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Criteria 1. Qualifications and Expertise of Firms on Team

A. Proposed Firm List

The Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) requires a consultant with a successful track record in National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) environmental impact statement (EIS) process, management, and delivery; a history of developing and implementing strategies for meaningful and constructive engagement with stakeholders, Tribes, and the public; and a detailed understanding of the environmental, logistical, and political issues relating to the Interstate 5 (I-5) Tumwater to Mounts Road corridor project (WSDOT project). The WSDOT selected project team must prioritize innovative and timely decisions using practical solutions and collaborate with stakeholder and Tribes to apply the NEPA standard for a defensible EIS process throughout the project as shown in Exhibit 1.

Exhibit 1. Key Project Attributes Identified by ICF and Required for Successful Implementation

ICF, as the prime contractor, has assembled a team rooted in these core attributes, including Avenue Consultants (Avenue), Confluence Environmental Company (Confluence), Fehr & Peers, HNTB, PRR, Shannon & Wilson, Skillings, and Yates Consulting Group—collectively referred to as the ICF team, shown in Exhibit 2. This team combines unsurpassed local knowledge, WSDOT experience and national highway EIS expertise. Importantly, our team is comprised of trusted partners with whom we have a proven history of collaboration and successful project delivery over many years. Our shared history is further exemplified in Criteria 1, Sections B and C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>DBE Status</th>
<th>Years Providing Relevant Services</th>
<th>Number of Office Locations in WA State</th>
<th>Number of Employees in WA State</th>
<th>Number of Employees Nationwide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICF</td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avenue Consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confluence</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fehr &amp; Peers</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNTB</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>4,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRR</td>
<td>WBE, DBE</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon &amp; Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skillings</td>
<td>VBE</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yates Consulting Group</td>
<td>MBE, DBE</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ICF, with offices in Seattle, WA, and Portland, OR has been an integral part of NEPA’s evolution since its inception in 1970. Drawing on over 50 years of NEPA expertise, ICF has implemented the NEPA review process on some of the largest and most complex infrastructure projects in the United States. Locally, we bring extensive specialized technical expertise in NEPA and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) and technical prowess in areas such as biological analysis, fish and wildlife evaluations, wetland and stream assessments, public outreach, Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act evaluation, noise and air quality assessments, cultural resources, and environmental planning. ICF as the prime contractor will provide project management oversight, lead the environmental impact analysis (EIA), and provide environmental technical expertise.

Avenue Consultants staff have supported eight state departments of transportation (DOTs) on 13 design build (DB) and progressive DB projects and an additional seven projects on behalf of the DB contractor. Avenue will bring innovative, DB-based ideas to solve complex problems and will inject forward-thinking into the EIS to seamlessly transition the project to its future phases.

Confluence, headquartered in Seattle, WA, with an office in Bellingham, WA, began with WSDOT as its first client, and has continued to support WSDOT across multiple projects in western Washington. Confluence, a Washington-certified SBE, will be lead the Tribal Coordination and Section 7 Endangered Species Act (ESA) Coordination under Public Outreach & Coordination. They will also lead Land Use and support Fish, Wildlife, Vegetation and T&E Species.

Fehr & Peers with offices in Seattle and Tacoma, WA, is a recognized national leader in multimodal transportation analysis. Fehr & Peers has extensive experience with the preparation of transportation studies in support of NEPA/SEPA analyses across the western United States. Fehr & Peers will lead the transportation planning services team and lead the transportation and navigation team under EIA.

HNTB, with an office in Bellevue, WA, is a nationwide transportation infrastructure firm that offers comprehensive planning, design, engineering, and construction management services, bringing decades of WSDOT experience. HNTB will lead the conceptual engineering team and support practical solutions strategy and alternatives development, equity, social equity, cultural resources, and transportation and navigation.

PRR, based in Seattle, WA, is renowned for its ability to generate consensus around challenging public issues by facilitating partnerships between communities and public agencies. PRR is experienced at providing facilitation support to WSDOT. PRR will lead the outreach and coordination team and be responsible for public outreach, stakeholder engagement, and ensuring the project meets WSDOT’s social equity goals.

Shannon & Wilson, based in Seattle, WA, brings a team of experienced geotechnical and environmental engineers, geologists, engineering geologists, and environmental scientists with expertise in the varied subsurface conditions of the Puget Sound region. They also bring direct experience working with WSDOT, including providing information to avoid or remediate contaminated sites. Shannon & Wilson will lead the geology and soils and hazardous materials under the EIA.

Skillings, based in Lacey, WA, is experienced in providing the region and Nisqually Basin with engineering/constructability, hydrology and hydraulics, and wetland impact analysis and mitigation. Skillings will be responsible for engineering/constructability, hydrology and hydraulics, and wetland impact analysis and mitigation.

Yates Consulting Group, based in Tukwila, WA, brings expertise in public involvement and communications, including focus groups, public hearings, and surveys. Yates Consulting Group will leverage their four decades of experience in areas of diversity and inclusion, communications, and government affairs and will work closely with ICF and PRR on stakeholder identification and engagement.
Proposed Team, Roles, and Organizational Chart

The ICF team will be led by our proposed project manager (PM) Jack Allen. Jack, a seasoned NEPA transportation PM, will work closely with WSDOT to develop practical project solutions, strategize on project implementation, and proactively identify and resolve critical path items. Jack’s qualifications are provided in Criteria 2. Qualifications of Proposed Project Manager. Jan Aarts will serve as deputy PM (DPM), focusing internally on delivery, team coordination and communication, schedule management, workload distribution, and ensuring quality of deliverables.

ICF proposes a large and diverse technical team that is organized into four main working groups: Transportation Planning, led by Ariel Davis, AICP; Public Outreach and Coordination, led by Colleen Gants; Conceptual Engineering, led by Tim Horton; and Environmental Impact Analysis, led by Jan Aarts. These leads are individuals with specialized technical expertise related to the groups they manage and have extensive experience collaborating with other disciplines to craft defensible multidisciplinary EIS documents. Further information about key staff can be found in Criteria 3. Key Team Members Qualifications.

The ICF team will be supported by our strategic project areas of Quality Assurance and Strategic Guidance; Contract Administration; and Critical Support to ensure the project is completed in compliance with WSDOT’s technical and contractual requirements. The organizational chart provided in Exhibit 3 presents the entire proposed ICF team by working group structure.

Exhibit 3. The ICF team represents a multidisciplinary team to support informed decision making; the right blend of technical expertise to deliver a defensible outcome.

ICF’s Resource Experience matrix shown in Exhibit 4 in Section D. Staff Availability summarizes the strength of proposed ICF team identifying the team member, working group(s), years of experience, monthly available hours, and demonstrated experience directly applicable to the WSDOT project delivery. We will draw upon our combined experience and expertise to deliver a defensible, inclusive, and practical NEPA EIS.
B. Past Performance

The following project examples highlight the ICF team’s expertise successfully navigating issues that align with the unique needs of this WSDOT project, including: NEPA compliance within complex environmental context; tribal coordination and public outreach requiring sensitivity to diverse perspectives and priorities; delivery of practical solutions for transportation planning and infrastructure; and consideration of fish passage and sensitive habitat goals over the last 3 years.

At least two examples are provided for each teaming partner, and several examples highlight the ICF team’s collaborative partnerships on past projects. Client Performance Evaluation references are provided in Part B, Section 5, References/Past Performances with copies sent to WSDOT for ICF projects 1 through 3 listed below.

Project 1: I-605 Corridor Improvement Project (ICF)
Caltrans District 7/Metro, Cities of Baldwin Park, El Monte, Industry, Pico Rivera, South El Monte, Whittier, Downey, Norwalk, Santa Fe Springs, and Unincorporated Areas in Los Angeles County, CA, 2015–2021, ICF-$20 million.

Relevance to WSDOT: NEPA EIS for a large and complex transportation infrastructure project, multimodal considerations, and adjacent to Native American reservation and traditionally important river. Services Provided: This project facilitates improvements in freeway operations, safety, mobility, and travel times through a widening of the freeway mainline and improvements to interchanges and confluence areas along the I-605 at I-105, I-5, SR 60, and I-10. ICF is coordinating environmental documentation between both projects, serving as the California Environmental Quality Act/NEPA lead on the I-605/I-5 portion of the project, and designed and performed environmental technical analysis for both projects. Studies included traffic, noise and vibration, air quality and greenhouse gas, wetland delineation, flora and fauna surveys, cultural resources, environmental justice, and Section 4(f) analysis. ICF completed environmental and preliminary design studies in 2021 and continues to provide environmental planning and permitting support for on-going phases of the project.

Project 2: WSDOT SR 520 Program (ICF, HNTB, Confluence, Shannon & Wilson)

Relevance to WSDOT: Successful delivery of ESA, geotechnical, cultural resources tribal, permitting, and mitigation components—all in coordination with the NEPA process—for a complex project involving multiple standalone aquatic issues, and cultural and tribal consultations. Services Provided: ICF provided the full range of cultural resources support – archaeological monitoring, archaeological testing and evaluation, architectural history studies, interpretive panel design, consultation support for the West Approach Bridge North Project completed in 2019, as well led development of the Pontoon Construction Project NEPA EIS. For all the projects listed above ICF prepared the cultural resources materials to support these projects, performed cultural resources studies to comply with WSDOT's cultural resources obligations, and currently serving as embedded cultural resources support for the project team on the Montlake Project. Confluence led ESA compliance, Tribal coordination, mitigation, permitting, and environmental project delivery. They conducted technical analyses for the EISs and prepared multiple biological assessments and prepared and supported execution of the program Tribal Consultation Plan. They also led extensive technical working group meetings with design, cultural, and environmental staff as well as regulatory stakeholders and Tribes to identify design and construction approaches that avoided aquatic impacts to the extent practical as well as minimization for unavoidable impacts followed by robust and varied mitigation elements. Shannon & Wilson continues to provide geotechnical and hazardous materials services for the program. These services have included almost 800 subsurface explorations along the approximately 7-mile-long corridor; conceptual or final design recommendations for elevated bridge structures both on-land and overwater, retaining walls, lid structures, seismic design, and fish passage structures; contract document input and preparation; and construction support. HNTB is providing design review support for the Montlake Lid portion of the Montlake Project.
Project 3: Snake River Road Project Mileposts 19.00 to 21.97 (ICF)
Asotin County Public Works, Asotin, WA 2013-2021, $208,000. Relevance to WSDOT: Performed in support of WSDOT local program’s NEPA/SEPA obligations, transportation infrastructure project along traditionally important river with logistical considerations, and numerous natural and cultural resources and fish passage considerations. Services Provided: The project will reconstruct and improve the roadway and stormwater drainages between Mileposts 19.00 21.987 of Snake River Road at the base of Hells Canyon. ICF authored the project’s NEPA/SEPA documentation, performed cultural resources surveys, wetland delineations, floristic surveys, nesting bird surveys, environmental justice review, Section 4(f) review, worked with the engineering team to adjust the project design to minimize impacts to sensitive resources, and helped to integrate environmental and cultural resources considerations into the project’s design specifications.

