

## Formal Task Assignment Document

### 2019 – 2021 SNOHOMISH COUNTY ON-CALL TASK ASSIGNMENT

Name of Project: 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update SEPA Consultant  
Project Number: PDS  
Discipline: Planning & Development Services  
Task No.: TA #3 Completion Date: 12/31/2023

The COUNTY desires to authorize services pursuant to the AGREEMENT entered into with **BERK Consulting, Inc.** and executed on December 24, 2018, as amended by Supplement No. 1 on May 24, 2019, as amended by Supplement No. 2 on May 6, 2019, as amended by Supplement No. 3 on August 12, 2020, to be amended by Supplement No. 4 to be executed contemporaneously with this Task Assignment #3, and identified as Agreement No. **OCC19-3-1(D)**, On-Call Consultant Services for **Comprehensive Plan Review**.

All provisions in the AGREEMENT remain in effect except as expressly modified by this TASK ASSIGNMENT, and are incorporated herein by reference.

### ATTACHED TO THIS TASK ASSIGNMENT

- Scope of Work
- Cost Estimate with Total Hours to Perform Work
- Items unique to the project not included in the AGREEMENT and which are to be reimbursed at cost with no markup.

The **Total Amount Authorized** under this TASK ASSIGNMENT, inclusive of all fees and other costs is **\$482,450.00**. **No other payment shall be allowed unless a TASK ASSIGNMENT Supplement for changed Scope of Work has been signed and authorized before work is performed.**

All work under this TASK ASSIGNMENT shall be performed pursuant to the terms, conditions, specifications, and limitations contained in the AGREEMENT.

If you concur with this TASK ASSIGNMENT and agree to the items as stated above, please sign and date in the appropriate spaces below and return to the COUNTY for final action.

Approved as to form only:

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Consultant Signature* *Date*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Deputy Prosecuting Attorney* *Date*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Authorized Signature Name* *Date*

# Snohomish County Comprehensive Plan Update EIS 2024

## Project Understanding

Snohomish County desires to conduct State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review for its required major update to its Growth Management Act (GMA) Comprehensive Plan. The update includes land use and zoning maps, General Policy Plan, Transportation Element, Capital Facilities Element, Parks And Recreation Element, and docket requests for changes to the UGA boundary and/or policies. The County is planning on a no-action alternative required by SEPA and two action alternatives. The County would like the Consultant team to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) including all elements required by law and as set forth herein.

Deliverables include:

- Review of a SEPA checklist or scoping document prepared by the County,
- Review of a Determination of Significance prepared by the County,
- Materials for two public meeting series (scoping and Draft EIS),
- Scoping report,
- Conditions and Trends Report that identifies equity and resilience frameworks as well as baseline natural and built environment conditions that will become part of the affected environment of the EIS and provide alternative screening tools, e.g. performance metrics,
- Preparation of an Arterial Segment Analysis, Transit Evaluation, Mode Share Evaluation, a Project List of roadway capacity projects, and Level of Service (LOS) Methodology,
- Preliminary Draft EIS, and
- Public Draft EIS.

Depending on public health guidelines and recommendations, and the needs of the project, public meetings may need to be virtual or hybrid in nature with in-person and online options.

The County has requested this scope of services and corresponding level of effort from BERK Consulting, Inc. and its team. This scope of services does not include evaluation of docket applications and preparation of a Final EIS, which would occur in a separate on-call agreement/scope.

Consultant EIS Team roles include the following:

- BERK: Prime and Project Management, Land Use/Plans, Demographics/Environmental Justice, Public Services, Engagement

- Confluence: Fish/Wildlife/ Vegetation/ Wetlands
- Fehr & Peers: Transportation, Air Quality Support
- Geosyntec: Earth/Topo/Soil/Erosion and Groundwater
- ICF Jones & Stokes (“ICF”): Cultural Resources
- Parametrix: Editing and Production, Air Quality, Energy, Surface Water, Utilities, Emergency Services

Snohomish County will provide overall project direction. The County will conduct the transportation modeling in-house. As well, Snohomish County will provide GIS services to prepare spatial analysis and EIS maps, with targeted coordination with the Consultant team.

BERK Consulting, and subconsultants (collectively the Consultant) will prepare the EIS and support the GMA and SEPA engagement process in an integrated manner. Major tasks include the following:

**1. Project Coordination**

- 1.1 Kickoff Meeting
- 1.2 Team Coordination and Meetings
- 1.3 Progress Reports and Schedule

**2. Scoping**

- 2.1 Public Engagement Strategies
- 2.2 Scoping Documents
- 2.3 Public Scoping Meeting
- 2.4 Scoping Process Report

**3 Conditions and Trends**

- 3.1 Equity and Resilience Frameworks

3.2 Natural Environment

3.3 Built Environment

**4. Analysis of changes to Land Use and Zoning Maps**

- 4.1 Description of Alternatives
- 4.2 Alternatives Evaluation

**5. Draft EIS**

- 5.1 Preliminary Draft EIS
- 5.2 Draft EIS

## Task Description

### 1. PROJECT COORDINATION AND STRATEGIES

#### 1.1 Kickoff Meeting

The Consultant will develop a coordinated kick-off meeting agenda designed to share project objectives and jump-start discussions on integrated environmental review strategies, integrated community engagement strategies, approach to visioning and alternatives, key technical methods, and critical path schedules.

#### 1.2 Team Coordination and Meetings

The Consultant will conduct regular check-in meetings with key project staff to address emergent issues, surface potential obstacles early, and employ strategies to meet project goals and schedule. These could be conducted virtually by phone or video, or in person as pandemic conditions and needs of the project

allow.

### 1.3 Progress Reports and Schedule

At the project launch phase the Consultant will provide an initial project schedule. As the project proceeds, the Consultant will monitor and adapt the schedule as needed. Schedule status will be reported in monthly progress reports. Monthly billings will also be prepared in accordance with the project contract.

