Local Agency A&E Professional Services Supplemental Agreement	Consultant/Address/Telephone **WSP USA, Inc.** 101 Fourth Avenue, Suite 3100 Seattle, WA 98154 Contact Name / E-Mail Address Greg Banks / greg.banks@wsp.com Telephone 206-431-2253 Fax N/A	
Supplement Number **Supplement No. 4**		
Agreement Number **CCF02-22**	Execution Date 12/16/2022	Completion Date 12/31/2027
Project Title Design Services, Granite Falls Bridge 102	New Maximum Amount Payable $4,139,888.00	
Description of Work *Provide all design services necessary to complete final plans, special provision preparation and estimates (PS&E), to provide NEPA approval and permits, and to provide Construction Phase services for Granite Falls Bridge 102 that carries the Mountain Loop Highway over the South Fork of the Stillaguamish River.*		

The Local Agency of Snohomish County desires to supplement the Agreement entered into with **WSP USA, Inc.** and executed on December 16, 2022, as amended by Supplement No. 1 on June 14, 2023, as amended by Supplement No. 2 on October 18, 2023 and identified as Agreement No. **CCF02-22**. All provisions in the basic agreement remain in effect except as expressly modified by this supplement.

The changes to the Agreement are described as follows:

I

The "Maximum Amount Payable" on the Agreement title page is amended as follows:

Maximum Amount Payable $4,139,888.00

II

EXHIBIT A-1 Supplemental Scope of Work, attached hereto and by this reference made part of the original Agreement, as additional work toe be performed under EXHIBIT A.

III

EXHIBIT B DBE Participation, attached hereto and by this reference made part of the original Agreement, has been amended and hereby replaces the original Exhibit B.

IV

EXHIBIT D Prime Consultant Cost Computations – Fee Schedule, attached hereto and by this reference made part of the previously amended Agreement, and adds supplemental cost computations for the additional work to be performed under Exhibit A-1 of this Agreement.

V

EXHIBIT E Sub-consultant Cost Computations – Fee Schedule, attached hereto and by this reference made part of the previously amended Agreement, and adds supplemental cost computations for the additional work to be performed under Exhibit A-1 of this Agreement.

If you concur with this supplement and agree to the changes as stated above, please sign in the appropriate spaces below and return to this office for final action.

By: **WSP USA, INC.**

Banks, Gregory (USGB675343) Digitally signed by Banks, Gregory (USGB675343) DN: E=greg.banks@wsp.com, CN="Banks, Gregory (USGB675343)", OU=Active, OU=Users, OU=US, OU=WSPObjects, DC=corp, DC=pbwan, DC=net Date: 2024.07.10 14:32:11-07'00'

Consultant Signature

By: **SNOHOMISH COUNTY**

Klein, Ken Digitally signed by Klein, Ken Date: 2024.08.21 13:17:25 -07'00'

Approving Authority Signature

Date

PART I – GENERAL ACTIVITIES

TASK 10.0 GENERAL ACTIVITIES
Task 10 is supplemented as documented within:

Subtask 10.3 Coordination and Meetings [Supplemented]
This subtask is supplemented to include environmental coordination meetings:

- **Environmental Coordination Meetings:** The CONSULTANT shall participate in bi-weekly environmental coordination meetings with the AGENCY. It is assumed that coordination meetings will be attended by two (2) CONSULTANT team members and meetings will have a duration of 90-minutes. Meetings will occur over a period of one year (i.e., 12-months).

PART VI – PERMITTING AND PLANNING

TASK 60.0 Environmental Documentation and Permitting
Task 60 is supplemented as documented within:

Subtask 60.1 Critical Area Study [Supplemented]
The CONSULTANT will prepare a Critical Area Study using the template provided by the AGENCY. The Critical Area Study will incorporate existing conditions information included in the Final Wetland and Stream Report (February 2024).

The CONSULTANT will conduct a site visit to supplement existing tree survey data. The focus will be to collect species and diameter information for existing mapped trees.
Assumption(s)

- Prior to preparing the Critical Area Study, a meeting will be held with the AGENCY to confirm approach and tailor the template to the project.
- The AGENCY will provide mitigation strategy and information on proposed mitigation sites (SCC 30.62A.140 and 150).
- Additional tree data can be collected within two days.
- A formal tree survey will not be completed for the project corridor.