Project 4: Millennium Bulk Terminals—Longview, NEPA, and SEPA EISs (ICF, Confluence)
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)-NEPA, Cowlitz County and Washington Department of Ecology-SEPA, 2013–2021, ICF-$10 million, Confluence-$100,000. Relevance to WSDOT: Preparation of NEPA and SEPA EISs with rail, fisheries, and tribal resource issues for a large, complex, politically sensitive project in western Washington. Services Provided: SEPA/NEPA environmental review for the Millennium Bulk Terminals—Longview project for Cowlitz County Dept. of Building and Planning; Washington Department of Ecology; and USACE, Seattle District. As the prime contract, ICF managed and oversaw the SEPA and NEPA review effort, developed the SEPA and NEPA scope, processed 215,000 public scoping comments, completed third-party review of applicant-provided technical information, prepared supplemental technical studies and parallel SEPA and NEPA EISs. ICF retained Confluence to provide ESA Section 7 support on this project.

Project 5: I-5 Marine View Drive to SR 528 Corridor Improvements (ICF, Confluence, HNTB, PRR, Shannon & Wilson)
WSDOT, September 2017–Present, HNTB $ 6 million, ICF $50,000, Shannon & Wilson $430,000, PRR $190,000, Confluence $117,000 Relevance to WSDOT: Successful U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) permitting, tribal coordination, expedited Delivery adding HOV capacity to I-5 over a river, hydraulic modeling for a major river valley, multimodal share use path, cultural resources studies. Services Provided: HNTB delivered concept plans and DB documents. The team developed traffic modeling and studies to expanded I-5 capacity by added additional HOV lanes and multimodal, shared-used path. The team modeled the hydraulic conditions in the Snohomish River basin ensure that the project met zero rise criteria and secured the required USCG, and BNSF Railway Company (BNSF) permits. The team coordinated the stakeholders including the Tulalip Tribe to restore 12.5 acres of saltwater marsh habitat and protect critical tribal infrastructure. Confluence managed regulatory compliance, environmental permitting, environmental fieldwork, and delivered wetland and critical area reports for City of Marysville, City of Everett, and Snohomish County. They contributed all natural resource work and mitigation to the WSDOT Categorical Exclusion Form and supporting documents, prepared an advance mitigation use plan to support federal permitting and contributed to a biological assessment for ESA consultation, and delivered the environmental permitting package for all federal, state, and local permits. PRR provided services to inform and engage project area stakeholders during planning and design, planned and facilitated stakeholder interviews and a stakeholder advisory group that included the cities of Everett and Marysville, Community Transit, Tulalip Tribes, Snohomish County, and Washington State Patrol, and created public information materials, crafted blog posts, regularly updated copy and content on the state-run project web page, and planned a virtual voluntary submitter meeting for procurement. Shannon & Wilson completed conceptual geotechnical engineering analyses, DB request for proposal document preparation, an environmental hazardous materials corridor study, and a Phase II Environmental Site Assessment. A key element of Shannon & Wilson’s work was determining steep reinforced soil slope was feasible to address embankment and overpass bridge foundation construction on very soft estuarine deposits with potentially liquefiable alluvium interbeds. ICF prepared cultural resources documentation, including a Section 106 cultural resources technical report and an archaeological monitoring plan.
**Project 6: I-405/SR 167 Corridor Study GEC (Fehr & Peers, HNTB, PRR)**

WSDOT, March 2002–Present, HNTB $260 million, PRR $150,000, Fehr & Peers $448,000. **Relevance to WSDOT:** Award Winning Programmatic EIS, Implementation of HEAL Act, Multimodal and transit incorporation, Successful implementation of an active transportation system. **Services Provided:** The I-405/SR 167 Corridor Master Plan is a set of long-term multimodal improvements to Washington's most congested corridors. The I-405 portion has been completed establishing a multimodal network integrated with active transportation management system that optimizes transit route timing. The HNTB team is extending that same system south along the SR 167 corridor. The SR167 phase of the project will lead with equity and the newly pasted HEAL Act as well as an extensive multimodal and transit network connecting one of the largest freight corridors in Washington. These studies have led to 16 DB and DBB projects to date ranging from $10 million to over $700 million delivered on time and significantly under budget while providing an Award winning programmatic EIS and using a practical solutions approach. **PRR** has provided policy development, marketing strategies, public opinion research, campaign evaluation, and community outreach to implement the I-405 express toll lanes. Over the course of the program, PRR identified, managed, and facilitated regional stakeholder advisory groups and developed reports for legislative sessions. PRR continues to facilitate an Interagency Working Group and Executive Advisory Group that works to reach consensus and provide advice on the program’s phasing and funding direction. As an integrated part of the I-405 program team, we are also working collaboratively with Sound Transit to implement I-405 Bus Rapid Transit from Lynnwood to Burien, including the design and construction of new stations at the NE 85th interchange in Kirkland and the NE 44th Street interchange in Renton. PRR is also leading communications on the SR 167 Master Plan that connects to the I-405/SR 167 Corridor. **Fehr & Peers** is currently completing the SR 167 Master Plan task off the GEC which will build stakeholder consensus to address current and future transportation issues along the corridor, including identifying multimodal transportation needs and potential solutions, utilizing WSDOT's practical solutions framework.

**Project 7: SR 101 Siebert Creek—Remove Fish Barrier (Shannon & Wilson)**

WSDOT, 2019–2021, $170,000. **Relevance to WSDOT:** Worked as an extension of WSDOT HQ Geotechnical and coordinated with WSDOT Olympic Region staff to design a fish barrier removal in complex geotechnical conditions. **Project Amount(s):** $170,000. **Services Provided:** This fish barrier removal project is located along Siebert Creek crossing underneath State Route 101 in Clallam County. The geotechnical design services were completed under Shannon & Wilson’s WSDOT Geotechnical Engineering Personnel Augmentation Agreement with HQ Geotechnical. It included replacing a culvert under a 70-foot-high roadway embankment with a 177-foot-long, single-span bridge. The project design included evaluating WSDOT subsurface and laboratory data, analyzing bridge foundations, secant and structural earth walls, ground improvement shafts for seismic conditions, and slope stability. Shannon & Wilson also assisted with specifications and contract documentation.

**Project 8: Point No Point Fish Passage Project (Skillings)**

Kitsap County, 2018–2020, $130,000. **Relevance to WSDOT:** Engineering and environmental support for fish passage improvement on transportation infrastructure in the Puget Sound. **Services Provided:** Kitsap County requested consultant support to explore several preliminary design options for estuary restoration and fish passage barrier removal. Skillings performed field delineation and characterization of large wetland complex, evaluated hydraulic response to restoring tidal connectivity by modification of tide gate, and provided preliminary design for replacement tide gate that allowed for fish-passage and tidal flushing before activating (closing) at higher tidal event. Hydraulic analysis showed that restoring tidal inundation and complete barrier removal provided critical refuge habitat for Chinook Salmon.

**Project 9: Grouse Ridge Road Culvert Improvements—RMAP (Skillings)**

Washington Department of Natural Resources (DNR), 2018–2022, $835,000. **Relevance to WSDOT:** Engineering and environmental support for fish passage improvement on transportation infrastructure in the Puget Sound. **Services Provided:** The Washington DNR proposed to remove a set of three fish passage barriers along Grouse Ridge Road and retained Skillings to support this effort. Skillings staff completed field analysis of 12 streams,
including 3 fish bearing and 9 non-fish bearing streams; identified associated wetlands and stream features; and completed hydraulic modeling to support design of new crossing structures for all 12 streams. Subsequently, non-fish bearing streams were hydraulically sized, while fish-bearing crossings were sized-based on Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife fish-passage requirements. Skillings completed permit applications with USACE/Ecology and completed wetland mitigation planning to compensate for impacts associated with up sizing each crossing. Finally, Skillings prepared 100% PS&E for all crossings, supported DNR with Bid Ad and Award, and provided full construction management for installation of new bridges for the three fish passable structures.

**Project 10: Road Usage Charge Study for Washington State — Equity Outreach (Yates Consulting Group)**

State of Washington, February 2020–Present, $161,422 to date. **Relevance to WSDOT:** Outreach and coordination with multiple groups (minorities, low income, displaced), navigated complex and interwoven stakeholder concerns. **Services Provided:** This project required significant outreach throughout the state necessitating coordination with 200 different groups (mostly minorities, low income, displaced communities). Yates Consulting contacted each organization through email and sometimes telephone contact and conducted presentations for some. In addition, Yates Consulting crafted focus group questions and conducted focus groups, administered surveys and performed one-on-one interviews with key stakeholders.

**Project 11: Inclusion/Community Engagement Manager for Van Asselt/Mercer Middle School—Seattle School District (Yates Consulting Group)**

Cornerstone Construction General Contractors, February 2021–Present, $37,500 to date. **Relevance to WSDOT:** Diverse historical and cultural issues intertwined with project goals, focused on meaningful community engagement and partnership. **Services Provided:** This project is for the Seattle School District and is located in an ethnically diverse neighborhood in South Seattle. Cornerstone Construction won the contract to renovate an existing historical school building (Elementary) and demolish an old structure and build a new school (Jr. High) on the site of where the demolished building was located next to the historical structure. The project is in a community in which there are 13 different languages spoken and a strong Community Council which is especially sensitive regarding airplane noise and declining air quality as a result of truck and aviation activity. Yates Consulting is charged with crafting a Community Outreach Plan and a Minority and Women-owned business recruitment effort. The firm has so far identified 200 key organizations (business, nonprofit, civic) in the community and is in contact with several community leaders to have Cornerstone and the School District become better partners in addressing the impact of its construction and to engage the community in a meaningful way.

**Project 12: Practical Solutions Performance Framework (Fehr & Peers)**

WSDOT, 2018–2019, $323,000. **Relevance to WSDOT:** Understanding of WSDOT’s decision-making philosophy and performance measure framework for infrastructure investments on the corridor. **Services Provided:** Fehr & Peers led the development of policy objectives and identifying measures and metrics used in WSDOT’s Practical Solutions Framework, focusing on details within the Mobility Performance Framework. Fehr & Peers also prepared training materials and provided technical support to regional WSDOT staff throughout the state in implementing the frameworks. Fehr & Peers also prepared training materials, including a Practical Solutions website.

