

PROJECT MEMORANDUM

AERA EAST CAT CANYON OIL FIELD REDEVELOPMENT PLAN EIR

To: Kathryn Lehr, County Project Manager
From: Vida Strong, Aspen Project Manager
Date: July 8, 2019
Subject: Aera Budget Summary

This memorandum is being submitted to provide a comprehensive tabulation of additional time required by the Aspen Team for the preparation of the Aera East Cat Canyon Oil Field Redevelopment Plan Project Environmental Impact Report (EIR), specifically:

- Draft EIR, Tasks 3 thru 5,
- Final EIR, Tasks 6 thru 10, and
- Analysis of New Alternative.

1.0 Draft EIR, Tasks 3 thru 5

This section provides a summary of efforts required to complete Tasks 3 through 5, resulting in the issuance of the Draft EIR on November 30, 2018. This section is organized as follows:

- **Section 1.1: Task 3. Project Description/Alternative/Settings**
- **Section 1.2: Tasks 4 & 5. Administrative Draft EIR & Draft EIR.** Note that these Tasks have been combined given the overlapping nature in which each of the EIR sections were individually reviewed and finalized.
- **Section 1.3: Summary of Tasks 3 thru 5 Out of Scope Activities**

1.1 Task 3. Project Description/Alternatives/Settings

Section 2.0, Project Description/Alternatives. The original administrative draft of Section 2.0, Project Description/Alternatives, which was based on the application materials and County input on Alternatives,¹ was submitted November 10, 2016 and P&D initial feedback was provided December 2, 2016. Concurrent with that effort, the initial Data Request for Aera was sent October 11, 2016 and responses from Aera, within nine separate Response Packages, were provided through July 19, 2017. As a result, revised versions of Section 2.0 were submitted to P&D on February 20, March 8, April 27, June 14, and November 6, 2017. Also, concurrent with this effort, draft Section 2.0 was provided to Aera on July 10, 2017 and Aera provided edits on July 31, 2017 (Excel file dated July 17, 2017).

¹ As described in our Proposal, Section 4.3, "Aspen will use the Applicant's application materials and graphics to the maximum extent feasible to prepare the Project Description".

Subsequently, the following changes had been proposed/requested by Aera and/or the County which necessitated multiple re-submittals of revised Section 2.0.

■ **Project Description:**

- Changing the trucking fleet to CNG. Original input provided on December 8, 2017, and subsequent input provided April 24, 2018 in Appendix B of AQIA (see Air Quality below).
- Updated Conservation Easement descriptions since original input. Aspen worked with P&D/Aera to resolve and modified Figures 2-6, 2-26 and 2-27 accordingly.
- Aera provided separate review edits/comments on May 17, 2018.
- Vested Tentative Map changes were provided which included edits to Figure 2-3 and updated to Section 2.0.
- APCD provided comments on Section 2.0 on October 31, 2018 which were incorporated

■ **Alternatives**

- Alternatives White Paper was updated on two separate occasions which necessitated multiple rounds of revisions and P&D reviews of the Pipeline Alternatives.
- In June 2018, P&D requested that Aspen prepare a pipeline alternative comparison table.
- Updates to ERG franchise agreement status were incorporated into Alternative 3 and revisions submitted to P&D in September 2018.

■ **Air Quality/GHG's**

- An updated GHG reduction strategy in the form of a mulch farming plan was provided in April 2018. Aspen converted to AAM May 4, 2018. See Bio Resources and GHG below.
- In response to APCD review comments, further CNG trucking fleet changes were submitted May 3, 2018 (see Air Quality below).

Sections 4.2 through 4.10, Settings. The preparation of the ERG Draft EIR was occurring concurrently with the Aera Draft EIR. As edits were being made to the ERG document, they at often times resulted in changes to the Aera EIR including the incorporation of edits made to the ERG settings into the Aera settings. Aspen aimed to keep the settings in each EIR consistent so internal drafts of the Aera settings sections could always reflect the latest progress on the ERG Draft EIR. The intent was to minimize the chance of County staff having to make duplicative comments on Aera, as well as providing consistent setting information for both Draft EIRs for public review and comment.