Deliverable(s)

- Draft and final Critical Area Study using AGENCY template

Subtask 60.3 Visual Assessment [Supplemented]
The CONSULTANT will develop an additional viewpoint (bringing the total to six) and an additional three simulations (bringing the total to six) for the project. The supplemental viewpoint and simulation assumptions are stated below.
Assumption(s)

- The CONSULTANT will add one new viewpoint for visual analysis. The viewpoint is intended to represent the proposed scenic overlook looking upstream and qualitatively assess bulk/scale impacts to the TCP.
- The CONSULTANT will add three new visual simulations to represent views of retaining the existing bridge at each viewpoint. Each simulation includes up to 4 hours to generate a respective view from the 3-D model (pre-and post-project conditions) and 10 hours to complete the analysis for a single viewpoint.

Deliverable(s)

- No new deliverables. Additional viewpoint and simulations will be incorporated into the Draft and final Visual Report.

Subtask 60.4 NEPA Documentation [Amended]

This supplement updates the project documentation summary table included in the scope of services for the Parks, Recreation Areas, Wildlife Refuges, Section 4(f)/6(f), NEPA CatEx Environmental Element as shown in the highlighted text in the below table.

NEPA CatEx Environmental Elements	Proposed Documentation
Part 4 – Environmental Considerations	
Air Quality	CatEx Form
Critical/Sensitive Areas	Critical Area Study
Cultural Resources/Historic Structures	Archaeology/Cultural Resource Technical Report
Floodplains and Floodways	CatEx Form
Hazardous and Problem Waste	CatEx Form
Noise	CatEx Form
Parks, Recreation Areas, Wildlife Refuges, Section 4(f)/6(f), etc.	Individual Section 4(f) Evaluation
Resource Lands	CatEx Form
Rivers, Streams or Tidal Waters	Critical Area Study
Tribal Lands	CatEx Form
Visual Quality	CatEx Form
Water Quality/Stormwater	CatEx Form
Commitments	CatEx Form
Environmental Justice	CatEx Form
Part 5 – Biological Assessment	Biological Assessment

Subtask 60.7 Noise Analysis and Technical Memorandum [New Task]

The CONSULTANT shall conduct the following tasks to evaluate noise levels and to prepare a Noise Technical Memorandum for the project:

Noise Monitoring

A noise monitoring survey to identify the contribution of traffic noise at sensitive use locations and Traffic Noise Model (TNM) noise modeling analysis to estimate traffic noise impacts at noise sensitive receptor locations for the existing year (YEAR) and design year (YEAR) for both the build and no-build conditions. The following analyses will be performed:

- Collect field noise measurements at up to 12 representative locations. Field noise measurements shall include simultaneous noise measurements at sensitive use locations and location(s) near Granite Falls Bridge 102/Mountain Loop Highway, and will document the contribution of traffic noise at sensitive use locations, including Granite Falls. Field measurements shall include the collection of 1/3 octave data to help identify and quantify noise levels from other local noise sources such as Granite Falls.
- The field work shall also include simultaneous traffic counts of autos, medium and heavy trucks, and an estimate of the speeds at up to 4 representative locations to validate the traffic noise model.

- Noise measurements will be collected on public or AGENCY rights-of-way wherever possible to minimize the need to obtain rights-of-entry. Locations where rights-of-entry or permits may be required to conduct this field work will be identified a minimum of three weeks prior to start of the field work by the CONSULTANT. Any rights-of-entry required will be obtained by the AGENCY and provided to the CONSULTANT a minimum of three days prior to the start of the field work.
- Using the field measurement data, assess noise levels at sensitive use locations, including with WSDOT Noise Abatement Criteria as applicable.
- Using the field measurement data from the field work, develop a TNM validation model.
- Coordination with the AGENCY to confirm all noise-sensitive land uses located within the noise study for inclusion in analysis and the TNM.
- Using the validated TNM model, develop models for the existing year (YEAR) and the future design year (YEAR) for the build and no-build condition. The results of the future build model will be used to determine the potential noise impacts to any noise sensitive receivers (at up to 25 modeled locations).
- Using the future build model and predicted noise levels, evaluate the need for noise abatement such as a noise barrier that may be applicable for the project area. Determine the feasibility and reasonableness of identified noise barriers and recommend for construction, as appropriate.