## 2. SCOPING

### 2.1 Public Engagement Strategies

The Consultant will peer review the County's public engagement plan and provide advice on equitable engagement methods designed to reach persons that typically do not participate in planning processes. The County will lead engagement, and develop messaging and materials. The Consultant will interview up to four stakeholder groups or agencies that serve diverse populations. This will help the team identify the best means of reaching diverse communities in areas anticipated to change under alternatives and that have not been part of prior planning processes. As a result of this targeted engagement, the Consultant will identify objectives and key messages regarding the integration of SEPA elements with GMA elements. The Consultant will define the approach to the SEPA-based engagement such as scoping and Draft EIS issuance.

### 2.2 Scoping Documents

The Consultant will peer review a determination of significance and scoping notice prepared by the County together with a County-prepared supporting document (scoping document or SEPA checklist) indicating what topics are identified for inclusion in the scoping process. The scoping notice will initiate a minimum 21-day comment period, which can be coordinated with comprehensive plan engagement efforts of the County and the Consultant.

### 2.3 Public Scoping Meeting

The Consultant will prepare for and facilitate two public scoping meetings, anticipated to be virtual or hybrid and supported with media and online tools (e.g. fact sheet, presentation, story map with map comments, survey). The Consultant will develop a story map outline and the County GIS will prepare the story map. The County will engage interpreters and translators to support meetings and materials development (English and two other languages).

### 2.4 Scoping Process Report

Following the scoping period, the Consultant will summarize the results of scoping events, identify themes, and how input will be integrated into the EIS. A draft and revised scoping process report following County review will be prepared. Comments will not be provided an individual response but will be synthesized and catalogued by theme.

### 3. CONDITIONS AND TRENDS

#### 3.1 Equity and Resilience Frameworks

The Consultant will develop frameworks such as performance metrics that allow current conditions and future alternatives to be screened for their advancement of hurdles to equity and climate resilience. This effort will provide a cohesive evaluation framework for equity and resilience while advancing EIS topics in the context of SEPA requirements.

The Consultant will identify thresholds of significance to define impacts for EIS topics with a resilience and equity lens. The Consultant will identify data and maps available to address EIS requirements and the performance metrics.

By EIS topic and equity and resilience performance metrics, the Consultant will identify mitigation best practices, advances in environmental protection, and sustainability tools that could be addressed in alternatives or programmatic mitigation.

The Consultant will assemble a matrix with the metrics and share it with County staff at a team meeting, and finalize it with a summary memo. The performance metrics will be used in the EIS to assess the alternatives in a unified manner (e.g. in the summary or dedicated chapter, as well as be referenced in individual topic-specific sections of the EIS).

#### 3.2 Natural Environment

The Consultant will prepare chapters of an Existing Conditions Report addressing the natural environment at a programmatic level relying on relevant and available maps and studies, including:

- Earth/Topography/Soil/ Erosion
- Air Quality/Climate Change
- Water Resources (Ground and Surface)
- Fish/Wildlife/Vegetation/ Wetlands

The evaluation will summarize conditions at a countywide scale and by subareas: High Capacity Transit Subarea, Urban areas collectively, Rural areas collectively. The results will be integrated into the Draft EIS as the Affected Environment.

#### 3.3 Built Environment

The Consultant will prepare chapters of an Existing Conditions Report addressing the built environment at a programmatic level relying on relevant maps and studies, including:

- Land and Shoreline Use
- Plans and Policies
- Population/Housing/ Employment and Environmental Justice
- Cultural Resources
- Transportation
- Energy

- Public Services
- Utilities

For transportation, this will include Consultant review of all City and State arterial segments (up to 300 total per Task 5.1) to confirm roadway characteristics such that maximum service volume (MSV) can be determined for existing conditions. Consultant will review the Florida Department of Transportation methodology used for state arterial units in the 2015 Comprehensive Plan and may recommend changes if that methodology has since been revised. County staff will provide Consultant with MSVs for County arterial segments and with AM and PM peak hour counts for all County, City, and State arterial units.

Across other topics, the evaluation will summarize conditions at a countywide scale and by subareas: High Capacity Transit Subarea, Urban areas collectively, Rural areas collectively. The results will be integrated into the Draft EIS as the Affected Environment.

## 4. ANALYSIS OF CHANGES TO LAND USE AND ZONING MAPS

### 4.1 Description of Alternatives

The Consultant will review County frameworks for alternatives, and provide recommendations on alternatives to be discussed during scoping; following scoping, the Consultant will advise on adjustments to the alternatives to be studied in the Draft EIS. Alternatives are anticipated to include a no action and two action alternatives. Alternatives may vary the level, type, and location of growth. Following scoping, the Consultant will write an alternatives chapter of the Draft EIS for County review, and eventually to advance the Draft EIS impact analysis.

### 4.2 Alternatives Evaluation

It is anticipated that the No Action Alternative and a bookend alternative may be developed first, followed by a mid-range or moderate alternative. Each alternative will be evaluated for potential impacts using defined thresholds of significance and the performance metrics identified in Task 3.1. The alternatives will be compared using the subareas defined under the Existing Conditions work in Tasks 3.2 and 3.3.

#### *Transportation Evaluation*

**Task A. Model Coordination:** County staff will provide the Consultant with post-processed AM and PM peak hour forecasts for all County, City, and State arterial segments for the No Action Alternative and two action alternatives. The Consultant will review the forecasts and identify any apparent illogical growth or inconsistencies among alternatives for the County to consider.

**Task B. Arterial Segment Analysis:** Using the final post-processed forecasts for the future year alternatives provided by the County, the Consultant will complete volume-to-MSV analysis for both the AM and PM peak hours for the following study segments:

- County arterials: Up to 300 arterial units will be analyzed using the methodology and adopted LOS standards from Snohomish County Code Chapter 30.66B.
- State highways: Up to 100 state highway arterial units will be analyzed using adopted level of surface (LOS) standards. State highways will be analyzed using a segment-based LOS method similar to the County arterial unit analysis (with potential methodological updates as discussed in Task 3.3).