1.2 Tasks 4 & 5, Administrative Draft EIR & Draft EIR

Across Issue Areas. The following circumstances affected the majority of issue areas in one capacity or another.

- Due to Project Description/Alternative changes (see above) presented by Aera verbally in November 2017 and subsequent documents in December 2017, the Aspen team was turned off until January 2018 at which time the team had to get back up to speed. All issue area impact analyses were

submitted to the County by April 23, 2018 except for Air Quality because of pending changes in the AQIA and the APCD review that occurred in October 2018 (see Air Quality/GHG below).

- The preparation of the ERG Draft EIR was occurring concurrently with the Aera Draft EIR, which resulted in domino changes to the Aera EIR. Additional examples include:
 - Aspen worked with P&D and APCD on the ERG Draft EIR Air Quality and GHG sections (ERG Draft EIR was released June 2018). The coincidental timing of the ERG internal working drafts for Air Quality and Climate/GHG influenced the respective Aera analyses (see Air Quality/GHG below). This effort allowed us to update internal drafts of the Aera Air Quality and GHG sections to always reflect the latest progress on the ERG Draft EIR. The intent was to minimize the chance of County staff having to make duplicative comments on Aera.
 - With the completion of the comment period for the ERG Draft EIR and given the nature of the comments and resultant ERG EIR changes, additional changes were also made to the Aera Draft EIR as described below. This resulted in additional section changes and subsequent rounds of review by P&D staff.
- Given the time delay over the span of roughly twenty-four months, from initial Project Description development (November 2016) to release of the Aera Draft EIR (November 2018), information available for the PetroRock, ExxonMobil Interim Trucking, and Plains Line 901/903 Replacement, continue to be developed and change. This affected multiple Aera EIR sections, including alternatives, cumulative, and the cumulative analyses across many issue areas.

Revisions to the following sections were required since the original April 23, 2018 submittals of the Admin Draft sections (with the exception of Air Quality and Risk of Upset):

Section 3.0, Cumulative. The original administrative draft of Section 3 was submitted in February 2017. In response to updated Plains and ExxonMobil applications, updated PetroRock trucking numbers, and revised CNG trucking numbers provided in May 2018, Cumulative was updated and resubmitted to P&D in May 2018. Updates were also made to Cumulative in September 2018 in response to comments received on the ERG DEIR, including Figure 3-1; revised Section 3.0 submitted to P&D September 2018.

Section 4.2/4.4, Air Quality & Climate Change/GHG. The Administrative Draft version of Section 4.2, Air Quality, was submitted on October 2, 2018 and the Administrative Draft version of Section 4.4, Climate/GHG, was submitted on February 13, 2018, and on October 2, 2018, these sections were provided to APCD for interagency coordination. For this effort, Aspen's work included gathering and reviewing numerous unanticipated revisions to the AQIA and HRA as follows:

- Aspen initiated our review of Aera's AQIA with HRA, as dated March 2016.
- In August 2017, Aspen began review of an updated AQIA dated June 2017, which allowed for re-drilling wells and operational-phase drilling.

In 2018, Aspen began assisting the County with interagency coordination with the APCD for CEQA. Accordingly, various Applicant-driven changes during 2018 were reviewed by Aspen in parallel coordination with APCD, including the following, in order of when the County & Aspen received them:

- February 2018, the addition of CNG Tankers (AQIA dated January 2018);
- April 2018, additional corrections (AQIA dated April 2018);
- August 2019, the addition of PM10 from travel on paved roads (AQIA dated July 2018);

- September 2018, other clarifications received; and
- September 2018, the addition of fugitive solvent emissions (AQIA dated November 2018).

Other late-filed clarifications included:

- Paving equipment (November 2018),
- Workovers (November 2018), and
- Drilling muds emissions (November 2018)

The various changes to AQ and GHG information required close coordination of Aspen AQ-GHG technical staff with APCD and County staff. Our technical specialist and Project Manager participated in the following calls:

- 3/2/2018 (County and APCD),
- 5/14/2018 (County staff only),
- 9/14/2018 (County and APCD),
- 11/1/2018 (County staff only),
- 11/8/2018 (County staff only), and
- 11/15/2018 (County and APCD).