Traffic Data

Peak-hour traffic volumes, speeds, and vehicle mix for the project will be provided by the AGENCY for use in the analysis for the existing year (YEAR) and the design year (YEAR) for the build and no-build conditions.

Design Data

Existing and proposed MicroStation base map files including 5-foot contours, ROW line, additional features such as existing noise walls and retaining walls, existing and proposed location of any concrete safety barriers top elevation and beginning and end locations and existing and proposed roadway profiles will be provided by the AGENCY. Roadway profile x, y, z coordinates will be provided by the AGENCY. The footprints for homes and businesses will be identified through GIS by the CONSULTANT for modeled receptor locations.

Analysis Years

The CONSULTANT shall model noise levels for the existing year (YEAR) and the design year (YEAR) for the build and no-build conditions.

Analysis Alternatives

The CONSULTANT shall model noise levels for the design year (YEAR) build and no-build conditions (alternatives).

Assumption(s)

- Up to 12 noise measurements will be sufficient to identify and quantify noise from other local noise sources such as water from Granite Falls.
- Up to 4 noise measurements will be sufficient for validation of the TNM.
- Up to 25 noise modeling sites will be needed to analyze noise levels and potential project impacts along the project corridor.
- The noise modeling will account for the various scenarios. The analysis of additional design alternatives shall require additional scope and budget consideration.
    - One design alternative is assumed for this scope of work.
    - One design alternative will retain the existing bridge.
    - One design alternative will retain the existing bridge and construct the new bridge.

Construction Phase Noise Impact Analysis

The CONSULTANT shall conduct the following tasks for the construction phase of the project:

- Qualitatively discuss potential construction phase noise impacts based on predicted noise levels of activities, including blasting, and relative to applicable jurisdictional construction noise guidelines.
- List Best Practices for construction period noise abatement as appropriate.

Deliverable(s)

- Draft Noise Technical Memorandum and electronic noise measurement data and TNM files
- Final Noise Technical Memorandum and electronic TNM files

Subtask 60.8 Individual Section 4(f) Evaluation [New Task]

An Individual Section 4(f) Evaluation must be completed when approving a project that requires the use of Section 4(f) property if the use results in a greater than de minimis impact and a programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation cannot be applied to the situation (23 CFR 774.3). The Individual Section 4(f) Evaluation documents the evaluation of the proposed use of Section 4(f) properties in the project area of all alternatives. The Individual Section 4(f) Evaluation requires two findings:

- That there is no feasible and prudent alternative that completely avoids the use of Section 4(f) property; and
- That the project includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the Section 4(f) property resulting from the transportation use (See 23 CFR 774.3(a)(1) and (2)).

The CONSULTANT will prepare an Individual Section 4(f) Evaluation to support the NEPA documentation process. The Individual Section 4(f) Evaluation will follow format and guidance provided by FHWA's Technical Advisory T6640.8A and the WSDOT Environmental Manual and includes the following elements.

Meeting/Coordination

The CONSULTANT will participate in meetings with the AGENCY, WSDOT, and 4(f) stakeholders over the course of the project. The AGENCY will organize project coordination meetings, establish agendas, and prepare and distribute notes of meetings for each meeting. Anticipated meetings include:

- 4(f) Kick-Off Meeting: The CONSULTANT shall facilitate an in-person kick-off meeting with key CONSULTANT team members. Other CONSULTANT team members will be invited to participate remotely. The kick-off meeting shall be approximately two (2) hours in duration and attended by an average of five (5) key CONSULTANT team members.

- Site Visits: The CONSULTANT will conduct one (1) all day site visits during evaluation. Site visits will include an average of two (2) CONSULTANT team members.

- Internal Team Meetings: The CONSULTANT shall facilitate an average of two internal project team coordination meetings per month during evaluation. Meetings shall be approximately one (1) hour in duration and attended by an average of two (2) CONSULTANT team members.

- Client Meetings: The CONSULTANT shall facilitate an average of two client team coordination meetings per month during Section 4(f) evaluation. Meetings shall be approximately one (1) hour in duration and attended by an average of two (2) CONSULTANT team members.