- Adjacent jurisdiction arterials: Up to 200 adjacent jurisdiction arterial segments will be analyzed using local jurisdiction LOS standards. Adjacent jurisdiction arterial segments will be analyzed the segment-based methodology from Snohomish County Code Chapter 30.66B.

No intersection-specific LOS calculations will be performed as part of this task.

**Task C. Transit Evaluation:** The Consultant will analyze transit ridership and reliability within the county. The analysis will include inventories of existing facilities and services as well as planned changes. Transit service analysis will be based on travel time reliability estimates for key transit routes served by Community Transit, Sound Transit, and Everett Transit. Link travel times for the study corridors will be provided by County staff for both existing and all future year alternatives. For budgeting purposes, we have assumed that AM and PM peak hour travel time reliability will be calculated on up to 25 corridor segments. It is assumed that overall estimated ridership levels by service type (for both the base year model and all future scenarios) will be provided by County staff with technical support from Fehr & Peers regarding which metrics should be extracted. Fehr & Peers will also extract key ridership statistics from the Sound Transit model for comparison with the County model forecasts.

**Task D. Mode Share Evaluation:** The Consultant will summarize mode splits (auto, transit, walk/bike) within up to 20 sub-areas (envisioned as subareas of the existing TSAs).

**Task E. Project List:** Using the findings for the future year scenarios, Fehr & Peers will develop a list of roadway capacity projects to address the transportation needs identified by the arterial segment analysis. This list will be a foundation for the County's update of its Transportation Element.

**Task F. Transportation Data for Environmental Analysis:** The Consultant will develop data to support the environmental analysis for the EIS. The Consultant will provide traffic volumes and intersection LOS for air quality and climate change analysis, and then the Consultant team will complete said analysis. Data for up to 10 intersections will be developed for each analysis scenario to support air quality analyses.

**Task G. Level of Service Methodology Development:** This task includes a series of workshops and methodology development as identified below:

*Workshop 1 - Kickoff:* The Consultant will facilitate a workshop with County staff to discuss several key topics:

- Review the concurrency management system and how LOS is currently being applied to understand both what is working well and what needs to be changed.
- Discuss recent trends in Snohomish County and the changing context of the Urban Core and UGAs to understand County staff's priorities and concerns as they plan for specific geographic areas.
- Review data availability so that the Consultant understands the parameters of the types of LOS systems that could be explored. The Consultant will present a high-level summary of travel time data sources that could supplement existing resources.

*Background and Best Practices Memorandum:* Based on the discussion at the kickoff workshop, the Consultant will prepare a memorandum documenting the key takeaways and priorities from the kickoff workshop as well as a review of select LOS and concurrency systems within Washington State as well as other best practices from around the country.

*Workshop 2 – Best Practices Review and Selection of Potential LOS Frameworks:* The Consultant will facilitate a workshop with County staff to discuss LOS/concurrency best practices from other jurisdictions and understand which programs, or elements of programs, are of most interest to Snohomish County. The desired outcome of this workshop is for the group to coalesce around the frameworks to be explored in more detail.

Following this workshop, the Consultant will propose up to three potential LOS methodologies (addressing both planning-level LOS and concurrency implementation) for review by County staff. This scope assumes up to two rounds of consolidated comments and revisions to finalize the three potential methodologies.

*Evaluate Potential Alternate LOS Methodologies:* The Consultant will evaluate up to three LOS methodology scenarios using initial transportation modeling results from the EIS land use alternative considered to have the greatest potential impact on county facilities. The evaluation will examine future LOS results for a sample set of study facilities using each of the methodologies. Fehr & Peers will summarize the findings from this evaluation in a technical memorandum.

*Workshop 3 - Select a Preferred LOS Alternative:* The Consultant will facilitate a workshop with County staff that will include a presentation of the findings from the evaluation of the potential LOS methodology scenarios. Discussion would include the level to which each methodology is expected to help the County attain its transportation goals, ease of implementation and ongoing use, data needs, and potential ramifications related to the County's project list, determination of existing deficiencies, and impact fee program. The desired outcome of the workshop is to select a final proposal for changes to the LOS standard/concurrency management methodology. The final proposal could be a combination of preliminary options or include refinements to one of the proposals based on the findings.

*EIS Evaluation of Selected Methodology:* If the County decides to pursue an alternate LOS methodology, the Consultant will apply that methodology at the appropriate geography such that it can be included as part of the Comprehensive Plan EIS. Up to 180 hours has been included in the budget for this effort. If the methodology selected requires a higher level of effort, the Consultant would work with County staff to determine if additional budget is required or if some work could be completed by County staff.

*Implementation Recommendations:* Based on the LOS methodology selected, the Consultant will prepare a technical memorandum summarizing recommendations for implementing the proposed LOS methodology. This would include policy recommendations to be included in a Comprehensive Plan amendment and code amendments as necessary to codify the change in LOS methodology. This scope assumes County staff would lead the drafting of the Comprehensive Plan and code amendments based on this input. Fehr & Peers would complete one round of review and provide suggested edits to County staff. If the County determines additional support is needed beyond the technical memorandum recommendations and amendment/code review, the Consultant would prepare a proposed scope and fee amendment.

## 5. ISSUE DEIS

### 5.1 Preliminary Draft EIS

#### *Document Design and Outline*

The Consultant will prepare a document template/format for use by the County for the Draft EIS that is reader friendly and graphic-rich while conveying the essential analysis of the existing conditions and SEPA analysis. Developing an early outline of the Existing Conditions Report and SEPA documents will allow the County and the Consultant to create a common structure for all authors. This approach improves efficiency and SEPA compliance.

This scope anticipates a unified SEPA process consisting of a single EIS that is organized to share Countywide, subarea, and transportation system conditions and environmental implications.