These various Applicant-driven revisions as well as incorporation of APCD and P&D direction/comments, required multiple updates of the Air Quality section and in some cases the GHG section.

Another unanticipated effort was an independent review of overlapping construction emissions for each of Aera's proposed 30+ years of variable operation and construction. This supplemental information appended the Applicant's 1500+ pages of calculations, in Draft EIR Appendix E.

Section 4.3, Bio Resources. The Administrative Draft version of Section 4.3 was submitted in early March 2018 and a revised Section 4.3 was provided a few weeks later which included additional CTS information. Aera's proposal in May for GHG mulch farming within the conservation area was reviewed by Aspen for its possible effects on CTS dispersal and proposed mitigation; additional revisions to Section 4.3 were provided. P&D comments, including peer review comments, were provided in June 2018. Aera provided additional input on CTS, including shapefiles, which was incorporated into Figures 4.3-8a/b in August.

Section 4.5, Cultural. P&D comments on the Administrative Draft version of Section 4.5, including updates to the County Guidelines for Cultural Resources, were provided in June 2018. Concurrently/subsequently, additional information was provided by Aera including the David Stone mailer/NAHC response memo on SCGP-1 and PGE-1 (August 2018), and the road report (August 2018). Subsequent revisions to Section 4.5 were submitted to the County in September, October, and November 2018.

Section 4.6, Geology Processes/Geologic Hazards. The Administrative Draft version of Section 4.6 was submitted in February 2018; a revised Section 4.6 was submitted May 14. Based on ERG DEIR comments (August 2018), Aera provided White Papers on subsidence and induced seismicity in September and November 2018 which were incorporated into Section 4.6. An update on the beneficial reuse program was added as well. Revised Section 4.6 was submitted mid November 2018.

Section 4.7, Hazardous Materials/ROU. The pending Pipeline QRA was submitted in January 2018. In February 2018 a call was held with Aera and their risk consultant, to review the Transportation QRA methodology and feedback was provided to P&D. Concurrently, review of the Facility QRA resulted in several questions for Aera. Responses and revised Facility QRA were submitted in March 2018. Revised trucking numbers provided in May 2018 assumed that all LCO trucks would return with blended crude however were found to be contrary to Transportation QRA that included empty trucks. Updated LCO and blended truck trips and mileage were provided to support the Transportation QRA. Subsequently, updated Facility, Transportation, and Pipeline QRAs were submitted in May and June 2018. These responses and revised QRAs resulted in the submittal of Section 4.7 in May, and June 2018.

Section 4.9, Surface/Groundwater Quality. The Administrative Draft version of Section 4.9 was submitted on February 26, 2018; in response to P&D comments revised Section 4.9 was submitted June 2018. In response to comments on the ERG Draft EIR, Aera provided a PowerPoint on Aquifer Protection in October 2018 which was incorporated into Section 4.9. Aera also provided a GeoTracker Summary for soil/groundwater contamination in September 2018 which was reviewed and a call was held, but given the general nature of the Summary, it wasn't incorporated. An update on the UIC exemption request was added as well. This additional information necessitated the resubmittal of Section 4.9 in mid-November 2018.

Section 4.10, Traffic/Transportation. The Administrative Draft version of Section 4.10 was submitted in February 2018. Revised Aera trucking numbers (provided in May 2018) and updated PetroRock trucking numbers (April 2018) necessitated updates in numbers for the proposed Project and cumulative. In addition, the Supplemental Traffic Analysis was submitted in May 2018 and Orcutt traffic counts were submitted in June 2018.

Section 5.0, Alternatives Comparison. At the request of P&D, Section 5.0 was reformatted to include the alternative discussions from each issue area, including an expansion of the alternative impact discussions by impact number. The draft format was submitted to P&D and edits were provided by P&D in August 2018. Subsequently, revisions to Section 5.0 were provided October and November 2018.