**Project 13: US 89; Farmington to I-84 Progressive Design Build (PDB) ($500 million) (Avenue Consultants)**

Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT), 2018–2021, $720,000. **Relevance to WSDOT:** Advisory role on large and complex transportation project with multiple partner agencies and stakeholders. Developed tactics to facilitate expedited environmental review. **Services Provided:** Converting a 9-mile 4 lane major arterial corridor spanning five Cities, into a 6-lane freeway with four new interchanges via the UDOT’s first PDB delivery. Avenue participated on the senior leadership team advising, developing, and documenting processes for this new alternative delivery method, and identifying, resolving, and mitigating risks with third parties, including the Bureau of Reclamation, USACE, and Federal Emergency Management Agency, related to major water storage and distribution facilities, water quality, and flood plains map revisions. Also, developed tactics to further innovative design to accommodate award of construction contract within 4 months of environmental clearance.
Project 14: Porter Rockwell Bridge Replacement (Avenue Consultants)
Ralph L. Wadsworth Construction Co. for UDOT DB Project, 2019–2021, $700,000. **Relevance to WSDOT:** Provided design review and recommendations, coordination with UPRR, provided constructability and risk management review for a transportation infrastructure project. **Services Provided:** Replacement of bridge spanning the Jordan River, Union Pacific Railroad mainline, and two canals. Included roadway improvements, new structures conveying canals and realignment of the Jordan River Trail. Avenue provided innovative design solutions accounting for the constrictions and in compliance with the environmentally cleared project area reducing the cost of roadway improvements and subsequently structure span and width. We understand the constructor’s point of view and can provide constructability knowledge to address a contractor’s risk perspective and enhance the opportunity for contractor innovation to reduce cost and accelerate schedule delivery of the project.

C. ICF/Subcontractor Partnerships
The ICF team has a strong history of collaborating to provide policy and strategy support, developing practical solutions, and delivering projects for WSDOT. Our track record for collaboration will help to ensure that we will move as a single entity, and with one voice, in meeting the project’s needs and goals. Criteria 1, Section B. Past Performance includes a selection of projects where ICF and our teaming partners have worked together in the last three years. In these instances, each teaming partner’s project role is described and discussed.

D. Staff Availability
The ICF team’s goal is to ensure availability of key staff and important staff resources to meet the project’s needs for the duration of the project. Our proposed PM is empowered by ICF and our teaming partners to acquire the internal resources necessary to ensure that the project is appropriately staffed.

Our proposed staff availability matrix shown in **Exhibit 4** identifies the resources, working group(s), key resource areas, monthly available hours, years of experience, and demonstrated experience directly applicable to the WSDOT I-5 Tumwater to Mounts Road project delivery. We will draw upon our combined experience and expertise to deliver a defensible, inclusive, and practical NEPA EIS. The estimate of available time shown for each individual assumes a full-time equivalent monthly schedule of 160 hours. Additional availability information for specific efforts or beyond the personnel identified may be provided upon request.
Exhibit 4. ICF’s Resource Experience Matrix—The ICF team is abundantly qualified to comprehensively address the numerous technical, procedural, and engagement challenges the project poses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member</th>
<th>Working Group(s)</th>
<th>Yearly Experience</th>
<th>Monthly Staff Availability in Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jack Allen</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Aarts</td>
<td>DPM, EIA Load</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariel Davis, AICP</td>
<td>TP, Lead, EIA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleen Gantke</td>
<td>PO&amp;C Lead</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Horton</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Adamson</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Anderson</td>
<td>EIA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin Anderson, PE</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Blair</td>
<td>EIA</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Barley</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rakesh Bhatnagar, PE, CFM, CFSCIL</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Blair</td>
<td>EIA</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Bloch</td>
<td>EIA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Breiden</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Bromund</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Carr</td>
<td>EIA</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Chu, PE</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Cooper, PE</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Cross, RPA</td>
<td>EIA</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon Crossen</td>
<td>EIA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Czeska</td>
<td>EIA</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Dyer, PE</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rymee Edwards, PLS, CFEdS</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexen El-Aasar, PE</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoshni Etassaouini, PE, PhD, PTOE</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Tall Eder, MA, RPA</td>
<td>PO&amp;C</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Fussell</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seth Galler POST, AICP</td>
<td>TP, EIA</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jorge Garcia, PE</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Gauke</td>
<td>EIA</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Camperline, PE</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Alice Gerhart, AICP</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa Giffen</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Girsh, PE</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJ Grove, PE</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Guerero</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kara Hall, PE</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Horton, PE</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brett Houghton</td>
<td>PO&amp;C</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Hu, PhD, PE</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill James, PE</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Johnson</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Member</td>
<td>Working Group(s)</td>
<td>Years Experience</td>
<td>Monthly Staff Availability in Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rebecca Jost</td>
<td>EIA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rachel Kamman</td>
<td>EIA</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Jadene Kearney, PE</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ingrid Kimball</td>
<td>EIA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tanya Lee, PE</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ian Lee, PE</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Carole Leigh</td>
<td>CE, EIA</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kevin Monroe, PE</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Jon Nepstad</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Erin Pace</td>
<td>EIA</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Jeff Pierson</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Beth Rodehorst</td>
<td>EIA</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Don Samsdahl, PE</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Michael Shannon, PE</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Patrick Skillings</td>
<td>EIA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dave Stanek, PE</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tracee Strum-Gilliam</td>
<td>PO&amp;C</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• January Tavel, MHP</td>
<td>EIA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Audrey Tay</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Marco Toapanta, EIT</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Alicia Toney</td>
<td>EIA</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shilpa Trisal</td>
<td>EIA</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sasha Visconti</td>
<td>PO&amp;C, EIA</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Jason Volk</td>
<td>EIA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Jon Walker</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lauren Wheeler</td>
<td>PO&amp;C</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Scott White</td>
<td>EIA</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kary Witt, PE</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Darold Woodward, PE</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Henry Yates</td>
<td>PO&amp;C</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Staff:

- Key Staff

FIRMS:

- ICF
- Avenue
- Confluence
- Fehr & Peers
- HNTB

PRR:

- Shannon Wilson

RCE:

- Skilling
- Yates Consulting Group

CATEGORIES:

- CA Contract Administration
- CE Conceptual Engineering
- CS Critical Support
- DPM Deputy Project Manager
- EIA Environmental Impact Analysis
- PM Project Manager
- PO&C Public Outreach & Coordination
- TP Transportation Planning
Criteria 2. Qualifications of Proposed Project Manager

ICF’s proposed PM, Jack Allen is a seasoned NEPA professional with 37 years providing NEPA transportation delivery projects in the western United States, including the WSDOT SR 9 and SR 530 Stillaguamish River Bridges Replacement Project and SR 525 Improvement/Paine Field Boulevard Extension Project. Jack has also successfully managed the timely preparation of over 30 EISs and environmental assessments (EA) for major transportation infrastructure projects. His successful experience shows that he is a problem-solver with an emphasis on defensibility on highly contentious, high-profile projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jack Allen has the right qualifications to lead the WSDOT I-5 Tumwater to Mounts Road - NEPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Exemplary technical skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Procedural prowess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Tested NEPA DOT EIS experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Quality project delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Timely and informed decisions for practical and sustainable solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Delivers meaningful public &amp; agency involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Effectively directly multidisciplinary teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Exemplary design-build exposure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Proactive communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Management Highlights

✓ Successfully led NEPA/404 Merger Process first efforts to implement at the project level
✓ Managed 6 of the top 10 Department of Transportation (DOT) projects simultaneously as PM and four state DOT on-call and management consultant contracts concurrently as Contract Manager
✓ Regularly completed EAs within 12-month period
✓ Completed complex, controversial EIS in 29 months; considered the Financial Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) one of the best submitted to the agency per the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) legal sufficiency
✓ Primary author of state DOT’s first “reader-friendly” hybrid format EIS; elements which are now considered portions of the state DOT’s NEPA document templates.
✓ Successfully designed and implemented first partnering application to the EIS process at the DOT level

A. Proposed Project Manager Experience

Jack, has provided three projects to demonstrate his project management experience specifically relating to NEPA EIS and Planning and Environmental Linkage (PEL) projects. We include the project name, client, role and responsibilities, key project areas and the similarities to the WSDOT project.

South Mountain Freeway (SMF) EIS/Section 4(f) Evaluation—2000–2017
Arizona DOT (ADOT)—Steve Boschen, State Engineer

The EIS for this estimated $2.1 billion highly controversial freeway project was ADOT’s highest priority project. Responsibilities and Tasks: Project Manager, NEPA strategist, Environmental lead, primary EIS author, discipline analyst, and outreach strategist. Responsible for purpose and need, alternatives development and screening process, public involvement, process strategist, primary author, and Section 4(f) Evaluation, Jack also managed technical team analysis of controversial issues for most environmental elements considered under Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) TA 6640.8A. Key project highlights and similarities to the WSDOT project are shown below.

- Developed ADOT’s first use of a “hybrid” reader friendly style EIS document. **WSDOT is a leader in reader friendly EIS documents. Jack brings direct experience to this innovative approach to storytelling in the EIS.**
- Prior to the draft EIS (DEIS), over 200 public meetings held with virtual and in-person public hearings throughout the corridor. **Jack’s outreach background will bring direct benefit to Section 3 EIS/record of decision (ROD) of the WSDOT project as it will peak serious public interest.**
- Agency coordination was inclusive and project critical. Involved extensive interaction with adjacent Gila River Indian Community, the City of Phoenix and federal, state, and local agencies like FHWA, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), USACE, Environmental Protection Agency, Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), ADEQ, SHPO, Maricopa Association of Governments. **Extensive interaction with the Nisqually, Squaxin Island, and Cowlitz Indian Tribes is fully anticipated as well as extensive interface with numerous agencies and jurisdictions such as NMFS, USFWS, USACE, BIA, Tumwater, Olympia, Dupont, Joint Base Lewis-McChord (JBLM), Thurston**
Regional Planning Council (TRPC), and South Sound Military and Communities Partnership. Jack provides a history of successful outreach.

- The Section 4(f) Evaluation represented the most complex evaluation process ADOT had ever encountered. The South Mountain Regional Park region alone represented one of the largest traditional cultural properties in the southwest as well as one of the largest municipal natural parks in the country. The WSDOT project will assess several potential Section 4(f) resources along the corridor length including the Billy Frank Jr. Nisqually National Wildlife Refuge and the Eagle’s Pride Golf Course. Jack provides extensive Section 4(f) experience.