The Preliminary Draft EIS will contain the following elements required in WAC 197-11:



- Cover Letter
- Fact Sheet
- Table of Contents
- Chapter 1–Environmental Summary
- Chapter 2–Proposal and Alternatives
- Chapter 3–Affected Environment, Significant Impacts, and Mitigation Measures
- Chapter 4–References
- Chapter 5–Distribution List
- Appendices

The Consultant will prepare a preliminary draft EIS for County review and comment. Natural and built environment scope topics and approaches are included in the table below with Consultant EIS team leads indicated.

The Draft EIS will be for the entire county and comparative in nature. The impact analysis will include quantitative and qualitative approaches such as models (e.g. transportation) or adopted standards (e.g. stormwater LID practices, public service levels of service, etc.) to determine the effect of the alternatives.

**Natural and Built Environment Topics for EIS**

**Assumed Environmental Topics for SEPA Document**

**Earth/soil/erosion, ground water (Geosyntec)** The Consultant will identify earth and soils and geologic hazard information based on review of critical areas inventory extents across the study areas from County geodatabases and studies. The Consultant will review subbasin characteristics from the County’s Groundwater Management Plan and identify areas that are important for groundwater discharge and recharge. The Consultant will work with County Surface Water Management staff to identify impervious area assumptions for land use and broadly identify concerns with infiltration and recharge. Available basin studies for Little Bear Creek and the Southwest UGA Boundary Planning Study will be integrated. The Consultant will identify programmatic measures for avoidance, minimization, and mitigation considering existing and potential changes to critical areas regulations.

**Air quality/climate change (Parametrix; Fehr & Peers model)** The Consultant will conduct a qualitative analysis of the impacts to air quality and climate change and greenhouse gas emissions that could result from each of the growth alternatives. The analysis will include a discussion of the potential impacts to existing air quality, including the growth alternatives’ potential to affect compliance with any applicable federal, state, or local regulatory requirements. In addition, the analysis will identify appropriate avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures, as applicable, and a discussion of how the growth alternatives’ impacts to air quality relate to the County’s sustainability and climate resiliency goals.

**Surface water (Parametrix)** The Consultant will evaluate the impacts of the growth alternatives to surface water resources, including streams, rivers, lakes, shorelines, floodplains and floodways. In addition to natural water resources, this analysis will consider existing and proposed changes to stormwater infrastructure, land cover (impervious surfaces), and land use. The Consultant will identify

## Assumed Environmental Topics for SEPA Document

appropriate avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures for impacts as applicable, and discuss how the growth alternatives and subsequent impacts to water resources relate to sustainability and climate resiliency goals.

**Fish/wildlife/wetlands (Confluence):** The Consultant will evaluate growth alternatives on compatibility and consistency with Snohomish County critical area code sections, Washington Administrative Code, and applicable Federal laws, such as the Endangered Species Act and the Magnuson-Stevens Fisheries Act. The Consultant will discuss how the growth alternatives relate to sustainability and climate resiliency goals, and potential changes to critical areas regulations.

**Energy (Parametrix)** The Consultant will conduct a qualitative evaluation for each growth alternative on how it might affect the levels of energy consumption and demand on existing energy sources. The analysis will identify appropriate avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures as applicable. Included in the analysis will be a high-level discussion of how the growth alternatives and subsequent impacts to energy relate to sustainability and climate resiliency goals.

**Land Use Patterns and Policies (BERK):** The Consultant will evaluate growth alternatives on compatibility and consistency with state GMA goals, VISION 2050, and elements of the Comprehensive Plan Update Vision. The Consultant will evaluate change in land use and shoreline patterns, and consider existing policies and proposed policies and land use/zoning categories. The effect of land use changes on the Shoreline Master Program will also be identified. In a sub-section of the chapter the Consultant will integrate the evaluation of the draft Comprehensive Plan (General Policy Plan and other chapters) to support the analysis of plans and policies per Task 4.4.

**Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice (BERK):** The Consultant will review the ability of alternatives to meet the County's growth allocations. The Consultant will also analyze the potential relative effects of growth alternatives on affordable housing conditions and economic development strategies, potential job types, and jobs/housing balance. The Consultant will consider demographic characteristics of the population in different geographies of unincorporated Snohomish County and identify any environmental justice considerations of the alternatives using the equity framework in Task 3.1.

**Cultural (ICF):** The Consultant will analyze each alternative and develop mitigation to address impacts to cultural resources. This will be accomplished by summarizing previously recorded cultural resources, updating the existing historic context of the land use and development, and then using these two data sources to identify the general cultural resources sensitivity. Based on this sensitivity, mitigation measures will be developed to provide guidance and direction to protect cultural resources on County proposals (e.g. infrastructure) as well as programmatically across the alternative geographies.

### **Transportation (Fehr & Peers):**

The Consultant will synthesize the results of Tasks 3.3 and 4.2 into a section of the EIS that for each alternative identifies the affected environment, impacts, and mitigation measures as well as potential significant unavoidable adverse impacts.

**Public Services (BERK, Schools and Parks; and Parametrix, Police and Fire Services):** Growth under the alternatives will affect a wide variety of public services, including police protection, fire

## Assumed Environmental Topics for SEPA Document

and emergency medical services, parks, and schools. The Consultant will evaluate each alternative with regard to the level of demand anticipated for each of these public services based on available system plan and service delivery studies and adopted level of service standards.

**Utilities (Parametrix):** The Consultant will analyze each alternative for impacts, mitigation requirements, and public-private funding options for utility improvements for each alternative (water, wastewater, and stormwater). The Consultant will consider anticipated or needed improvements to accommodate growth and development projections.

## 5.2 Draft EIS

**Document:** Based on one round of consolidated County comments on the Preliminary Draft EIS, the Consultant will prepare revised preliminary draft. Upon confirmation of edits, the Consultant will prepare a print-check document and a Draft EIS for posting online and public review. The Consultant will prepare the notice of availability for County publication. The County will publish the Draft EIS.