1.3 Summary of Tasks 3 thru 5 Out of Scope Activities

The Aspen Technical Proposal to prepare an EIR for the Aera East Cat Canyon Oil Field Redevelopment Plan, dated June 17, 2016, and accompanying Cost Proposal, dated July 19, 2016, were based on the following assumptions:

- “Aspen will use the Applicant’s application materials and graphics to the maximum extent feasible to prepare the Project Description” (Technical Proposal, Section 4.3). “This estimate is based on receiving any additional information from the Applicant and timely response to data requests or clarifications” (Cost Proposal, Page 2).
- The Administrative Draft EIR would be submitted “70 working days after scoping meeting” (as required by the RFP) which was held November 15, 2016 (Technical Proposal, Section 5, Exhibit 6). “Aspen will submit the Administrative Draft EIR to the county for review and comment as one reproducible unbound cop, three bound copies, and one electronic copy on CD” (Technical Proposal, Section 4.4).

- “Aspen will obtain all comments on the Administrative Draft EIR from the County’s Project Manager, who will compile one set of unified comments for use in revising the document” (Technical Proposal, Section 4.5).
- The Draft EIR would be release approximately 5.5 months after the issuance of the Notice to Proceed (Technical Proposal, Section 5, Exhibit 7).
- “Our cost assumes that the EIR will not exceed a total of 150 pages (with appendices on a CD)” (Cost Proposal, Page 2).

Because of the complexity of the Project and Aera data request responses and proposed changes, as well as the preparation of the ERG EIR, interagency coordination with APCD, and other cumulative project developments (PetroRock, ExxonMobil Interim Trucking, and Plains Line 901/903 Replacement), the following was instead required to complete the Draft EIR:

- Aspen provided the initial Data Request for Aera on October 11, 2016 and responses from Aera, were provided through July 19, 2017, a nine-month period.
- In addition to responding to Data Requests, Aera made Project Description changes including replacing their truck fleet with CNG tankers and adding the Conservation Easement and GHG reduction strategy (mulch farming).
- Revised project description including, two reviews of Section 2.0 by Aera, plus other Aera/P&D requests/input (see Section 1.1), resulted in eight separate submittals of Section 2.0, Project Description/Alternatives, revisions.
- Aera project changes and resultant AQIA revisions, as well as interagency APCD coordination for CEQA, resulted in Aspen review of seven versions of the AQIA, three supplemental information submittals (paving, drilling muds, and workovers), six calls with APCD and/or P&D to review changes to Sections 4.2 and 4.4, and incorporation of APCD comments on Section 2.0.
- The preparation of the ERG Draft EIR concurrently with the Aera Draft EIR, resulted in ongoing changes to the Aera EIR sections to ensure consistency. In addition, comments on the ERG Draft EIR necessitated additional changes to the Aera Draft EIR.
- During the Aera Draft EIR preparation, information available for the PetroRock, ExxonMobil Interim Trucking, and Plains Line 901/903 Replacement, continue to be developed and change affecting the alternative and cumulative descriptions and analyses.
- All of the above factors resulted in multiple revisions of many issue areas as presented in Section 1.2. To keep the preparation of the EIR moving forward, each EIR section was submitted for review as it was available instead of waiting for a complete Administrative Draft EIR and Draft EIR submittals.
- Instead of 5.5 months to release the Draft EIR as contemplated in the Proposal (as required by the County RFP), approximately 24 months, from initial Project Description development (November 2016) to release of the Aera Draft EIR (November 2018) was required.
- The Aera Draft EIR, without appendices, was 688 pages.

Table 1 at the end of this memo summarizes the additional hours and costs required to complete Tasks 3 and 4/5.

2.0 Final EIR, Tasks 6 thru 10

This section of the memo presents the additional efforts required to complete the Aera Final EIR and is organized as follows:

- **Section 2.1: Task 6. Hearing and Comment Summary**
- **Section 2.2: Tasks 7 & 8. Responses to Comments and Administrative Final EIR.** Note that these Tasks have been combined given the overlapping nature in which the preparation of each response influences changes to the EIR document.
- **Section 2.3: Task 9. Draft Final EIR and Hearings**
- **Section 2.4: Task 10. Final EIR**
- **Section 2.5: Summary of Tasks 6 thru 10 Out of Scope Activities**

2.1 Task 6. Hearing and Comment Summary

The Public Comment Hearing was held at Santa Maria Board of Supervisors' Hearing Room on January 17, 2019 where 91 separate commenters spoke. The final Comment Hearing Summary was submitted to P&D February 6, 2019. Hearing attendance and preparation of the Comment Hearing Summary were conducted within the allocated budget for this task.