- Officials With Jurisdiction Meetings: The CONSULTANT shall facilitate an average of one OWJ meeting per month during evaluation. Meetings shall be approximately one (1) hour in duration and attended by an average of four (4) CONSULTANT team members.

- Comment Resolution Meetings: The CONSULTANT shall facilitate two (2) comment resolution meetings (for draft and final 4(f) report documents) during evaluation. Meetings shall be approximately two (2) hours in duration and attended by an average of four (4) CONSULTANT team members.

- Public Outreach Meetings: The CONSULTANT team will participate in up to two (2) general project public outreach meetings. Meetings will be in-person within the City of Granite Falls, be attended by two (2) CONSULTANT team members, and have a duration of 2-hours each.

Meetings may also include between the CONSULTANT and the CONSULTANT's cultural resource subconsultant. It is assumed that a single cultural resource subconsultant team member will participate in ten (10) coordination meetings having a duration of 1.5-hours in addition to responding to email inquiries. Meetings will take place remotely.

Draft Individual 4(f) Report Preparation

The CONSULTANT will prepare a Draft Individual 4(f) report in compliance with WSDOT and FHWA guidance for conducting Section 4(f) analysis and reporting.

Identification of Section 4(f) Properties

The CONSULTANT will identify and describe (eligibility/significance, physical description, features, figures/maps to identify the relationship of the alternatives to the properties, demonstration of need) any resources to which Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation Act of 1966 apply. Section 4(f) requires consideration of:

- Parks and recreational areas of national, state, or local significance that are both publicly owned and open to the public

- Publicly owned wildlife and waterfowl refuges of national, state, or local significance that are open to the public to the extent that public access does not interfere with the primary purpose of the refuge

- Historic sites of national, state, or local significance in public or private ownership regardless of whether they are open to the public (See 23 U.S.C. § 138(a) and 49 U.S.C. § 303(a))

Assessing Use of Section 4(f) Properties

Once Section 4(f) properties have been identified in the study area, it is necessary to determine if any of them would be used by an alternative or alternatives being carried forward for detailed study. A use of Section 4(f) property is defined in 23 CFR 774.17. A use occurs when:

- Land is permanently incorporated into a transportation facility;
- There is a temporary occupancy of land that is adverse in terms of the Section 4(f) statute's preservationist purposes; or
- There is a constructive use of a Section 4(f) property.

The CONSULTANT will evaluate each Section 4(f) property for use by the project and will document these uses, in coordination with the AGENCY and other parties. Evaluation of each property will include visual and noise analysis as described in Subtasks 60.3 and 60.6 respectively.

Determination Of A De Minimis Impact To Section 4(f) Property

A de minimis impact is one that, after taking into account any measures to minimize harm (such as avoidance, minimization, mitigation or enhancement measures), results in :

- A determination that the project would not adversely affect the activities, features, or attributes qualifying a park, recreation area, or refuge for protection under Section 4(f).

A de minimis impact determination requires agency coordination and public involvement as specified in 23 CFR 774.5(b). For parks, recreation areas, or wildlife and waterfowl refuges, the official(s) with jurisdiction over the property must be informed of the intent to make a de minimis impact determination, after which an opportunity for public review and comment must be provided. After considering any comments received from the public, if the official(s) with jurisdiction concurs in writing that the project will not adversely affect the activities, features, or attributes that make the property eligible for Section 4(f) protection, then FHWA may finalize the de minimis impact determination.

The CONSULTANT will evaluate the WDFW property for de minimus use, in coordination with the AGENCY and other parties.

4(f) Resource Analysis

The CONSULTANT will evaluate the effects of project activities (e.g., construction noise, tree removal, and construction activities) on the 4(f) resources. Visual simulations prepared in Task 60.3 will be used to evaluate visual effects on the 4(f) resources. Noise modeling prepared under Task 60. 7 will be used to evaluate both construction noise and road noise effects on the 4(f) resource. Feasible and Prudent Avoidance Alternatives

The intent of the statute, and the policy of FHWA, is to avoid and, where avoidance is not feasible and prudent, minimize the use of significant public parks, recreation areas, wildlife and waterfowl refuges and historic sites by our projects. Unless the use of a Section 4(f) property is determined to have a de minimis impact, FHWA must determine that no feasible and prudent avoidance alternative exists before approving the use of such land (See 23 CFR 774.3). The Section 4(f) regulations refer to an alternative that would not require the use of any Section 4(f) property as an avoidance alternative. Feasible and prudent avoidance alternatives are those that avoid using any Section 4(f) property and do not cause other severe problems of a magnitude that substantially outweigh the importance of protecting the Section 4(f) property (23 CFR 774.17).