- Local community impacts, including environmental justice and Title VI were critical analytical issues, Jack was directly involved in Title VI issues on SMF. Title VI will be a key issue needing analysis, due to fishing rights afforded the local Indian tribes in the Nisqually River.


Maricopa Association of Governments, Phoenix, AZ—Bob Hazlett, Senior Engineering Project Manager

A first of its kind project for the Phoenix, AZ, the I-10/I-17 Masterplan developed solutions for alternative programs encompassing suites of sequenced, sustainable projects to be delivered to two through lanes in the heart of Phoenix proper. **Responsibilities and Tasks:** PEL PM and primary author, NEPA and outreach strategist, discipline analyst. Jack served as the PM for the PEL study delivery (again, a first in the state) for the masterplan alternatives and provided managerial oversight of public and agency engagement, purpose and need development, and the development and screening of alternative programs. Part of the PEL responsibility was to outline next steps after PEL study completion and these included outlining NEPA requirements for each project in alternative programs as well as recommendations on project sequencing. **The Maricopa Association of Governments PEL document included a section on next steps to transition to NEPA compliance.**

- Required an inclusive outreach approach reaching across multiple communities and neighborhoods. The WSDOT project will require engagement of numerous communities and jurisdictions and will require an inclusive, holistic outreach effort to address societal equity.

- The PEL study required the team to examine the transition of projects identified in the alternative programs in terms of NEPA requirements to support seamless “incorporation by reference” into later document processes. This project requires, in close concert with WSDOT leadership and staff, thoughtful strategy and actions to ensure seamless and defensible transition from the PEL to the EIS process.

- Projects within the alternative programs required they be examined for sustainability and resiliency, and delivery practicality. Without proactive and effective process leadership, it would be easy for the improvements to expand unnecessarily well beyond I-5 operations. Project purpose will focus on practicality of delivery, sustainable and resilient solutions.


ADOT—Steve Boschken, State Engineer

The EIS for 18 miles of new freeway from SR 87 to US 60 through Mesa, AZ, was ADOT’s largest project in history at the time. The EIS process and ROD were completed in just over 2 years. **Responsibilities and Tasks:** Project Manager, Environmental lead and primary EIS author, NEPA and outreach strategist, discipline analyst. Jack actively managed key issues like complex Section 4(f) resources issues, cultural resources and jurisdictional waters, housing displacement, tribal land issues, Title VI/environmental justice populations, agency and public involvement and successful implementation of the NEPA-404 Merger Process (an ADOT first). **The RMF EIS delivered early implementation of sustainable project features for ADOT.**

- The ROD was delivered in 29 months from notice of intent (NOI) publication despite the high degree of complexity, visibility in the press, and controversy. The WSDOT project will require a hands-on EIS consultant PM proactively managing process, content, and document development to deliver the Section 3 EIS in under three years.
The RMF EIS was ADOT’s No. 1 priority project. Highly controversial, public and agency outreach was extensive, as represented by over 2,000 people attended the two public hearings. The 2020 corridor study actively sought public engagement and the WSDOT Section 3 will peak serious public interest pertaining to the delta habitat as well as modal choice considerations in design.

Jack managed the design and implementation of agency scoping as a 2-day agency partnering session with agreements reached on project critical topics of review times, agencies’ scope limits and needs from the project team for various stakeholders and Tribal communities. Extensive interaction with the Nisqually, Squaxin Island, and Cowlitz Indian Tribes is fully anticipated as well as extensive interface with numerous agencies and jurisdictions such as NMFS, USFWS, USACE, BIA, Tumwater, Olympia, Dupont, JBLM, TRPC, and South Sound Military and Communities Partnership.

The Section 4(f) Evaluation was a highly complex evaluation process for ADOT. The Red Mountain Regional Park included freeway development in master planning without joint-planning as the freeway was planned for as an add-in into the park and not joint-development. The WSDOT project will assess several potential Section 4(f) resources along the corridor length including the Billy Frank Jr. Nisqually National Wildlife Refuge. The evaluation will require a robust understanding of Section 4(f) guidance, policy and regulation.

Project alternatives passed through extensive and importantly historic district and other cultural resources of significance. The I-5 corridor is rich with history relating to interactions a Native American communities and early Anglo settlers to the region. Effective and respectful communications with Indian Tribes in the region will be critical to delivery of the Section 106 and Section 4(f) processes.

B. Ability to Manage Problems

We provide the following examples of the ability of our proposed PM, Jack, to strategically manage project problems and actions taken to mitigate them.

Quality Control (QC) of Preliminary DEIS (PDEIS)

Project: ADOT, RMF EIS/Section 4(f) Evaluation, SR 87-US 60. Problem and Potential Impact: In the midst of ADOT’s most complex and largest EIS in its history, the project team encountered QC breakdowns in delivering the PDEIS to FHWA for local review. To worsen conditions, the PDEIS inadvertently was delivered to FHWA for legal review. The PDEIS was met with a high degree of disdain due to the quality issues. This led Ms. Peters, who later went on to become the U.S. DOT Administrator, to halt all consultant’s projects until PDEIS corrections could be made and the ROD filed. The situation presented not only potential major delay but also substantive hardship for the consultant. Mitigation: To effectively manage the potentially scheduling-changing problem, the team rolled up their sleeves and got to work. Jack took full responsibility, and with the team, worked diligently to correct all quality mistakes. Result(s): This commitment led to delivery of the ROD in 29 months from NOI. FHWA legal staff later went on to say the final product represented one of the finest EIS products they had encountered.

Legal Recommendation for Additional Text Despite an Already High Degree of EIS Defensibility

Project: ADOT, SMF EIS/Section 4(f) Evaluation. Problem and Potential Impact: During final EIS delivery, the project team, including staff from a private legal firm as well as administrators from DOT, MPO, and FHWA, reviewed the last handful of DEIS comments received to determine appropriate responses for documentation. A continuing recommendation by legal staff was to add more text into the main body of the final EIS despite an eventually proven high degree of EIS defensibility. Mitigation: As the Senior NEPA Strategist, Jack conveyed the additions would lead to further delay in ROD issuance by adding at least nine months of additional review by DOT and FHWA. Result(s): The team chose not to add the text and the EIS and its process went on to be praised by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals for its robustness.

Anticipated Potential Project Delays

Project: ADOT, SMF EIS/Section 4(f) Evaluation. Problem and Potential Impact: The EIS used an 11 x 17 hybrid “reader-friendly format (a technically adequate format and first of its kind for ADOT), but also included content firsts, such as language tonality and unique use of figures and captions. Jack anticipated potential project delays.
from the project sponsor, federal, cooperating, and regulatory agencies regarding the ability to deliver important timely reviews, *(scheduled 30-day reviews could turn into 90 days)*. **Mitigation:** Jack proactively developed document review guidance providing early reviews with agency staff that addressed factors such as, “why formatting might be different”, “why information is presented a certain way”, or “where differences exist and why”.

**Result(s):** Important factors were achieved, initial review schedules adhered to; adoption of a more defensible, yet reader friendly approach to telling the EIS story; and future agency NEPA documents used the created EIS template format.

### C. Professional Licenses/Accreditations

Jack is active in several national professional organizations to keep him active in current in all environmental regulation. His role does not require specific licensees or accreditations.

### Criteria 3. Key Team Members Qualifications

In recognition of the WSDOT project’s complex environmental, design, stakeholder and tribal engagement, and transportation planning needs, ICF’s PM will be supported by key team members leading the proposed working groups as shown *Exhibit 3* in Proposed Team, Roles, and Organizational Chart of Criteria 1, *Transportation Planning, Public Outreach and Coordination, Conceptual Engineering, and EIA*. These working groups teams will collaborate together to guide the technical deliverables and quality of the nearly 80 procedural and technical specialists. The team will provide expertise applicable to the project’s technical, procedural, and engagement challenges.

### A. Key Team Roles and Responsibilities

**Jan Aarts—DPM and EIA Lead**

As the DPM, monitor the ICF team scope of work execution, schedule and budget, QA/QC for EIS related deliverables, and coordinate daily communication with WSDOT. As the working group lead, manage preparation of the initial environmental analysis for I-5 Sections 1 and 2, and I-5 Section 3 EIS discipline reports. Jan does not hold licenses or accreditations applicable to the State of Washington.

- **I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project, NEPA EA, Oregon DOT (ODOT), Portland, OR (2017–2020).** Technical lead/author for environmental reports and EA sections, and author for major sections of FHWA’s finding of no significant impact. Supported ODOT staff during public meetings and helped prepare responses to public and agency comments on the EA.
- **South Sammamish Plateau Access Road and Sunset Interchange Modifications NEPA/SEPA EIS, King County and the City of Issaquah, WA (2000–2002).** EIS team lead, coordinated the preparation of EIS technical sections with the design team and subject matter experts/authors, and responsible for QA/QC of EIS related project deliverables.

**Ariel Davis, AICP—Transportation Planning Lead**

The Transportation Planning working group lead and lead coordinator of the WSDOT project’s multimodal transportation planning approach consistent with WSDOT’s practical solutions performance framework and NEPA requirements including evaluation of travel demand forecasting, traffic operations, transit, active transportation, safety, and equity. Ariel holds an American Institute of Certified Planners, #29577, 2017 applicable to the State of Washington and uses with her projects.
• **SR 167 Completion Project (part of the SR 167/SR 509 Puget Sound Gateway Program), GEC (2016–2017).** Lead analyst for the project’s travel demand forecasting efforts. Engaged with jurisdictions along the corridor to develop consensus on the land use assumptions for the project’s travel demand model and documented the travel demand forecasting model development for WSDOT staff.

• **West Seattle and Ballard Link Extensions (WSBLE), EIS (2017–Present).** Led the nonmotorized EIS analysis for the WSBLE project and evaluated high-capacity transit extensions from West Seattle to downtown Seattle and Ballard to downtown Seattle. Developed a pedestrian level of service methodology to analyze sidewalk, crosswalk, and corner performance for dozens of station area options. Developed 10-minute walksheds and bikesheds to and from the future stations that account for topography and traffic signal delay and identified potential impacts of the alternatives. Lead author of the nonmotorized sections of the EIS and Transportation Technical Report.

• **Seattle Center Arena Renovation Project EIS and Transportation Management Plan (2017–2021).** DPM for the EIS transportation evaluation of the renovation of Key Arena in the Uptown neighborhood of Seattle. Coordinated with SDCI, Seattle DOT, Seattle Center, City Attorney’s Office, and the developer, Oak View Group, and engaged with neighborhood groups. Completed the Transportation Management Plan which outlined an operational plan for an event day as well as demand management strategies, performance standards and a monitoring plan.