2.2 Tasks 7 & 8. Responses to Comments and Administrative Final EIR

Table 2 summarizes the 933 comments that were received on the Aera Draft EIR by commenter category. As provided in our Cost Proposal, "our cost estimate assumes that no more than 400 individual comments (public and agency) will be responded to, including Public Hearing comments"; therefore, the 933 comments represent a 133% increase. A small percentage of the comments are similar to comments received on the ERG Draft EIR (about 20%).

As presented in our Technical Proposal, Section 4.7 (Task 7 – Responses to Comments on Draft EIR), as required by the County RFP, "Aspen will prepare and submit written responses to comments". Further, Section 4.8 notes that "Aspen will prepare and submit an Administrative Final EIR within 15 working days of receipt of the County's final comments on the written responses to comments received on the Draft EIR." Given the extent of the comments and need for additional information from Aera (three separate Information Requests sent to Aera), Aspen recommends that the preparation of responses to

comments and resultant document changes occur in phases so as to not hold up the timeline for completion of the Administrative Final EIR, instead of submitting the responses to comments as one submittal and Administrative Final EIR as a separate submittal. On May 3, 2019 the County authorized a release of \$34,580 from contingency. The release of these funds have allowed Aspen to continue their

Table 2. Comments on the Aera Draft EIR

Commenter Category	Number of Comments
Applicant	194
Regulatory Agencies	22
Non-Gov Organizations - EDC & Hunt	255
Non-Gov Organizations - Other	70
Public	301
Comment Hearing	91
TOTAL	933

work on Tasks 7 and 8 while a contract modification is being processed. Upon approval of the contract modification, the contingency will be replenished to its original amount.

An additional factor that could affect the Task 7/8 effort is the third Planning Commission hearing for ERG which is scheduled for August 2019 and any subsequent Planning Commission and Board of Supervisor hearings that could occur. This hearing(s) could also influence the preparation of the responses to comments and resultant Aera EIR document changes; the level of effort associated with these possible changes is unknown at this time. Finally, P&D staff has requested the review of the ExxonMobil cumulative trucking risk approach and its incorporation into the Aera cumulative trucking risk of upset analysis.

Given a recommended phased approach to preparation and review of the responses to comments and resultant document changes, the unknown influence of ERG decision maker hearings on the Aera Final EIR, additional cumulative trucking risk analysis, and since the level of effort for making document changes (i.e., Task 8, Administrative Final EIR) would be commensurate with the effort to respond to comments (i.e., Task 7), Aspen is requesting a 150% increase in the Tasks 7 and 8 budgets (see Section 2.5 below).

Once Aera has submitted adequate responses to all information requests, Aspen will respond to all comments and update the Draft FEIR for the County's review within 4 weeks. Upon receiving comments from the County and pending the nature of these comments (i.e., minor changes vs. spill over edits), the Draft Final EIR can be prepared within 3 weeks. The suggested timelines assume that no additional edits as a result of ERG's Planning Commission or Board of Supervisor hearings would occur between the final submittal of adequate Aera responses and final Aspen edits to the Draft FEIR. If additional edits resulting from the ERG hearings are required, additional budget will need to be authorized. The Draft FEIR is assumed to be available 4 weeks prior to a scheduled decision-maker hearing.

2.3 Task 9. Draft Final EIR and Hearings

Production of the Draft Final EIR and attendance of two public hearings by the Aspen Project Manager and up to four issue area specialists is assumed under Task 9 of our Technical Proposal, Section 4.9. Given the potential for controversial public input, the Technical Proposal assumed the attendance of the Aspen air quality/GHG, risk of upset, geologic hazards/groundwater, and oak tree restoration technical experts; however, this list can be modified based on project needs. The unit cost for the Aspen Project Manager and technical experts to attend additional hearings are provided in our Cost Proposal. As discussed with P&D staff, attendance of an additional three public hearings (two were anticipated in the original proposal) is included in Section 2.5 below. Note that for the individual hearing costs presented in the Cost Proposal, four-hour hearings were assumed and based on that length, one day of travel expenses was assumed. This proposal includes an additional 4 hours for each of the two previously budgeted hearings.