The first step in determining whether a feasible and prudent avoidance alternative exists is to identify a reasonable range of project alternatives including those that avoid using Section 4(f) property. The avoidance alternatives will include the no-build. An important consideration in identifying potential avoidance alternatives is that they should have a reasonable expectation of serving traffic needs that have been identified in the project purpose and need.

The regulations state that a potential avoidance alternative is not feasible if it cannot be built as a matter of sound engineering judgment (23 CFR 774.17). If a potential avoidance alternative cannot be built as a matter of sound engineering judgment it is not feasible and the particular engineering problem with the alternative should be documented in the project files with a reasonable degree of explanation.

The third and final part of the feasible and prudent avoidance alternative definition sets out standards for determining if a potential avoidance alternative is prudent. An alternative is not prudent if:

- It compromises the project to a degree that it is unreasonable to proceed in light of the project's stated purpose and need (i.e., the alternative doesn't address the purpose and need of the project);
- It results in unacceptable safety or operational problems;
- After reasonable mitigation, it still causes severe social, economic, or environmental impacts; severe disruption to established communities; severe or disproportionate impacts to minority or low-income populations; or severe impacts to environmental resources protected under other Federal statutes;

- It results in additional construction, maintenance, or operational costs of extraordinary magnitude;
- It causes other unique problems or unusual factors; or
- It involves multiple factors as outlined above that, while individually minor, cumulatively cause unique problems or impacts of extraordinary magnitude.

Supporting documentation is required in the Section 4(f) evaluation for findings of no feasible and prudent alternatives (See 23 CFR 774.7(a)). Documentation of the process used to identify, develop, analyze and eliminate potential avoidance alternatives is very important. The Section 4(f) evaluation should describe all efforts in this regard. This description need not include every possible detail, but it should clearly explain the process that occurred and its results.

The CONSULTANT will develop and evaluate for feasibility and prudence TWO (2) avoidance alternatives (in addition to the No Build Alternative and Bridge Preservation Alternative), in coordination with the AGENCY and other parties.

Evaluate All Possible Planning to Minimize Harm

After determining that there are no feasible and prudent alternatives to avoid the use of Section 4(f) property, the project approval process for an Individual Section 4(f) Evaluation requires the consideration and documentation of all possible planning to minimize harm to Section 4(f) property (*See* 23 CFR 774.3(a)(2)). Minimization of harm may entail both alternative design modifications that reduce the amount of Section 4(f) property used and mitigation measures that compensate for residual impacts. Minimization and mitigation measures should be determined through consultation with the official(s) with jurisdiction. These include the SHPO and/or THPO for historic properties or officials owning or administering the resource for other types of Section 4(f) properties. Mitigation measures involving public parks, recreation areas, or wildlife or waterfowl refuges may involve a replacement of land and/or facilities of comparable value and function, or monetary compensation to enhance the remaining land. Neither the Section 4(f) statute nor regulations requires the replacement of Section 4(f) property used for highway projects, but this option may be the most straightforward means of minimizing harm to parks, recreation areas, and wildlife waterfowl refuges and is permitted under 23 CFR 710.509 as a mitigation measure for direct project impacts. Mitigation of historic sites usually consists of those measures necessary to preserve the historic integrity of the site and agreed to in accordance with 36 CFR 800 by FHWA, the SHPO or THPO, and other consulting parties. In any case, the cost of mitigation should be a reasonable public expenditure in light of the severity of the impact on the Section 4(f) property in accordance with 23 CFR 771.105(d). Additional laws such as Section 6(f) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act may have separate mitigation and approval requirements and compliance with such) requirements should also be described within the Section 4(f) discussion of all possible planning to minimize harm.