**Tim Horton—Conceptual Engineering Lead**

The Conceptual Engineering working group lead to coordinate and oversee engineering concepts development to support the WSDOT project, providing guidance and insight to for accurate project phasing and cost estimates development. Tim holds a Professional Engineer Washington 45840 license applicable to the State of Washington and uses within his projects.

• **SR3 Belfair Area Wide Safety Improvements (2010–2016).** Led the conceptual design of corridor to complete the legislative intent while reducing project scope to meet legislative budgeting appropriation. This project widened SR 3 through Belfair adding a two way left turn lane, enclosed drainage, multimodal facilities, sidewalks, new signals, and one fish passable structure.

• **SR 167/70th Avenue E. Vicinity Bridge Replacement (2019–Present).** Utility and Signing Discipline 2nd Option Roadway Lead for Stage 1a, the first stage of the Puget Sound Gateway Program. Completion of concept plans for the design builder to bid that included a signal span bridge that eliminated the I-5 work zone, avoided over 40% of planned wetland impacts, and avoided impacts on a fish-bearing stream. These changes allowed the team to secure the best value and low bid for Stage 1a reconstruction of the 70th Avenue E. overcrossing.

• **US 12, Nine Mile Hill to Frenchtown Vic — Build new Highway; Walla Walla County, WA, Interchange Improvements (2019–Present).** Deputy Design Manager and Roadway/Utilities/Signing Discipline Lead for the project, which widens 11.5-miles of US 12 from two to four lanes. Tim led the development of alternative technical concept (ATC) 1 the project’s only ATC. Tim’s concept used the existing US 12 as a frontage road, allowed the DB to eliminate three at-grade intersections and replace them with diamond interchanges at each end of the project. In addition, by constructing the nine mile hill interchange as part of phase 7. Tim’s design concept saved WSDOT over $3 million in project costs for phase 7 while reducing the future projects phase 8 cost by an additional $4 million.

**Colleen Gants—Public Outreach and Coordination Lead**

The Public Outreach and Coordination working group lead and project communications, public outreach and stakeholder engagement lead. Coordinate with Olympic Region communications on a community engagement plan incorporating NEPA requirements, inclusive engagement, and HEAL Act principles. Convene and staff advisory groups engaged in past projects and work with WSDOT to incorporate an Equity Advisory Group. Colleen does not hold licenses or accreditations applicable to the State of Washington.
• **I-405/SR 167 Corridor Program** (2003–2010 and 2020–2022): As Communications Lead, helped form, staff and facilitate the Executive Advisory Group, Funding and Phasing Committee, Interagency Working Group, Citizen Advisory Committee, and a national Expert Review Panel that evaluated WSDOT’s funding approaches on this vital corridor. Coordinated all communications and engagement around NEPA, advisory groups, integration with the SR 167 Master Plan PEL communications, and I-405/SR 167 funding and fish passage elements.

• **SR 509/I-5/SR 167 Puget Sound Gateway Project Development** (2012–2013): As interim communications and external relations manager for WSDOT’s Toll Division, collaborated with WSDOT staff to lead early stakeholder engagement, staff the SR 509 and SR 167 business coalitions, draft and edit collateral materials and a summary report, and coordinate government relations activities. In 2016, PRR began work as lead communications consultant to deliver the Gateway Program.

• **SR 9/SR 204 Intersection Improvement Project** (2016–2019): As Communications Lead, drafted and implemented a community engagement plan; coordinated stakeholder advisory group workshops; planned open houses and local business roundtables; coordinated presentations at community meetings and elected officials’ briefings; managed project website, social media, and the community database. Maintained a consistent presence in the community to address widespread citizen and business/property owner interest

**Outreach Communication**

Colleen, our public outreach and coordination lead, has more than 20 years WSDOT public involvement project experience, beginning with PRR at a WSDOT project office on Corson Avenue. Upon completion of the I-405 Master Plan and Programmatic EIS for the I-405/SR167 project, Colleen led public involvement on three project-level EAs funded by the Nickel Package in 2003. This work led to engage communities, drivers and transit riders on 10 project EAs throughout the 50-mile corridor, including the Springbrook wetland mitigation bank in Renton.

Colleen has led public involvement for WSDOT Toll Division projects serving as interim communications manager, NWR’s SR 9/SR 204 Project, Oregon’s Yelm Loop Project, I-405/SR 167, and SR 520. Colleen’s national project experience has enhanced her WSDOT community engagement approaches, particularly the St. Elizabeth’s East Campus EA in the Anacostia area of Washington, DC. Colleen’s project goals are to truly engage more people through creative means such as, community advisory committees, CBOs, enlisting local people in outreach, developing messages and materials, meeting people where they are, and reporting back on how their input was considered.

**Criteria 4. Project Delivery Approach**

The I-5 corridor is a key thoroughfare for freight, people, and national security. Through the past decade, the region has grown immensely, creating increased delays to all users and limiting economic activity. The WSDOT project is the next step in improving the region’s interface of the transportation network, economic vitality, and natural habitat—a truly sustainable and resilient focus. Successful conclusion of the scoped effort will be completion of three main deliverables.

• **Section 1 and 2 Briefs.** Documenting initial environmental analysis for and including I-5 preliminary plans for Section 1, southern I-5 from the US 101 interchange to Pacific Avenue SE interchange and Section 2, middle I-5 from Pacific Avenue SE interchange to Marvin Road NE interchange

• **Section 3 EIS and Associate ROD.** Providing the EIS/ROD for the northern I-5 section between the interchanges at Marvin Road and Mounts Road, including the Nisqually River bridges

To deliver this project, a team must account for the effort taken by WSDOT for the proposed action, including the 2020 Corridor Study and anticipated 2022 PEL study highlighted below.
2020 Corridor Study. I-5: Tumwater to Mounts Road Mid- and Long-Range Strategies

The 2020 corridor study emphasized collaborative efforts to assess all transportation modes as well as non-transportation modes, the WSDOT and TRPC looked to:

- Positively address regional congestion management
- Identify potential improvements for the US 101/I-5 interchange
- Deliver a plan for the Nisqually River bridges to address ecosystem benefits

Undesirable congestion on I-5 continues to occur, mostly at three locations during peak commute periods: the US 101 interchange at Exit 104; between the state Capitol and Lacey at Exits 105 and 109; and near the Nisqually River bridges. One key outcome, as mandated by the legislature, is to account for a Nisqually River bridges strategic plan to promote a healthy interface between I-5 and related improvements and the river system. Among many recommendations, the corridor study accounted for:

- Treating all strategies as provisional until the joint Nisqually Indian Tribe/U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) study of comprehensive ecosystem behaviors is completed
- Incorporating salmon productivity, flood control, and other environmental considerations into the design as contextual needs rather than as mitigation for impacts
- If funded for environmental reasons, allowing design to: (1) permit future widening to alleviate the anticipated southbound chokepoint at Mounts Road and (2) address the active transportation gap between Thurston and Pierce Counties

To study alternatives, the collaborative stakeholder effort included a broad range of perspectives, disciplines, outreach backgrounds, and decision-making, articulating desired outcomes as shown in Exhibit 5 to improve predictable travel times on I-5 (travel times and reliability); increase efficiency and equity in movement of goods, services and people (efficiency and equity); improve commercial and industrial access in the region (accessibility); improve operational performance and efficiencies during disruption (resilience); and reduce, minimize, and/or avoid transportation-related impact on the corridor and regional affected environment, including the wildlife habitat in the Nisqually River delta.

Against these parameters, a multitiered screening was undertaken starting with 55 scenarios (10 of which were capable of modeling). Through screening, provisional recommendations were made for next steps, including the preparation of the PEL study described below.

Anticipated 2022 PEL Study. I-5: Tumwater to Mounts Road Mid- and Long-Range Strategies

Building from the 2020 corridor study, the PEL study is the result of a collaborative, integrated approach to decision-making that accounts for environmental, community, and economic goals in accordance with WSDOT's Practical Solutions requirements. Currently, the PEL study is under review by the Nisqually Indian Tribe and is pending publication; its contents are not yet subject to public review. The PEL study extensively built from the 2020 corridor study to advance findings in the project delivery continuum; substantiated purpose and need through TRPC’s traffic modeling to determine individual benefits while accounting for strategies easily implemented to improve person through-put;
screened scenarios/alternatives and provisionally recommended two action alternatives to carry forward into the Section 3 EIS as shown in Exhibit 6.

Since WSDOT is in the business of delivering transportation solutions, both alternatives necessarily focus around I-5 scenario improvements that intend to improve performance for travel times, reliability, efficiency, equity, modal choice, accessibility, and resiliency while effectively mitigating impacts on natural resources like those found in the Nisqually River delta; and advanced the NEPA EIS process by essentially validating purpose and need and the alternatives development and screening EIS steps while documenting NEPA informal considerations of hard look, reasonable person, and full disclosure.

A. Project Delivery Approach

ICF is responsive to WSDOT’s project delivery requirements as presented in the following work plan elements highlighting our efficient, defensible, and timely systemic approach incorporating practical design that consider least-cost solutions while accounting for the project’s relations to the surrounding natural, physical, and built environments.

Work Plan Elements

The ICF team’s proactive delivery of work plan elements focus on three key factors in delivery success: Project Management, EIS Process Management, and QA/QC Process as described below.

Project Management

EIS delivery requires a robust, proactive, multidisciplinary approach to management, facilitating a blend of art, science, engineering, and diplomacy and leading to an informed, resilient, and sustainable practical solution. ICF’s team represents the necessary blend of NEPA, technical, and outreach competencies. For example, it is not enough to know that traffic modeling and forecasting are using state-of-the-practice analytical tools, methods, and assumptions; it must blend with NEPA intent to ensure data used for purpose and need development is not too narrowly or broadly defined to support a reasonable range of alternatives for detailed study in the EIS process. Effective project management will defensibly account for the myriad of documented decisions that must be addressed leading to a ROD and must facilitate timely process to support a resilient and sustainable practical solution. Below, ICF presents our project management best practices that focus on avoiding surprises and reducing risk.

- **Project Start.** Within the first 30 days of notice to proceed, the ICF team will prepare plans for communications, QA/QC, project filing, safety, risk register, schedule, style guide, templates, and methodologies for WSDOT, stakeholder and Tribe approvals, as appropriate. Advances clear project delivery expectations and maximizes ability for on-time delivery and allows to strategically think about EIS next steps.