**Draft EIS Engagement:** The Consultant will support outreach during comment period of Draft EIS such as development of a preferred alternative.

During the comment period, the Consultant will:

- Review County-provided digital mapping and engagement materials.
- Develop summary content regarding Draft EIS conclusions and alternatives that can be developed into a communication piece by County communications staff for posting online or turning it into a Story Map.
- Attend two virtual or in-person meetings during the comment period to help develop a preferred alternative for evaluation in the Final EIS. Develop meeting materials in up to two languages aside from English.

Firm Name - Berk							
	Lisa Grueter	Radhika Nair	Jessie Hartmann	Kizz Prussia	Jonathan Morales	Josh Linden	Total Hours and Estimated Cost by Task
	Project Manager [SEPA Strategy, Land Use Policy]	Engagement Lead	EIS Lead Author [Land Use/ Demographics]	EIS Contributor, Engagement Support	EIS Contributor [Services]	Analyst [Env Justice]	
	Principal	Sr Associate II	Sr Associate I	Associate II	Associate II	Associate II	
Rate	\$240.00 ✓	\$154.55 ✓	\$125.80 ✓	\$105.71 ✓	\$107.12 ✓	\$107.12 ✓	
<b>1. Project Coordination</b>							
1.1 Kickoff Meeting	4	4	6	2	2	2	
1.2 Team Coordination and Meetings	24	12	24	4	4	4	
1.3 Progress Reports and Schedule	24		12				
<b>2. Scoping</b>							
2.1 Public Engagement Strategies	4	16	2	8			
2.2 Scoping Documents	2						
2.3 Public Scoping Meeting	8	24	16	32			
2.4 Scoping Process Report	8		4	16			
<b>3 Conditions and Trends</b>							
3.1 Equity and Resilience Frameworks	12	20	8	8	8	16	
3.2 Natural Environment	10						
3.3 Built Environment	16		32	16	32	8	
<b>4. Analysis of changes to Land Use and Zoning Maps</b>							
4.1 Description of Alternatives	24		8				
4.2 Alternatives Evaluation	16		54	24	40	8	
<b>5. Draft EIS</b>							
5.1 Preliminary Draft EIS	24		32	8	8	4	
5.2 Draft EIS	24	32	32	32	16	4	
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>200 ✓</b>	<b>108 ✓</b>	<b>230 ✓</b>	<b>150 ✓</b>	<b>110 ✓</b>	<b>46 ✓</b>	<b>844</b> <b>\$126,193</b>
<b>Total Estimated Hours</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>230</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>844</b>
<b>Cost (Hours*Rate)</b>	<b>\$48,000 ✓</b>	<b>\$16,691 ✓</b>	<b>\$28,934 ✓</b>	<b>\$15,857 ✓</b>	<b>\$11,783 ✓</b>	<b>\$4,928 ✓</b>	<b>\$126,193</b>
<b>Subtotal Consultant Cost</b>	<b>\$126,193 ✓</b>						
<b>Project Expenses at ~1% of Project Budget</b>	<b>\$1,260 ✓</b>						
<b>Estimated Project Total</b>	<b>\$127,453 ✓</b>						

Records/data/copies/meeting materials \$945.00  
Postage/delivery/parking/travel/mileage \$315.00

Confluence Environmental								Subtask Subtotals	Task Percentages
	Kerrie McArthur	Suzanne Viera	Natalie White	Nora Burton	Kathy Sitchen	Total Hours and Estimated Cost by Task			
	Senior Scientist	Project Scientist 2	Project Scientist 1	Accounting	Editor				
Rate	\$155.28 ✓	\$105.28 ✓	\$92.12 ✓	\$116.50 ✓	\$113.17 ✓				
1. Project Coordination								\$0	
1.1 Kickoff Meeting	3							\$466	
1.2 Team Coordination and Meetings	6							\$932	
1.3 Progress Reports and Schedule								\$0	
2. Scoping								\$0	
2.1 Public Engagement Strategies								\$0	
2.2 Scoping Documents								\$0	
2.3 Public Scoping Meeting								\$0	
2.4 Scoping Process Report								\$0	
3 Conditions and Trends								\$0	
3.1 Equity and Resilience Frameworks	4							\$621	
3.2 Natural Environment	40	20	20	4	8			\$11,531	
3.3 Built Environment								\$0	
4. Analysis of changes to Land Use and Zoning Maps								\$0	
4.1 Description of Alternatives								\$0	
4.2 Alternatives Evaluation	16			2	4			\$3,170	
5. Draft EIS								\$0	
5.1 Preliminary Draft EIS	40	20		4	8			\$9,688	
5.2 Draft EIS	8			1	4			\$1,811	
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>117 ✓</b>	<b>40 ✓</b>	<b>20 ✓</b>	<b>11 ✓</b>	<b>24 ✓</b>		<b>212</b>	<b>\$28,219</b>	<b>100%</b>
							<b>\$28,219</b>		<b>99%</b>
<b>Total Estimated Hours</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>24</b>		<b>212</b>		
<b>Cost (Hours*Rate)</b>	<b>\$18,168 ✓</b>	<b>\$4,211 ✓</b>	<b>\$1,842 ✓</b>	<b>\$1,282 ✓</b>	<b>\$2,716 ✓</b>		<b>\$28,219</b>		
<b>Subtotal Consultant Cost</b>	<b>\$28,219 ✓</b>								
<b>Project Expenses at ~1% of Project Budget</b>	<b>\$280 ✓</b>								
<b>Estimated Project Total</b>	<b>\$28,499 ✓</b>								

Hours	55%	19%	9%	5%	11%	100%
Dollars	64%	15%	7%	5%	10%	100%

Expense Breakdown	
Records/Data/Copies/Meeting Materials	\$210.00
Delivery/Postage/Parking/Travel/Mileage	\$70.00
<b>Expense Total</b>	<b>\$280.00 ✓</b>