The CONSULTANT will prepare documentation of all possible planning to minimize harm, in coordination with the AGENCY and other parties:

- Design modifications to reduce the use of Section 4(f) property
- Mitigation to compensate for 4(f) use

Alternative with Least Overall Harm

If there is no feasible and prudent avoidance alternative, then FHWA may approve, from among the remaining alternatives that use Section 4(f) property, only the alternative that causes the least overall harm in light of the statute's preservation purpose. To determine which of the alternatives would cause the least overall harm, FHWA must compare seven factors set forth in 23 CFR 774.3(c)(1) concerning the alternatives under consideration. The first four factors relate to the net harm that each alternative would cause to Section 4(f) property:

- The ability to mitigate adverse impacts to each Section 4(f) property (including any measures that result in benefits to the property);
- The relative severity of the remaining harm, after mitigation, to the protected activities, attributes, or features that qualify each Section 4(f) property for protection;
- The relative significance of each Section 4(f) property; and
- The views of the officials with jurisdiction over each Section 4(f) property.

The remaining three factors enable FHWA to take into account any substantial problem with any of the alternatives remaining under consideration on issues beyond Section 4(f). These factors are:

- The degree to which each alternative meets the purpose and need for the project;
- After reasonable mitigation, the magnitude of any adverse impacts to resources not protected by Section 4(f); and
- Substantial differences in costs among the alternatives.

The CONSULTANT will evaluate the following alternatives for least overall harm, in coordination with the AGENCY and other parties:

- No Build Alternative
- Preferred Alternative: bridge removal and replacement slightly downstream
- Existing bridge remains, replacement slightly downstream
- Other bridge replacement options evaluated in the Type Size and Location studies
- Two (2) avoidance alternatives mentioned above

Final Individual 4(f) Report Preparation

The CONSULTANT will prepare a Final Individual 4(f) report in compliance with WSDOT and FHWA guidance for conducting Section 4(f) analysis and reporting. The final report will focus on the identification of the preferred alternative, 4(f) "no feasible or prudent alternative conclusions, and a summary of mitigation for project impacts.

Assumption(s)

- Section 4(f) meeting agendas will be prepared by the AGENCY and reviewed by the CONSULTANT one week prior to each meeting.
- Meeting attendance notes will be prepared by the AGENCY and reviewed by the CONSULTANT. Notes to be provided for review and comment by attendees within one week following each meeting.
- The CONSULTANT will provide two staff for each meeting.
- There are two Section 4(f) resources in the project area and one potential Section 4(f) resource:
    - The existing Granite Falls Bridge
    - A Traditional Cultural Property, as identified by the Stillaguamish Tribe
    - The WDFW property (potential)
- Although the boundaries of the TCP have not been defined, a replacement bridge in the vicinity of the existing bridge will result in a use of the TCP.
- The evaluation of alternatives to completely avoid the TCP will not be prudent (and is not currently possible) because the boundary is not currently defined. The AGENCY has conducted several Type, Size, Location studies for Granite Falls Bridge 102 since 2013. Therefore, the analysis will assume that the TCP will be impacted.

- The WDFW property will meet the criteria for a de minimis use, if determined a Section 4(f) property
- Removal of the existing Granite Falls Bridge will be evaluated as a use and require an alternative analysis to support removal. The alternative analysis will include the following scenarios; bridge removal, bridge rehabilitation, and bridge retention with ownership transfer.
- The bridge removal plan will evaluate two options for removal and include an option for salvage and marketing to interested parties. Three drawings will be prepared to illustrate each option.
- The bridge rehabilitation plan will evaluate one option to bring the bridge up to code and requirements for maintenance to keep the bridge serviceable. Three drawings will be prepared to illustrate this option.
- Retention of the existing Granite Falls Bridge will be evaluated in the least harm analysis and include assumptions for sale to a willing buyer.
- The avoidance alternatives will be developed as planning concepts, supported by engineering and cost estimating as needed.
- The evaluation of avoidance alternatives will find them to be not prudent
- The avoidance alternatives will be developed as planning concepts, supported by engineering as needed

Deliverable(s)

Draft Section 4f Evaluation, components of the draft will include:

- Identification of 4(f) Properties
- Evaluation of Use by the Project
- Evaluation of Avoidance Alternatives
- Documentation of All Possible Planning to Minimize Harm, including Mitigation
- Evaluation of Least Overall Harm
- Supporting documentation as needed (provided by others)