- **Communication.** ICF’s PM will be hands-on, external facing, and fully engaged with WSDOT staff through weekly proactive communications and staff meetings to review progress against schedule and risk. Proactive communications to avoid surprises for WSDOT.

- **Team Leadership.** ICF’s PM will fully engage with the ICF key team members and working group leaders weekly to monitor progress against schedule, risk, percent complete, percent spent, and other key performance metrics. Internal leadership interaction reduces duplication of effort, shares project information, and creates consistency in product delivery.

- **Active Management.** ICF’s PM will actively manage, at the direction of WSDOT leadership, each step of the EIS process, from PEL to EIS transition to active management of technical impact analyses and DEIS and financial EIS (FEIS)/ROD delivery. Active management prevents scope deviation and costly delays.

- **Project Focus.** ICF’s DPM will provide laser focus on internal team activities, ensuring that team members have the data and resources necessary to deliver on scope, schedule, and budget. Internal focus strategically advances appropriate resource allocation, avoids scope deviation, and proactively anticipates project challenges warranting action.
**EIS Process Management**

NEPA clearly places emphasis on process, and most legal challenges on EIS delivery are rooted in process issues. To reduce litigation risk, an effective PM must (1) have a comprehensive NEPA understanding for DOT-type projects and (2) actively manage the EIS process to NEPA intent for hard look, reasonable person, and full disclosure. To deliver risk avoidance and reduction, a nuanced understanding specific to highway projects and active EIS process management is necessary. Paramount to achieving this critical issue, the leadership team must understand each EIS step has subtle decisions to be accounted for and documented. The ICF core leadership team will play an active role in process management through weekly reviews (described above). Led by Jack, the team will use a decision matrix tool, as shown in Exhibit 7 to capture all the decisions and conclusions that must be accounted for in EIS process management to maximize process defensibility.

**Exhibit 7. The NEPA EIS Leader’s Critical Role in Processing Continuity and Defensibility When Multiple Technical Disciplines are Involved in a Single Process**

The PEL-to-EIS process transition is a procedural step, unique to this project yet critical to this project’s success. The challenge is described in the Key Activities and Critical Milestones section below, but it will take active process management to ensure a seamless transition occurs.

**QA/QC Process**

Many factors could contribute to delays and inefficiencies on the WSDOT project. One notable factor is poor quality in process, content, and document presentation. Poor quality and clarity of documents expands review time and creates adversarial roles within the project team. Worse yet, poor documentation fails to tell the “process story”. This is predictable because since the mid-1980s, federal agencies have reported the quality of environmental documents as a top complaint in proposed action delivery—so much so that organizations like American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials regularly produce and issue guidance on how to improve the quality of environmental documents.

To deliver consistent quality, the ICF team knows best practices are available and must be implemented from the project start with a strong QA policy. ICF will deliver strong QA policy starting with detailed work plans highlighting methods, assumptions, data sources, and approach. In providing high-quality delivery, we will require interim deliverables as key check points in document preparations to prevent scope creep and associated delays and develop tools and procedures like style guides, peer reviews, and technical editors in schedule development and document reviews.
If document quality is a concern, then the right experts (ICF’s technical editors), should be engaged to deliver high quality. ICF has been in the business of delivering quality EISs for transportation projects since NEPA’s inception in 1970.

**Incorporating Practical Design/Least-Cost Solutions**

Design delivery activities to support the EIS process will depend heavily on the PEL study recommendations and outcomes that identify and describe the alternatives recommended for detailed study in the EIS. It is our understanding that minimal design work has been done on the recommended alternatives. Our designers, led by HNTB, will need to develop a horizontal and vertical profile to a level sufficient to understand preliminary plans (1) are plausible, constructible, order of magnitude, and fundable; (2) are understandable by the general public and stakeholders; and (3) allow for meaningful comparative impact assessment and related mitigation strategy.

We fully anticipate that design refinement will be necessary from the PEL conclusions in the form of a screening process to further refine the alternatives for meaningful study. It is during this exercise that the ICF team will focus on designing concepts consistent with WSDOT Practical Solutions guidance, including consideration of cost efficiencies, an example is shown in [Exhibit 8](#).

The ICF team of designers from HNTB are well-informed of WSDOT design policy and expectations, having been a key design services provider to WSDOT for many years, as exemplified by HNTB’s role as I-405’s program manager.

In many ways, the ICF team has already started to study design challenges along the corridor. For example, we have started scrutinizing bridge crossings along this I-5 section. For example, both directions of I-5 in Section 3 are constrained by BNSF under crossings near MP 115.68.

Assuming at least one of the action alternatives includes widening of I-5 to match the roadway section to the north, the existing bridge spans will need to be lengthened to accommodate the new I-5 width. Historically, BNSF’s responsiveness has been slow with the traditional response being to build a temporary bridge and then replacing the existing bridge and shifting back to the original alignment. That approach causes increased cost, longer schedules, and additional impact to the traveling public. To overcome this challenge, the issue requires an established trust level with BNSF staff.

The ICF team has a long history of providing planning, design, and construction management for BNSF in the northwest. Our seasoned BNSF/Sound Transit coordination design lead has years of experience working closely with BNSF to provide capacity improvements to their heavy rail infrastructure throughout the northwest, including the nearby Nisqually Crossovers Project where the Lakeview Spur (Amtrak) joins the BNSF mainline.
BNSF is in the process of replacing some of their 100-year-old mainline bridges. To accomplish that with minimal interruption to service, the new bridge is being constructed immediately adjacent to the existing bridge and the track is being built to within a few feet of the existing main. When it is time to switch train traffic over to the new bridge, the track connections at both ends will be made within a brief work window, typically just a few hours. The old bridges will be removed, and traffic will remain on the new alignment. This technique could be used to replace the two BNSF bridges over I-5 for the WSDOT project, creating the longer spans necessary to allow widening of I-5 without impacting BNSF’s service.

A similar process could be used to replace the two Lakeview Spur (Amtrak) bridges that cross I-5. In that location we propose revising the alignment rather than placing the new bridges adjacent to the existing ones as shown in Exhibit 9. This could allow the use of larger radius curves both north and south of I-5 to increase track speed and improve safety. These potential alignment concepts are shown in.

**Key Activities and Critical Milestones**

ICF presents a high-level project schedule with critical milestones in Exhibit 10. This schedule is a rollup of a detailed 200-line-item schedule developed using scheduling software to deliver the confidence that our team will deliver the project on schedule per the request for qualifications. At each of these milestone points, WSDOT will be able to “step back” with the ICF team and confirm validity of past process and content decisions and confirm next steps moving forward. As represented by the examples below, key activities are numerous and challenging and could certainly influence the ability to deliver on-schedule milestone dates.
### Exhibit 10. The High-level Schedule’s Key Milestones are Checkpoints in Project Delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Schedule Feature</th>
<th>Q2 2022</th>
<th>Q3 2022</th>
<th>Q4 2022</th>
<th>Q1 2023</th>
<th>Q2 2023</th>
<th>Q3 2023</th>
<th>Q4 2023</th>
<th>Q1 2024</th>
<th>Q2 2024</th>
<th>Q3 2024</th>
<th>Q4 2024</th>
<th>Q1 2025</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Kick-Off</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEL Study-to-EIS Integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose and Need/Validation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives to be Studied in Daily Validation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept Design, Screening, Prelim. Engineering*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sections 1 and 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS Section 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team and Stakeholder Consensus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3 - Publish Notice of Intent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3 - Public and Agency Scoping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoping Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoping Report and Dissemination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3 - Discipline Reports/Special Studies**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 7 Consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 404(b)(1) Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4(f)(v) Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sections 1 &amp; 2 - initial environmental analyses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICF preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3 - Draft EIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3 - Public Comment/Hearings(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3 - Final EIS/Response to Comments/ROD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Team Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity Advisory Group Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Advisory Group Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Group Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excl. tops survey, geotech report, hydraulic study, bridge studies, plan & profile development, drainage and stormwater to 15% design  
** incl. Section 4(f)(v), wetland and stream, cultural resources, air noise, community impact, environmental justice, equity, Title VI, hazardous materials, et.

### Approach Based on Deliverables Understanding

It is assumed the PEL and follow-on EIS, will focus on the study limits from Marvin to Mounts Roads, WSDOT Section 3. Therefore, WSDOT Sections 1 and 2 of I-5 will not be directly associated with PEL study findings to complete initial environmental analyses and preliminary plans. However, the completion of analytical and plan work for Sections 1 and 2 must account for:

- Defensible logical termini to avoid any validity in possible accusation of segmentation
- Consistency with purpose and need and alternatives development and screening in the PEL and EIS processes, including compatibility with the Selected Alternative in the EIS
- Methods and assumptions consistency to assess sections’ issues with the likes of sustainability, resiliency, equity, Section 4(f), and biological resources
- Coordinated public and agency outreach to reduce the chance of confusion around preliminary plan development and environmental analysis for the three sections of I-5

Because of these interactions—and under the assumption WSDOT wishes to publicly disclose development of the preliminary plans and initial environmental analysis for Sections 1 and 2—the ICF team proposes it would be prudent to time and coordinate key features of all three studies as follows.

- **Purpose and Need.** The primary focus of the critical purpose and need is to fix the identified transportation problem consistent along the entire corridor length; validate PEL purpose and need and other two sections’ purpose and need simultaneously. **Validation substantially increases process and proposed action defensibility for the entire corridor.**
- **Reasonable Range of Alternatives.** As part of EIS process, validate PEL screening results and confirm consistent concept design for entire corridor; issue preliminary plans for all three sections at start of EIS impact analysis commencement to demonstrate consistency. **Reduces possible interpretation of pre-determination; conveys holistic approach to corridor analyses.**
• **Findings.** Issue the preliminary plans and initial environmental analysis for Sections 1 and 2 in draft from one to two months in advance of the DEIS. *Issuing all three documents would lead to public confusion on what to comment on; issuance of preliminary plans and initial environmental analysis for Sections 1 and 2 in advance of the DEIS will give the public advance design understandings that may help focus DEIS comment.*

• **Final Recommendation.** Issue preliminary plans and initial environmental analysis for Sections 1 and 2 at Selected Alternative identification and ROD issuance for EIS for Section 3. *Issuing all three decisions simultaneously would give study finality to the corridor with clear direction of WSDOT and stakeholder intentions.*

**Approach and Key Activities to the EIS Process**

Key issues in multiple disciplines will challenge the team in timely delivery. The issues map shown in Exhibit 11 below conveys the amassing of complex issues in WSDOT Section 3. The following issues described further in this section, exemplify primary work plan elements to successfully complete preliminary plans and environmental analysis for the project. Proposed WSDOT primary workplan elements include:

1. Creating a Flawless Transition from PEL to EIS Process
2. Innovative Public, Agency, and Stakeholder Outreach Achieving Project Definition Alignment
3. Creating a Transportation Solution that Delivers Natural Resource Benefits to the Nisqually River Basin and its Habitat
4. Designing Bridge Crossings for the Future
5. Comprehensive Accounting of All Travel Types in the Corridor
6. Supporting an EIS Base Foundation through Defensible Travel Analysis

Exhibit 11. The myriad of technical challenges is highly concentrated in the EIS Section 3 of I-5
1. Creating a Flawless Transition from PEL to EIS Process

To flawlessly achieve incorporation of the PEL by reference, the following steps are necessary to reach a ROD for the Marvin Road interchange to Mounts Road interchange (Section 3) of I-5: PEL acceptance by the federal lead agency, publish NOI for the EIS, PEL incorporation by reference through documented action by the project sponsor and federal lead agency, public and agency scoping, validation of purpose and need and final alternatives screening (concept 15% design) to establish reasonable range of alternatives from PEL results, impact analysis, DEIS, public hearing, and FEIS/ROD.