	Fahr & Peers						Total Hours and Estimated Cost by Task	Subtask Subtotals
	Chris Breiland	Ariel Davis	Jeff Pierson	Marissa Milam	Peter Nguyen	Brittany Skinner		
	Principal III	Senior Associate II	Associate II	Engineer/Planner III	Senior Engineering Technician III	Senior Administrative Assistant II		
Rate	\$240.0 ✓	\$176.4 ✓	\$148.9 ✓	\$104.1 ✓	\$115.7 ✓	\$104.1 ✓		
1. Project Coordination							\$0	
1.1 Kickoff Meeting	2	4		2			\$1,394	
1.2 Team Coordination and Meetings	8	16	4	8		2	\$6,379	
1.3 Progress Reports and Schedule							\$0	
2. Scoping							\$0	
2.1 Public Engagement Strategies							\$0	
2.2 Scoping Documents							\$0	
2.3 Public Scoping Meeting	2	4		4	8	1	\$2,631	
2.4 Scoping Process Report							\$0	
3 Conditions and Trends							\$0	
3.1 Equity and Resilience Frameworks	4	8		8		1	\$3,308	
3.2 Natural Environment							\$0	
3.3 Built Environment	4	32	8	100	40	16	\$24,499	
4. Analysis of changes to Land Use and Zoning Maps							\$0	
4.1 Description of Alternatives							\$0	
4.2 Alternatives Evaluation	88	164	82	536	28	50	\$126,504	
5. Draft EIS							\$0	
5.1 Preliminary Draft EIS	8	40	8	40	40	8	\$19,790	
5.2 Draft EIS	4	8		12	8	2	\$4,754	
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>120 ✓</b>	<b>276 ✓</b>	<b>102 ✓</b>	<b>710 ✓</b>	<b>124 ✓</b>	<b>80 ✓</b>	<b>1412</b> <b>\$189,258</b>	
<b>Total Estimated Hours</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>276</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>710</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>1412</b>	
<b>Cost (Hours*Rate)</b>	<b>\$28,800 ✓</b>	<b>\$48,681 ✓</b>	<b>\$15,189 ✓</b>	<b>\$73,918 ✓</b>	<b>\$14,342 ✓</b>	<b>\$8,329 ✓</b>	<b>\$189,258</b>	
<b>Subtotal Consultant Cost</b>	<b>\$189,258 ✓</b>							
<b>Project Expenses at ~1% of Project Budget</b>	<b>\$1,890 ✓</b>							
<b>Estimated Project Total</b>	<b>\$191,148 ✓</b>							

Hours	8%	20%	7%	50%	9%	6%	100%
Dollars	15%	26%	8%	39%	8%	4%	100%

**4.2 Alternatives Evaluation Task Breakdown**

Task A. Model Coordination	4	4	20	4		2	34
Task B. Arterial Segment Analysis	4	32	16	140	8	12	212
Task C. Transit Evaluation	4	12	12	40		4	72
Task D. Mode Share Evaluation	2	6	4	12		2	26
Task E. Project List	16	32	6	60		6	120
Task F. Transportation Data for Environmental Analysis	2	8	16	60		4	90
Task G. Alternate LOS Methodology Study	56	70	8	220	20	20	394
<b>4.2 Alternatives Evaluation Total</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>536</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>948</b>

Expense Breakdown	
Records/Data/Copies/Meeting Materials	\$1,512.00
Delivery/Postage/Parking/Travel/Mileage	\$378.00
<b>Expense Total</b>	<b>\$1,890.00</b>

Geosynlec							Total Hours and Estimated Cost by Task	Subtask Subtotals
Bob Anderson	Christian Nilsen	Joel Prock	Dottie Metcalf-Lindberger	Lisa Curtis				
Project Director, Senior Principal	Project Manager, Senior Professional/Engineer	Project Professional/Engineer	Professional/Geologist	Project Administrator				
\$236.90 ✓	\$191.28 ✓	\$160.67 ✓	\$141.54 ✓	\$113.30 ✓				
1. Project Coordination							\$0	
1.1 Kickoff Meeting	1	1	1	1			\$730	
1.2 Team Coordination and Meetings	3	6	1	1	4		\$2,614	
1.3 Progress Reports and Schedule							\$0	
2. Scoping							\$0	
2.1 Public Engagement Strategies							\$0	
2.2 Scoping Documents							\$0	
2.3 Public Scoping Meeting							\$0	
2.4 Scoping Process Report							\$0	
3 Conditions and Trends							\$0	
3.1 Equity and Resilience Frameworks	4	6	0	6			\$2,945	
3.2 Natural Environment	8	16	32	32			\$14,626	
3.3 Built Environment	0	0	0	0			\$0	
4. Analysis of changes to Land Use and Zoning Maps							\$0	
4.1 Description of Alternatives							\$0	
4.2 Alternatives Evaluation	8	8	16	16			\$8,261	
5. Draft EIS							\$0	
5.1 Preliminary Draft EIS	4	4	16	16	4		\$7,001	
5.2 Draft EIS	2	4	4	4	4		\$2,901	
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>30 ✓</b>	<b>45 ✓</b>	<b>70 ✓</b>	<b>76 ✓</b>	<b>12 ✓</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>\$0</b>	
						<b>\$39,078</b>		
<b>Total Estimated Hours</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>233</b>		
<b>Cost (Hours*Rate)</b>	<b>\$7,107 ✓</b>	<b>\$8,608 ✓</b>	<b>\$11,247 ✓</b>	<b>\$10,757 ✓</b>	<b>\$1,360 ✓</b>	<b>\$39,078</b>		
<b>Subtotal Consultant Cost</b>	<b>\$39,078 ✓</b>							
<b>Project Expenses at ~1% of Project Budget</b>	<b>\$390 ✓</b>							
<b>Estimated Project Total</b>	<b>\$39,468 ✓</b>							

