Task 7.1: Adoption Hearings

R+A and Seifel will attend one meeting with each the EPC and the Planning Commission. This will include preparing a PPT presentation, reviewing the City-prepared staff report, and attending each of the EPC and City Council meetings.

### Task 7.2: Final Master Plan

Based on comments from the EPC and final direction from the City Council, R+A will prepare a final master plan for the site. This will include a Administrative draft and a proof draft prior to finalizing.

## Task 8: Project Management, Coordination and Meetings

This task includes overall project management and coordination of team members, including the City's other consultants such as TJKM. Tasks include weekly conference calls with City staff, managing the work of the consultant team, and project management.

## Task 9: Additional Services

This scope of services is based on the team's initial understanding of the tasks to be performed. Based on experience with similar projects additional services may be needed including the following:

- Preparing additional technical analyses and/or written products, as mutually agreed upon
- Preparing presentations for and/or participating in additional public meetings.
- Providing other additional advisory services, as mutually agreed upon.

## Project Schedule

The following is the draft project schedule for the project. Our goal is to complete the work, including project approvals, within 9 months. However, this schedule is contingent on clear decisions from City staff on the direction

of the Master Plan, review of analysis and components within 2 weeks of receipt, and the ability to modify EPC and CC presentations up to 1 week prior to each meeting.

Task	May (1)	June (2)	July (3)	August (4)	Sept (5)	Oct (6)	Nov (7)	Dec (8)	Jan (9)
1: Project Initiation									
2: Financial/Imp Considerations									
3: Conceptual Design									
4: Develop Alts									
5: Prepare Master Plan									
6: CEQA and Analysis									
7: Adoption and Final Plan									
8: Project Mgmt and Mtgs									

The following is more detailed information on the sequence of work in Task 6: CEQA and Analysis following the finalization of the preferred direction (land use mix, location of uses, development program, etc.). The follow sequence of work corresponds with the time between the latter part of September (Month 5) and December (Month 8).

Task	Duration of Task	Time Elapsed
1. DJP&A receives authorization to proceed	---	1 day
2. City and Project Team prepare draft Master Plan, provide land use assumptions to DJP&A	?	Day 1
3. Schaaf & Wheeler prepares draft Utility Confirmation after receipt of Master Plan land use assumptions	6 weeks	6 weeks
4. DJP&A submits Administrative Draft CEQA Compliance Checklist to City (two weeks after receiving report)	2 weeks	8 weeks
5. City staff reviews Administrative Draft CEQA Compliance Checklist and draft Utility Impact Assessment	2 weeks	10 weeks
6. DJP&A revises Administrative Draft CEQA Compliance Checklist and Schaaf & Wheeler revises report, as needed per comments received and submits Screencheck CEQA Compliance Checklist & Utility report	2 weeks	12 weeks
7. City staff reviews Screencheck CEQA Compliance Checklist	1 week	13 weeks
8. DJP&A revises Screencheck CEQA Compliance Checklist per comments received, finalizes documents for printing	1 week	14 weeks