PEL results should be validated to determine what, if any, additional work to support results would be needed.

- Additional design may be needed beyond that done for the PEL to facilitate meaningful and comparative impact analyses. This validation exercise is not atypical of an EIS process when temporal factors weigh upon timely decisions.
- Stakeholder demand can be expected to include basin enhancement/restoration as part of purpose and need. If that were to happen, then alternatives could be expanded to be beyond just transportation projects and therefore would weaken EIS process defensibility (as ruled on by the ninth circuit as recently as 2017). By keeping purpose and need to only transportation would allow the alternatives to be defensibly specific to transportation and enhancement opportunities could be important screening criteria and therefore, incorporated into design and not serve as a mitigation strategy.

According to the WSDOT corridor study:

“If any alteration to I-5 through the Nisqually River valley occurs, incorporate salmon productivity, flood control, and other environmental considerations into the design as contextual needs rather than as mitigation for impacts.”

The approach will require the ICF team to build trust and confidence with all stakeholders including the Tribes, so that the project will have design plans rooted in Practical Solutions while accounting for environmental improvement.

Actions To Facilitate a Seamless Transition

- Engage in robust agency and public outreach prior outreach likely occurred during the corridor study phase.
- Validate purpose and need before final screening. Ensure traffic forecasts and modelling are still valid from PEL to EIS.
- Considerations
  - Design of the two anticipated action alternatives will likely only be cross section narratives as concept design won’t be complete. Immediate design challenge will not be so much the horizontal profile but the vertical profile and what infrastructure will be underneath it to support it.
  - Account for tribal concerns for fish maintenance/enhancement in terms of environmental justice and Title VI from an economic standpoint as well as a religious/sacred practice right.
  - One more level of screening may be necessary whereby using both cross sections there would be three designs for each.
    - Use the existing vertical profile to accommodate the new cross sections;
    - put each new cross section on new structure and remove embankment from the old design to open up the entire basin (in essence, a very costly least damaging practical alternative); and
    - create a hybrid whereby the vertical profile accounts for the needs of cost effectiveness (practical) and the needs of the Nisqually Tribe relative to the natural resources of the delta and river basin.

Concept design to a 15% level becomes very important at this stage, the inflection point of support. Collaboration with stakeholders like Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Tribe will be critical to balance roadway operational performance, natural resource enhancement, and reasonable construction and maintenance cost—all equating to a Practical Solution. Robust stakeholder interface is critical to convey how this approach will create a win-win dynamic for WSDOT and the Tribes. Rooted in this collaboration will be a tribal need
to understand what constraints WSDOT is subject to, and conversely, WSDOT needs to understand the Practical Solution must meet the expectations of the tribe. The ability to achieve such a mutual understanding will be rooted in solid and defensible data. Delivering a flawless transition from PEL completion to EIS process will be rooted in expeditious yet robust validation of past actions and decisions and meaningful engagement of stakeholders. For WSDOT, these actions assure minimized risk of procedural backtracking, schedule delay avoidance, public and stakeholder trust in a fully disclosed setting, and assurances of a process that solidly supports informed project decision making.

2. Innovative Public, Agency, and Stakeholder Outreach Achieving Project Definition Alignment

A meaningful public, agency, and stakeholder outreach strategy must be developed and implemented for the EIS process and concurrently for the deliverable processes for Sections 1 and 2. While WSDOT conducted extensive community engagement during the corridor study, incorporating public input into the study goals, priorities and direction, the PEL process engaged the stakeholder groups on a lesser level, most notably around establishing a reasonable range of alternatives to carry forward into the EIS process.

Innovative outreach will be key to achieving project definition alignment. Key steps in achieving this outcome are:

- **Brief regional partners on the PEL process, results, and next steps (EIS)**
- **Contact each Technical and Executive Advisory Group members via email to invite them to a webinar meeting to give an update on the PEL, gauge their desired participation, inquire whether membership has changed.**
- **Re-engage partners shown in Exhibit 12 and broaden regional partners to include local community-based organizations (CBOs)**
- **Key messages to include, where we are in the process (Corridor Study, PEL, EIS); how to make transition from PEL to EIS; and what will be happening during the EIS preparation process**
- **Create a regional partner engagement framework and include critical agencies and stakeholders**
- **Draft a Community Engagement Plan (CEP) based on what is heard from partner interviews. The CEP would identify community engagement goals; describes the objectives and strategy for public involvement; identify outreach tactics, methods and activities in different phases of the EIS process; provide an implementation schedule for outreach activities and identify appropriate project team personnel responsible for public involvement activities.**
- **Create an Equity Advisory Group based on what is heard from CBO and other partner interviews. Coordinate and facilitate meetings around key project milestones where the team needs their input.**
- **Re-convene the Technical and Executive Advisory Groups to meet at key EIS milestones as well as participate in initial environmental analyses and preliminary plans for Sections 1 and 2. Coordinate and facilitate meetings around key project milestones where the team needs their input. The Technical Advisory Group will act as the EIS Local Agency Review Team.**

Community Engagement for the EIS will ensure the process is carried out in a transparent and informed manner providing the public meaningful input opportunity on issues and alternatives while demonstrating to the public WSDOT is a full partner. The CEP will include educational material initiating active community engagement, identifying advertising and meeting venues, and including communication strategies to connect with the public. Methods will include:

- **Scoping Public Meeting/Online Open House** will be where agencies, tribes, and the public are invited to comment on the range of alternatives, areas of impact, and possible mitigation measures that should be evaluated within the EIS.
• Develop community engagement strategies in line with the federal and state requirements for environmental
to overcome linguistic, cultural, institutional, geographic, and other barriers to meaningful participation.
• Assure meaningful community representation in the process, recognizing diverse communities and early
engagement through data-driven and equitable engagement.
• Seek Tribal representation in the process from the Tribes like the Nisqually and Squaxin Island.
• DEIS review period where we will seek public comment on the merits of the alternatives and the adequacy of the
environmental analysis.
• Develop responses to comments and a scoping document that (1) summarizes the comments received during
the scoping process; (2) identifies the elements of the environment, alternatives and mitigation measures to be
analyzed; (3) provides other relevant information; and (4) fully discloses how comments received are accounted
for in the EIS process.

WSDOT will receive objective recognition of and support for arduous effort to be a true partner in the project
delivery process through implementation of this strategic, living, multilevel outreach program.

3. Creating a Transportation Solution that Delivers Natural Resource Benefits to the Nisqually River Basin
and its Habitat

Several key technical issues are concentrated in the EIS section of I-5 Section 3 and seem interconnected within
the realm of the Nisqually River basin including Section 4(f), environmental justice, Title VI, ESA, wetlands, and
U.S. Coast navigational impact report.

Delicate, Yet Forward Thinking Treatment of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act

It is within these project limits wherein the Nisqually Indian Tribe signed the Treaty of Medicine Creek, which
affirmed the tribes right to hunt, fish, and gather in their usual and accustomed places. These rights included the
harvest of Salmon from the Nisqually River. This, essentially, made it an economy-based sacred right directly
potentially applicable to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. Concerns to account for with this critical issue are:

• If the project were to somehow contribute to degradation beyond what the no-action alternative is already doing,
then Title VI would have direct application and any lawsuit under that pretext would become a Department of
Justice issue. In such a case, from a NEPA perspective, WSDOT would only have to mitigate impacts to 2022
levels. This would likely not satisfy many stakeholders so procedural integrity is critical.
• On another hand, if the project is a net-zero adverse effect on the existing degraded conditions (i.e., no
unavoidable adverse impacts), then WSDOT is not obligated to mitigate per se. Again, this outcome would not
likely satisfy to stakeholders.
• If the project alternative design (as part of the proposed action and not as mitigation) incorporated features
enhancing basin conditions, then such enhancements could be described as incidental benefit to the basin as a
result of the project. Even with this scenario, some “wants” for basin improvement may be left on the table,
which again may not fully satisfy stakeholders, requiring critical and innovative thought from the team’s technical
and leadership expertise. For example, if the basin were to be designated as a mitigation bank for other
projects, would it be possible to enhance basin habitat performance over time? As an example, the current bow
in the Nisqually River is slowing sediment deposit in the bay. If it was determined that if the bow could be
removed and a desirable condition would be created, a mitigation bank designation could generate the dollars to
lead to a project that would achieve the goal (if none of the action alternatives were procedurally or financially
obligated to remove the bow), Some similar was done on the SR 167 project where WSDOT received funds
for Hylebos Creek improvements money and pre-built mitigation. This could be an innovative way to satisfy all
stakeholders and even provide mitigation for future project phases.

Creating a Win-Win Interface between I-5 Improvements and Operations and the
Nisqually River Basin Habitat

The Nisqually River delta is a transition zone between the freshwater riverine and saltwater Puget Sound marine
environment. The delta provides salmon and steelhead trout originating from the Nisqually River and other
watersheds a gradient of salinities for the physiological transition from freshwater to saltwater, turbid waters that
limit predation, and a source of invertebrate communities that support productive foraging and rapid growth. Protecting and restoring the Nisqually River delta is a top priority for recovery of Nisqually River Chinook salmon. The Nisqually Indian Tribe and Billy Frank Junior Nisqually National Wildlife Refuge (NWR) have prioritized restoring access to estuarine wetlands in the delta. The Tribe has completed several restoration projects to the east of the river downstream of I-5 and Nisqually NWR restored over 600 acres of estuarine wetlands within the NWR. These projects were on the Puget Sound (downstream) side of I-5. To date, no projects have been completed upstream of I-5 to restore tidally influenced freshwater wetlands.