Hours	13%	19%	30%	33%	5%	100%
Dollars	18%	22%	29%	28%	3%	100%

Expense Breakdown	
Records/Data/Copies/Meeting Materials	\$292.50
Delivery/Postage/Parking/Travel/Mileage	\$97.50
<b>Expense Total</b>	<b>\$390.00</b>

# Snohomish County Comprehensive Plan Update EIS 2024

Task	Consulting Staff - ICF					Labor Total	
	Employee Name	Cascella	Tavel	Ryder	Little		Yeates
	Project Role	Melissa Senior Archaeologist	January Senior Arch. Historian	Alexander Historian	Kainoa Archaeologist		Kelly GIS
Labor Classification	Sr Consult III	Sr Consult II	Assoc Consult III	Assoc Consult II	Assoc Consult I		
1. Project Coordination						\$0	
1.1 Kickoff Meeting	2.0					\$325	
1.2 Team Coordination and Meetings	4.0					\$649	
1.3 Progress Reports and Schedule						\$0	
2. Scoping						\$0	
2.1 Public Engagement Strategies						\$0	
2.2 Scoping Documents						\$0	
2.3 Public Scoping Meeting						\$0	
2.4 Scoping Process Report						\$0	
3 Conditions and Trends						\$0	
3.1 Equity and Resilience Frameworks	2.0					\$325	
3.2 Natural Environment						\$0	
3.3 Built Environment	6.0	6.0	12.0	6.0	3.0	\$3,831	
4. Analysis of changes to Land Use and Zoning Maps						\$0	
4.1 Description of Alternatives						\$0	
4.2 Alternatives Evaluation	12.0	12.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	\$4,687	
5. Draft EIS						\$0.00	
5.1 Preliminary Draft EIS	6.0	6.0	12.0	6.0	3.0	\$3,831.48	
5.2 Draft EIS	6.0	6.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	\$2,855.04	
Total hours	132.0	38.0 ✓	30.0 ✓	32.0 ✓	20.0 ✓	12.0 ✓	
% of Total Effort		29% ✓	23% ✓	24% ✓	15% ✓	9% ✓	
Billing Rates		\$162.25 ✓	\$143.00 ✓	\$97.63 ✓	\$97.70 ✓	\$80.74 ✓	
Subtotal		\$6,165.50 ✓	\$4,290.00 ✓	\$3,124.16 ✓	\$1,954.00 ✓	\$968.88 ✓	
Expenses						\$165.03	
<b>Total</b>						<b>\$16,667.57</b> ✓	

**Expense Breakdown**

Records/Data/Copies/Meeting Materials	\$123.77
Delivery/Postage/Parking/Travel/Mileage	\$41.26
<b>Expense Total</b>	<b>\$165.03</b>



	Sr. Planner	Senior Consultant	Senior Consultant	Planner III	Sr. Engineer	Engineer I	Sr. Engineer	Parametric				Sr. Scientist	Sr. GIS Analyst	Technical Editor	Publications Supervisor	Project Controls Specialist	Sr. Project Accountant	Sr. Contract Administrator	Total Hours and Estimated Cost by Task	Subtask Subtotals
								Planner IV	Energy	Public Services	Utilities									
	PWX PM	Senior Review/QC	Climate Change	Air Quality	Surface Water	Surface Water	Utilities	Public Services	Energy	GIS lead	Technical Editor	Publications Supervisor	Project Controls Specialist	Project Accountant	Contracts					
	\$175.00 ✓	\$220.00 ✓	\$220.00 ✓	\$150.87 ✓	\$176.00 ✓	\$101.61 ✓	\$176.00 ✓	\$144.35 ✓	\$175.00 ✓	\$112.07 ✓	\$93.39 ✓	\$125.00 ✓	\$114.04 ✓	\$117.00 ✓	\$117.00 ✓					
0. Task/Project Management																				
1. Project Coordination																				
1.1 Kickoff Meeting	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1					18	18	6	42	\$4,861
1.2 Team Coordination and Meetings	12	1			6														0	\$0
1.3 Progress Reports and Schedule																			10	\$1,651
2. Scoping																			19	\$3,376
2.1 Public Engagement Strategies																			0	\$0
2.2 Scoping Documents																			0	\$0
2.3 Public Scoping Meeting	2																		2	\$350
2.4 Scoping Process Report																			0	\$0
3. Conditions and Trends																			0	\$0
3.1 Equity and Resilience Frameworks	4	1	2																7	\$1,360
3.2 Natural Environment				8		8													16	\$2,020
3.3 Built Environment	4												4						32	\$5,111
4. Analysis of changes to Land Use and Zoning Maps																			0	\$0
4.1 Description of Alternatives	8	2	2	8	2	8	8	8	8	8	4								58	\$9,063
4.2 Alternatives Evaluation																			0	\$0
5. Draft EIS	24	4	4	16	8	20	16	16	16	4			12						148	\$22,309
5.1 Preliminary Draft EIS	20	2	2	8	4	12	8	8	8	4			12						100	\$14,542
5.2 Draft EIS																			0	\$0
Subtotal	75 ✓	11 ✓	11 ✓	41 ✓	21 ✓	49 ✓	41 ✓	41 ✓	41 ✓	17 ✓	24 ✓	20 ✓	18 ✓	18 ✓	6 ✓	434			434	\$64,643
Total Estimated Hours	75	11	11	41	21	49	41	41	41	17	24	20	18	18	6	434				
Cost (Hours*Rate)	\$13,125 ✓	\$2,420 ✓	\$2,420 ✓	\$6,188 ✓	\$3,696 ✓	\$4,979 ✓	\$7,216 ✓	\$5,918 ✓	\$7,175 ✓	\$1,905 ✓	\$2,241 ✓	\$2,500 ✓	\$2,053 ✓	\$2,108 ✓	\$702 ✓	\$64,643 ✓				
Subtotal Consultant Cost	\$64,643																			
Project Expenses at ~1% of Project Budget	\$650																			
Estimated Project Total	\$65,293 ✓																			