Final Section 4f Evaluation, components of the final will include:

- Preferred Alternative
- Conclusion - "no feasible and prudent alternatives to use of property"
- Summary

Exhibit B
DBE Participation

Firm Name	Certification Number	Amount Authorized	% of Total Agreement
WSP [PRIME]		$2,349,141	56.7%
Osborn Consulting Inc.	**D2F0019030**	**$585,254**	**14.1%**
J.A. Brennan & Assoc.		$373,061	9.0%
Ott-Sakai & Associates	**D4M0023226**	**$58,722**	**1.4%**
Shannon & Wilson		$695,565	16.8%
Harmsen		$15,756	0.4%
ERCI	**D2F0024050**	**$62,389**	**1.5%**
~~*IFC*~~		~~*$77,593*~~	~~*2.1%*~~
	Total Contract =	$4,139,888	100%
	Total DBE =	**$706,365**	**17.1%**

June 2024

The DBE Participation Plan is updated in June 2024 with Supplement 4. IFC was previously removed from the contract and replaced with **Equinox Research and Consulting, Inc. (ERCI).** ERCI is a DBE and will be included as a DBE for this contract. Supplement 4 adds additional scope and budget to the contract, and the summary table above was revised to the new contract totals and associated percentages of the total agreement.

2023

As shown in the table above, **Osborn Consulting Inc.** and **Ott-Sakai & Associates** are the firms being utilized on the contract to meet the federal DBE requirement of 17%. Osborn Consulting Inc. will be conducting 15.5% of the work and Ott-Sakai will be conducting 1.6% of the work. In total, this sums to 17.1% of the overall services being provided on the contract. Osborn Consulting Inc. will be providing the Task 23, TESC and Drainage design services. Ott-Sakai & Associates will be providing the Task 25 Constructability Review services.

SUPPLEMENT No. 4 Cost Computations

TOTAL SALARY COSTS (TSC)

	Personnel	Hours		Max Rates		Cost
1	Vice President, Business Line Leader	42	X	$ 280.00	= $	11,760
2	Senior Director, Engineer	334	X	$ 280.00	= $	93,520
3	Sr. Lead Consultant, Structural Engr.	132	X	$ 215.00	= $	28,380
4	Lead Consultant, Engineer	262	X	$ 173.16	= $	45,368
5	Sr. Environ. Scientist	760	X	$ 190.00	= $	144,400
6	Sr. Lead Environmental	16	X	$ 173.16	= $	2,771
7	Biologist	308	X	$ 149.03	= $	45,901
8	Manager, Contracts	48	X	$ 125.00	= $	6,000
	Total Hours	**1,902**		Subtotal Salary Costs (SSC) =	**$**	**378,100**
	Salary Escalation:			0.0% of DSC =	**$**	-
				TOTAL SALARY COSTS (SSC + SE) =	**$**	**378,100**

DIRECT NONSALARY COSTS (DNSC)	Qty	Rate		
Mileage	650	$ 0.625	$	406
Reproduction			$	250
Travel (1 night hotel, meals)	1	$ 300.00	$	300
TOTAL REIMBURSABLE EXPENSES (DNSC) =			**$**	**956**

TOTAL WSP =	**$**	**379,056**

SUBCONSULTANTS

Osborne	$	-
JA Brennan	$	-
Ott Sakai	$	-
Shannon & Wilson	$	-
Harmsen	$	-
ERCI	$	5,151
TOTAL Subconsultants =	**$**	**5,151**
TOAL Request =	**$**	**384,206**

Agreement Number: CCF02-22

Equinox Research and Consulting, Inc.

Subtask 60.8 - Individual Section 4(f) Evaluation				
Description	Position Classification	Hours	Rate	Cost
Meetings and Coordination	Principal Investigator	20	$ 143.07	$ 2,861.40
Individual 4(f) Report Review	Principal Investigator	16	$ 143.07	$ 2,289.12
Total				$ 5,150.52
Direct Costs				
Description	Position Classification	Units	Rate	Cost
Mileage (0 miles R/T)	Principal Investigator	0	$ 0.66	$ -
Total				$ -
TOTAL				$ 5,150.52

Agreement Number: CCF02-22