2.4 Task 10. Final EIR

As presented in our Technical and Cost Proposals, minimum time and associated budget are assumed for revisions to the Final EIR based on decision maker recommendations. Section 4.10 of the Technical Proposal, states that "should these recommendations involve additional in-depth analyses, re-analyses or new or expanded alternatives, a commensurate cost amendment may be requested". Since any recommended changes are unknown at this time, Aspen recommends that remaining or contingency funds be used for these possible changes.

2.5 Summary of Tasks 6 thru 10 Out of Scope Activities

As presented in Sections 2.1 and 2.4, no budget additions are requested for Tasks 6 and 10, respectively. Table 3 below presents the additional budget requested for Tasks 7 through 9 based on the discussions in Section 2.2 and 2.3.

Table 3. Task 7 thru 9 Requested Budget (no additional budget requested for Tasks 6 and 10)

	Task 7*		Task 8*		Task 9**		Tasks 7–9 Totals
	Proposal	Requested	Proposal	Requested	Proposal	Requested	
ASPEN							
Vida Strong, Project Manager						Hearings: \$7,000***	
Brewster Birdsall, Air Quality/GHG						Hearings: \$12,700***	
Aspen Total Budget	\$32,108	\$48,162	\$15,654	\$23,481	\$34,123	\$19,700	
Aspen Add'l Requested Budget		\$48,162		\$23,481		\$19,700	\$91,343****
SUBCONTRACTORS							
Jim Thurber, GTC (Geology/Geologic Hazards, Groundwater)						Hearings: \$13,000***	
Pete Stickles, ioMosaic (Hazardous Materials, Risk of Upset)						Hearings: \$18,000***	
LynneDee Althouse (Oak Tree Restoration)						Hearings: \$6,400***	
Subcontractor Add'l Requested Budget						\$25,700	\$18,000
TOTALS		\$48,162		\$23,481		\$45,400	\$117,043

*150% of original budget requested (see Section 2.2). Subcontract costs included in Aspen total budget.

**Based on per hearing cost presented in Cost Proposal. Three additional hearings per person assumed.

***Assumes 3 additional hearings and an additional 4 hours for the 2 budgeted hearings. Assuming 8 hour hearings, two night stays required for Brewster Birdsall (based in SF) and Jim Thurber (based in San Juan Capistrano). Two night stay already assumed for Pete Stickles (based in New Hampshire).

****Assumes \$34,580 will be used to replenish the contingency.

3.0 New Alternative Analysis

This section provides an estimate of the additional time and cost required by the Aspen Team to incorporate a new alternative into Sections 2.0 and 5.0 and limited recirculation of these sections. Table 4 provides the hours estimate for developing a new Alternative description for Section 2.0 and conducting an analysis by impact in Section 5.0. Please note the following assumptions:

- After the submittal of new Alternative information from Aera, one round of questions and responses is assumed. Aspen will review the information submitted by Aera and provide any questions or information requests within 2 weeks.
- Aspen will prepare the new Alternative description and submit to P&D for review within one week of submittal of a complete alternative information package by Aera (i.e., description, figure[s], accompanying resource data, etc.).
- When P&D approves the new Alternative description (one round of comments and revisions over a two-week period assumed), Aspen will prepare the impact analysis for Section 5.0 within two weeks

of receiving P&D approval on the new Alternative description and submit to P&D for review. It is assumed that the new Alternative would not result in any new impacts or an increase the severity of an existing impact.

- Within one week of final P&D comments on Section 5.0 (one round of comments and revisions over a two-week period assumed), Aspen will make revisions to Sections 2.0, if needed, and 5.0 and provide the updated files to P&D in electronic format.
- If recirculation is warranted, P&D would be responsible for document distribution and noticing for the 45-day public review period.
- No more than 30 unique comments would be submitted on the new Alternative. Aspen would provide responses to each comment and make any additional revisions to Sections 2.0 and 5.0, and provide to P&D for review and approval within 14 days. One round of P&D review is assumed.
- Although this recirculation is limited to a new Alternative, approximately 50-70 ‘off-topic’ comments are anticipated. These comments will be incorporated into the Response to Comment section created in response to the Draft EIR circulation period. These ‘off-topic’ comments are not anticipated to include comments on new topics, or those not previously raised. If comments are received on new topics, incorporation of these comments into the Response to Comments section will be funded by the contract contingency or a contract modification, per the County’s direction.