Hours	17%	3%	3%	9%	5%	11%	9%	9%	9%	4%	6%	5%	4%	4%	1%	100%
Dollars	20%	4%	4%	10%	6%	8%	11%	9%	11%	3%	3%	4%	3%	3%	1%	100%

Expense Breakdown  
Records/Data/Copies/Meeting Materials \$487.50  
Delivery/Postage/Parking/Travel/Meals \$162.50  
Expense Total \$650.00

**Hours**

Topic/Focus	Firm Name						Team Total
	BERK	Confluence	Fehr & Peers	Geosyntec	ICF	Parametrix	
Project Management, Land Use/Plans, Demographics/EI, Public Services, Engagement	Fish/Wildlife/ Vegetation/ Wetlands	Transportation, Air Quality Support	Earth/Tops/Soil/ Erosion and Groundwater	Cultural Resources	Editing and Production, Air Quality, Energy, Surface Water, Utilities, Emergency Services		
<b>1. Project Coordination</b>							
1.1 Kickoff Meeting	20	3	8	4	2	10	
1.2 Team Coordination and Meetings	72	6	38	15	4	19	
1.3 Progress Reports and Schedule	36	0	0	0	0	42	
<b>2. Scoping</b>							
2.1 Public Engagement Strategies	30	0	0	0	0	0	
2.2 Scoping Documents	2	0	0	0	0	0	
2.3 Public Scoping Meeting	80	0	19	0	0	2	
2.4 Scoping Process Report	28	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>3. Conditions and Trends</b>							
3.1 Equity and Resilience Frameworks	72	4	21	16	2	7	
3.2 Natural Environment	10	92	0	88	0	16	
3.3 Built Environment	104	0	200	0	33	32	
<b>4. Analysis of changes to Land Use and Zoning Maps</b>							
4.1 Description of Alternatives	32	0	0	0	0	0	
4.2 Alternatives Evaluation	142	22	948	48	35	58	
<b>5. DEIS</b>							
5.1 Preliminary Draft EIS	76	72	144	44	33	148	
5.2 Draft EIS	140	13	34	18	23	100	
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>844</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>1,412</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>434</b>	<b>3,267</b>
<b>Hours</b>	<b>844</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>1,412</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>434</b>	<b>3,267</b>
<b>Share</b>	<b>25.8%</b>	<b>6.5%</b>	<b>43.2%</b>	<b>7.1%</b>	<b>4.0%</b>	<b>13.3%</b>	
<b>Estimated Project Total Hours</b>	<b>3,267</b>						

**Dollars**

Topic/Focus	Firm Name						Team Total
	BERK	Confluence	Fehr & Peers	Geosyntec	ICF	Parametrix	
Project Management, Land Use/Plans, Demographics/EI, Public Services, Engagement	Fish/Wildlife/ Vegetation/ Wetlands	Transportation, Air Quality Support	Earth/Tops/Soil/ Erosion and Groundwater	Cultural Resources	Editing and Production, Air Quality, Energy, Surface Water, Utilities, Emergency Services		
<b>1. Project Coordination</b>							
1.1 Kickoff Meeting	\$2,973	\$466	\$1,394	\$730	\$325	\$1,651	
1.2 Team Coordination and Meetings	\$11,914	\$932	\$6,379	\$2,614	\$649	\$3,376	
1.3 Progress Reports and Schedule	\$7,270	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,861	
<b>2. Scoping</b>							
2.1 Public Engagement Strategies	\$4,530	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
2.2 Scoping Documents	\$480	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
2.3 Public Scoping Meeting	\$11,025	\$0	\$2,631	\$0	\$0	\$350	
2.4 Scoping Process Report	\$4,115	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
<b>3. Conditions and Trends</b>							
3.1 Equity and Resilience Frameworks	\$10,394	\$621	\$3,308	\$2,945	\$325	\$1,360	
3.2 Natural Environment	\$2,400	\$11,531	\$0	\$14,626	\$0	\$2,020	
3.3 Built Environment	\$13,842	\$0	\$24,499	\$0	\$3,831	\$5,111	
<b>4. Analysis of changes to Land Use and Zoning Maps</b>							
4.1 Description of Alternatives	\$6,766	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
4.2 Alternatives Evaluation	\$18,312	\$3,170	\$126,504	\$8,261	\$4,687	\$9,063	
<b>5. DEIS</b>							
5.1 Preliminary Draft EIS	\$11,917	\$9,688	\$19,790	\$7,001	\$3,831	\$22,309	
5.2 Draft EIS	\$20,256	\$1,811	\$4,754	\$2,901	\$2,855	\$14,542	
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$126,193</b>	<b>\$28,219</b>	<b>\$189,258</b>	<b>\$39,078</b>	<b>\$16,503</b>	<b>\$64,643</b>	<b>\$463,893</b>
<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>\$126,193</b> ✓	<b>\$28,219</b> ✓	<b>\$189,258</b> ✓	<b>\$39,078</b> ✓	<b>\$16,503</b> ✓	<b>\$64,643</b> ✓	<b>\$463,893</b> ✓
<b>Share</b>	<b>27.2%</b>	<b>6.1%</b>	<b>40.8%</b>	<b>8.4%</b>	<b>3.6%</b>	<b>13.9%</b>	
<b>Subtotal Consultant Cost</b>	<b>\$463,893</b>		3% escalation	\$13,917 ✓			
<b>Project Expenses at ~1% of Project Budget*</b>	<b>\$4,640</b> ✓						
<b>Estimated Project Total</b>	<b>\$468,533</b> ✓		Total with escalation	\$482,450 ✓			

Expense Breakdown*	Subtotal
Records/Data/Copies/Meeting Materials	\$3,570
Delivery/Postage/Parking/Mileage	\$1,070
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$4,640</b>