The Tribe has prioritized restoring wetlands upstream of I-5 and reconnecting historical distributary channels through the I-5 corridor. These channels would provide opportunities to restore tidal wetlands, expand area accessible to juvenile salmonids, and route sediment to portions of the estuary that are sediment deficient. Alternatives could range from placement of a few culverts or spanning bridges to improve flow through the corridor to elevating 2.75 miles of the existing causeway across the delta on pilings to allow full unfettered flow through the corridor.

ICF’s approach starting with screening and alternatives refinement will:

- Balance practical solutions (i.e., fundable and can be implemented within a reasonable timeframe) and meet the need to incorporate ecosystem services (salmon productivity, flood water relief, and delta flow and sediment transport processes)
- Be multifaceted—river hydraulics and channel migration observed upstream of I-5, flood modeling, delta-estuarine restoration concepts and physical processes within the delta, and salmon and steelhead habitat needs and projected benefits as alternatives are developed.

*The resulting alternatives inclusive of practical, balanced and enhancing design features will have a strong linkage to salmon and steelhead recovery and the treaty rights of the tribes.*

To achieve these results the ICF team has the:

- expertise to evaluate salmon and steelhead habitat needs in the Nisqually watershed and has supported the Nisqually Tribe in the development of their Chinook and steelhead recovery plans and fish management plans for Chinook and coho salmon and steelhead trout.
- experience developing restoration plans in sensitive coastal, wetland, and riparian habitats within the constraints of transportation and other infrastructure.

**Integration of Section 4(f) and the EIS into a Single Seamless Process**

Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act will quite likely apply to this project. Potential Section 4(f) resources immediately adjacent to I-5 include the Billy Frank Jr. Nisqually National Wildlife Refuge and the Eagle’s Pride Golf Course. It would be prudent early in the EIS process to subject action alternatives recommended to be carried forward into detailed analyses in the EIS to a feasible and practical avoidance analysis to determine if the potential for direct use of the Section 4(f) resources would be possible.

**4. Designing Bridge Crossings for the Future**

This critical delivery issue has been presented earlier in the proposal in Criteria 4, Project Approach, Incorporating Practical Design/Least Cost Solutions.

**5. A Comprehensive Accounting of All Travel Types in the Corridor**

The WSDOT project represents an opportunity to support a growing multimodal network. As shown in Exhibit 13 the project will provide an opportunity to connect Thurston County’s trail system to the new shared use path as part of the I-5 JBLM improvements along with a critical transit connection to the existing and future Sounder stations in Lakewood and DuPont. This would allow JBLM’s surrounding community access to the base using modes other than private vehicles. To effectively account for multimodal choice, our team will:

- engage user groups as part of scoping to advance past discussions to determine desirable modal conditions in the corridor
• work with the design team in final stages of screening to account for modal choice as part of the alternatives’ descriptions (and not something that is in addition to)

Our team has previously worked with WSDOT on critical infrastructure design; we bring local experience and national expertise to multimodal design. The EIS will develop modal solutions that incorporate many traffic management solutions deployed throughout the region. For example, extending the HOV or HOT lane south from Mounts Road combined with hard running shoulders can provide active traffic management and revenue and low-cost options to improve corridor movement. The ICF team has examined modal choice on the SR 167 HOT lanes and I-405 express lanes and hard running bus shoulders from Bellevue to Lynnwood. Each was tailored to optimize traffic performance. We will bring that experience and creativity to improving the traffic flow in the corridor. The ICF team also has experience working in the Nisqually Valley with completing the project directly to the north (JBLM stage 1) and south (Marvin Road interchange).

6. Supporting an EIS Base Foundation through Defensible Travel Analysis

While the corridor study and PEL have well-documented operational performance of I-5 in this transportation corridor, the ICF team has included renowned traffic specialists with Fehr & Peers to validate past traffic performance conclusions to further substantiate EIS process defensibility.

Our team will carry the practical solutions framework forward from the PEL process into the EIS evaluation. In partnership with WSDOT and key stakeholders, preliminary plans will be analyzed and documented with direct respect to meeting corridor needs for a safe, practical, multimodal and cost-effective project. With the PEL study and initial modeling already complete, the team will carry this momentum forward into the EIS with performance measures consistent with the Mobility Performance Framework (MPF) alongside strong stakeholder engagement.

Each of these performance measures include specific performance metrics that can be considered for detailed evaluation. To complete that detailed work, we will leverage our forecasting and traffic operations capabilities in EMME, Dynameq, Synchro/SimTraffic and VISSIM. With these software products, we can analyze alternative components such as hard shoulder running, mainline widening, HOV lanes, and interchange improvements. Through our ongoing work with TRPC using the same Dynameq model developed for this corridor, we understand the model is calibrated and validated but could benefit from additional peer review and updates to signal timing in the study area. Based on the performance metrics selected, we will also incorporate detailed microsimulation using SimTraffic and/or VISSIM as needed. We also understand this project needs to think beyond vehicle travel. The ICF team will bring a multimodal approach to our analysis, considering how alternatives would function for transit and potentially affect pedestrian/bicycle facilities along or across I-5.

The EIS may consider programmatic elements as part of the alternatives. One key Practical Solutions strategy considered is transportation demand management (TDM). We will use our team’s suite of TDM tools to quantify the effectiveness of demand management strategies throughout the Nisqually corridor. For example, Fehr & Peers can use their Excel-based TDM+ tool that estimates a percent reduction in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) due to different combinations of TDM strategies as shown in Exhibit 14. TDM+ incorporates the effects of numerous land use and design strategies as well as various travel incentives and disincentives.
Project-Specific Risks and Mitigations

Project-specific risks can be defined in terms of procedural, contextual, and documentation risks. Below is a representation of key risks to successful EIS and initial environmental analyses and preliminary plans delivery. The ability to affect a positive change, to expedite delivery, to achieve the stated duration goals, is a direct function of correcting repeatable and predictable delay factors rooted in process, technical content, and document creation. These are presented below.

Procedural and Documentation Risks

The ability to deliver a legally defensible process is understanding and strategic action on the multitude of conclusions that must be reached in each step of the EIS process. A representation of such decisions is reflected in the flow diagram in Exhibit 7 in the EIS Process Management subsection of Criteria 4, Work Plan Elements. The ICF team will create and use a decision matrix (housed in our singular project SharePoint site to manage version control, capture, and organize public comment, etc.) to document all actions that must be accounted for. This matrix will be part of every monthly team meeting and shared with the project team and groups like the Equity Advisory Group, the Technical Advisory Group and the Executive Group. Further, ICF will, upon direction from WSDOT, develop and implement a policy guide for decision documentation. In NEPA, it is just as important to document why the team did not take a certain action as it is to take a certain action.

Contextual Risk

Because the EIS process has been repeated over and over since 1970, risks can be predictable. ICF will anticipate potential risks and take actions, such as methodologies, assumptions, and data reports illustrating proposed approach will be created and peer reviewed both internally and externally (both resource agencies and appropriate stakeholders) early in the EIS process. This will establish expectations around EIS scope early in the process and help to avoid unwanted surprises later in the study process.

B. Resolving Conflicts

This project with its tremendous complexity, varied needs, and diversity of stakeholders, it is expected the team will encounter conflict along the way—this is not abnormal to the EIS process. Often, conflict arises around technical scope. Jack and the leadership team both avoid and resolve contextual conflict using specific techniques: (1) develop detailed work plans for each technical area and refer to the work plan direction often, (2) actively manage technical authors through proactive QA requiring interim submittals to check progress against work plan, and (3) use project management materials like the communication plan and style guide to ensure clear expectations are established around product delivery.

To resolve client conflict, the ICF team will establish a conflict resolution process as part of the internal communications plan with WSDOT. The process would outline steps of escalation to be taken in the event of disagreements about project issues such as approach, communication strategies, schedule, and/or budget. We feel the escalation process between client and consultant is standard operating procedure and a best practice implemented at the project start.

Management of stakeholder conflict will be a critical component of our project delivery approach. This may include conflict among stakeholder groups with opposing interests and priorities. Conflict avoidance starts with prevention and ICF will hold quarterly consultation meetings with the different groups highlighted in our project schedule to provide status briefings and seek input. In the event conflict cannot be avoided, time will be taken through professional facilitation from ICF team experts, like Colleen Gants and Henry Yates, to seek resolution and determine if FHWA and WSDOT NEPA EIS guidance and policy can account for potential resolution without precedent setting results. If resolution cannot be achieved, the stakeholder is afforded full right to comment on DEIS.
Content and WSDOT would be obligated to fully respond; this would make the conflict part of the record. Also, the project team, with WSDOT leadership, must balance conflict with the need to support an elemental NEPA aspect supporting timely decision making.

C. Deliverable Responsibility Understanding

In successfully delivering this project, a multitude of deliverables will be generated by both the ICF and WSDOT teams. Effective integration of work performed by both the ICF and WSDOT teams starts at the project kick-off wherein team leadership commit to treating the collective as one project team. In this manner, deliverables are not “yours and mine” but “ours”. Further, effective integration of deliverables starts early in the project through active use of the QA/QC plan. Deliverable integration starts with agreements on appropriate approach, methods, assumptions, and data sources to avoid both procedural and contextual conflict. Exhibit 15 outlines team proposed deliverable responsibilities.

Exhibit 15. Proposed Deliverable Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DELIVERABLE RESPONSIBILITY</th>
<th>WSDOT</th>
<th>ICF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020 Corridor Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022 PEL Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 and 2021 Traffic Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USGS Hydraulic Study (still in process)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication of NOI (Draft NOI created by the ICF team)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Record (converted from project files in the event of litigation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government-to-Government consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency-to-agency communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Relations materials and interviews (some written materials provided to WSDOT by the ICF team)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signed Draft EIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication of NOA (Draft NOA created by the ICF team)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft EIS distribution to participating and cooperating agencies (cover letter drafted by the ICF team)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of any Rights-of-Entry permits to consultant team in the field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final newspaper advertisements for public outreach activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final EIS/Response to Comments/Record of Decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft NOI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management Team agendas, meeting minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public and agency scoping materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity Advisory Committee, the Technical Advisory Group and the Executive Group agendas, meeting minutes, distribution materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary plans of action alternatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency-to-agency communications (with WSDOT approval)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft and Final Technical Reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Draft EIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Sections 1 and 2 initial environmental analyses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft NOA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearing materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft newspaper advertisements for public outreach activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Final EIS/Response to Comments/Record of Decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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