Table 4: Estimated Budget for New Alternative			
Aspen Team Staff, Role	Estimated Hours*	Rate	Total
Alternative Revisions Only			
-Vida Strong, Project Management	32	\$170	\$5,440
-Hedy Koczvara, Project Description/Alternatives	48	\$135	\$6,480
-Brewster Birdsall, Air Quality/GHG	8	\$180	\$1,440
-Jennifer Lancaster, Biological Resources	8	\$105	\$840
-Scott DeBauche, Noise & Traffic	4	\$110	\$440
-Phil Lowe, Water Resources	4	\$140	\$560
-Graphics/Bracketing/Printing/Administrative	24	\$95	\$2,280
-Printing ODCs, Shipping			\$300
TOTAL WITH RECIRCULATION*			\$17,780
TOTAL WITHOUT RECIRCULATION*			\$13,335

*25% of the estimated hours are assumed for recirculation related tasks (see last 3 bullets above).

4.0 Summary

Table 5 summarizes the additional funds requested due to additional efforts conducted for Tasks 3 through 5 (see Section 1.0 above), the anticipated level of effort to complete Tasks 6 through 10 (see Section 2.0 above), and analysis of a new alternative (see Section 3.0 above).

Table 5. Additional Budget Summary

	Tasks 3 thru 5	Tasks 6 thru 10*	New Alternative	Totals
Aspen Labor	\$72,378	\$91,343	\$17,780***	\$181,501
Subcontractors	\$21,522	\$25,700		\$47,222
TOTALS	\$93,900	\$117,043**	\$17,780***	\$228,723

*Subcontractor costs for Tasks 7 & 8 included in Aspen Labor budget.

** Assumes \$34,580 will be used to replenish the contingency.

***Assumes \$4,445 for recirculation related tasks.

Table 1. Tasks 3 and 4/5 Budget Summary

Staff Member (Role)	Task 3*					Task 4/5						Totals
	Hourly Rate	Proposal	Actual	Hour Difference	\$ Increase	Task 4 Proposal	Task 5 Proposal	Total Task 4/5	Actual Task 4/5	Hour Difference	\$ Increase	
Aspen Labor												
Vida (Mgmt, PD/Alts, Issue Area review, etc.)		6				8	2					
		20				72	20					
Total	\$170	26	62	36	\$6,120	80	22	102	322	220	\$37,400	\$43,520
Hedy (PD/Alts, Cumulative, Section 5.0)		6				8	2					
		12				36	24					
Total	\$135	18	43	25	\$3,375	44	26	70	153	83	\$11,205	\$14,580
Kati Simpson (graphics, GIS)	\$95	20	40	20	\$1,900	20	8	28	44	16	\$1,520	\$3,420
Brewster (Air Quality, GHG)	\$180	4	8	4	\$720	60	16	76	177	101	\$18,180	\$18,900
Aspen Labor Total					\$12,115						\$68,305	\$80,420
											Aspen Labor Total**	\$72,378
Subcontractor												
		Proposal Budget	Actual		\$ Increase	Task 4 Proposal	Task 5 Proposal	Total Task 4/5	Actual		\$ Increase	
GTC (Geology/Geologic Hazards, Groundwater)		\$1,426	\$6,150		\$4,724	\$24,624	\$7,128	\$31,752	\$38,226		\$6,474	\$11,198
ioMosaic (Hazardous Materials, Risk of Upset)		\$2,160	\$4,125		\$1,965	\$27,000	\$5,400	\$32,400	\$43,150		\$10,750	\$12,715
Subcontractor Total					\$6,689						\$17,224	\$23,913
											Subcontractor Total**	\$21,522
TOTAL**					\$18,804						\$85,529	\$93,900

*Once Invoice 3310.001-02 was submitted for the Project Description/Alternatives on May 26, 2017, additional PD/Alt work was rolled over to Task 4.

** 10% reduction in overall cost for Tasks 3, 4 and 5 pursuant to agreement between SB County and Aspen Environmental