9. Planning Commission Hearing & City Council Hearing

TBD

---

Total

14 weeks

**Raimi + Associates Budget Estimate**

Hours per Task	Raimi + Associates						Seifel Consulting					David J Powers & Associates				Technical Consultants				
	Principal (Raimi, Malhotra)	Associate Principal (Yurkovich)	Associate (Sensenig)	Intermediate Planner	Planner	FEE	President	Senior Managing Consultant	Consultant	Analyst	Support	Principal	Senior Project Manager	APM	Graphics	Support	Cornerstone Earth Group (Sub to DJP&A)	Fehr & Peers (Sub to DJP&A)	Schaff and Wheeler (Sub to R+A)	Cost Estimating (Sub to R+A)
Task 1: Project Initiation and Background Review	16	8	40	20		\$13,600	22	4	12	4	\$8,420					\$0				
Task 2: Preliminary Analysis of Financial and Implementation Considerations	16		8			\$5,040	22	10	16	6	\$10,310					\$0				
Task 3: Conceptual Design	24	16	80	60		\$28,200	24	16	20	6	\$12,550					\$0				
Task 4: Develop, Analyze and Refine Alternatives	32	16	140	110	20	\$50,100	24	16	20	6	\$12,550					\$0				
Task 5: Prepare Master Plan	32	16	100	90	40	\$42,400	12	4	4	-	\$4,440					\$0				
Task 6: CEQA Analysis of Preferred Alternative	8	12	16			\$4,680	6				\$1,560	45	99	124	18	\$51,940				
Task 7: Adoption and Final Plan	24		80	60	16	\$30,040	16	4	4	4	\$5,820					\$0	\$12,000	\$10,000	\$92,610	\$15,000
Task 8: Project Management and Meetings	40		40	40		\$21,800	16	8	-	8	\$6,440					\$0				
Total Hours	192	68	504	380	76	1,220	142	62	76	34	314	45	99	124	18					
Billing Rate	\$225	\$210	\$180	\$140	\$115		\$260	\$200	\$130	\$85		\$275	\$215	\$130	\$120					
Labor Cost	\$43,200	\$14,280	\$90,720	\$53,200	\$8,740	\$195,860	\$36,920	\$12,400	\$9,880	\$2,890	\$62,090	\$12,375	\$21,285	\$16,120	\$2,160	\$51,940	\$12,000	\$10,000	\$92,610	\$15,000
<b>Total Firm Labor Cost</b>						<b>\$195,860</b>					<b>\$62,090</b>				<b>\$51,940</b>					
<b>EXPENSES</b>																				
Mileage and Travel Expenses, printing						\$2,500					500									
Project/Sub Management (7%)						\$13,065										\$3,300				
Office Expenses (Phone, Fax, Copies, etc.)						\$5,876					500					\$790				
<b>Total Firm Expenses</b>						<b>\$21,441</b>					<b>\$1,000</b>					<b>\$4,090</b>				
<b>TOTAL Expenses Per Firm</b>						<b>\$217,301</b>					<b>\$63,090</b>					<b>\$56,030</b>	<b>\$12,000</b>	<b>\$10,000</b>	<b>\$92,610</b>	<b>\$15,000</b>
<b>TOTAL Base Project</b>						<b>\$466,031</b>														
<i>Contingency</i>						<i>\$33,969</i>														
<i>Total with Contingency</i>						<i>\$500,000</i>														

## Scope and Budget Assumptions

The following are the R+A team's scope and budget assumptions for the project.

- The level of effort for each task is limited to the number of hours for each task listed in the budget spreadsheet. Consultant Team members may reallocate hours between tasks if individual tasks are completed in less time than anticipated.
- The number of rounds of each deliverable (i.e., draft, final, etc.) for each product is identified in the scope. If the scope does not specify the number of deliverables for each product, the only one deliverable will be provided.
- All data and information provided by the City will be assumed to be correct and up-to-date. The Consultant Team is not responsible for out-of-date or inaccurate information.
- The property owners will provide supporting documentation and technical information regarding their November 2018 proposal to the Consultant Team. The Consultant Team is willing to enter into a non-disclosure, confidentiality agreement to share information and will incorporate non-proprietary data in its study findings that will be made public. All data and information provided by the property owners will be assumed to be correct and up-to-date unless determined otherwise by the Consultant Team, and the Consultant Team will not be responsible for out-of-date or inaccurate information provided by the property owners. This scope and budget assume that the following information will be provided:
  - Proposed development program and phasing by location, land use and number of square feet/units/rooms
  - Anticipated project revenues by land use
  - Development cost estimates, including site improvements, hard construction and soft costs
  - Proposed public infrastructure, circulation, open space, school, environmental mitigation, and other obligations/community benefits, along with projected costs
  - Any other technical information that is critical to understanding the development proposal
- All studies that the Consultant Team will prepare are identified in the scope of work. Any studies, tasks, deliverables or reports not specifically identified are assumed to not be included.
- City staff be responsible for, at minimum, the following activities:
  - Writing all staff reports
  - Logistics of all meetings, workshops, etc.
  - Outreach for all public meetings and workshops
  - Costs of meeting facilities and supplemental costs of meetings and workshops, including but not limited to, food, childcare, high-cost supplies, printing workshop materials, festival event activities, giveaways, etc.
  - Printing copies of documents (the Consultant Team will provide electronic versions and City staff will be responsible for printing)
- Timely response to Consultant Team questions and review of documents and materials prepared by the Consultant Team. The review of each deliverable is assumed to be one week.
- City staff will provide a single consolidated set of non-conflicting comments for each deliverable. All comments will be actionable with clear direction to the consultant team.