

**Joint Commission Sub-Committee  
September 2, 2004  
Draft Agenda**

- |      |   |                    |
|------|---|--------------------|
| I.   | Project update                          | Conrad/Rosenberger |
|      | • Schedule and project time line review | Himes              |
|      | • Work product and technical analysis   | DeGraff            |
| II.  | WSDOT/ODOT Memorandum of Understanding  | Conrad             |
| III. | Columbia River Crossing Task Force      | Rosenberger        |
| IV.  | Public Comment                          |                    |

---

Materials:

- Himes – project and work product schedule (major milestones only)
- DeGraff – white paper summary on status of technical reports (broad overview/reiterate how products will support/lead into an EIS)
- Conrad – MOU
- Rosenberger – Task Force outline



## **WSDOT/ODOT Work Session August 4 & 5, 2004 DRAFT Decision Summary**

### **TEAM DECISION POINTS AND OUTCOMES**

#### **Project Purpose and Work Product -**

- Project purpose:  
Complete the technical, regulatory and funding analysis for the I-5 Columbia River Crossing (CRC) that was started in the I-5 Partnership Study and prepare the required federal documentation to enter into a formal Environmental Statement (EIS) for the CRC.
- Work Product needed for this phase of the project:
  1. Pre-EIS DOT Memorandum of Understanding
  2. Pre-EIS communication plan
  3. Scoping assumptions, alternatives and issues for the DEIS
  4. Conceptual engineering and environmental analysis
  5. Traffic and tolling analysis
  6. Financial issues and funding strategy
  7. Regulatory issues and statutes affecting project implementation
  8. Coordination with innovative public partnership program
  9. Cost estimating validation process

#### **Commission and Joint Subcommittee -**

- Coordinate Joint Commission Subcommittee agenda with Jennifer Ziegler, WSDOT, prior to the transportation Commission's meeting on September 2, 2004.
- The DOT CRC team will collectively identify policy and high visibility issues to be brought before the Joint Commission.
- John Rosenberger, Matt, John Conrad, Don Wagner, WSDOT, Paula, and Jennifer Ziegler will be responsible for communicating with their respective Commissions, and the Joint Commission.

#### **Local Officials and Stakeholders -**

- Don and Matt (along with Rob and Dale) will be responsible for engaging local elected officials.
- Overall project status will be regularly communicated via a project report, to the following groups: Joint Subcommittee, Bi-State Coordinating Committee, the Regional Coordinating Committee and the Executive Committee. The project report will describe the purpose and need and the current status of the scope, schedule, budget, and corresponding deliverables. Executive summaries will be prepared as necessary. All external communication will be jointly agreed upon and sent under both DOTS' signature authority.
- The group concluded that community issues would be handled at the local level as they develop. Rob and Dale will be sharing updates on emerging issues with the team as part of bi-weekly updates.
- Don and Bart to share draft Task Force outlines with Dean Lookingbill on 8/6. Matt and Don will present the outline to Bi-State on 8/10.

### **Resolving Disagreements -**

- The group decided that they would resolve disagreements during team meetings that included Conrad and Rosenberger (meetings prior to Joint Commission Subcommittee sessions).

### **Team Communications -**

- ODOT and WSDOT are committed to implementing the project on an expedited basis as compared to most traditional approaches to project delivery. Assuming a replacement/supplemental bridge, the goal for beginning construction is 2010.
- Matt stated that he would commit John Osborne, ODOT, to help with project. He is Bart's counterpart and will enable Rob to coordinate with a project development manager.

### **Project Time Line -**

- ODOT and WSDOT agreed to procure the services of an environmental consultant by March, 2005 to develop the environmental impact statement.
- Dale Himes will update and disseminate his work product schedule summary to the team.
- The group agreed that they would hold a follow-up meeting November 9, 2004 to further discuss the time line as well as the success of the MOU and Task Force development.

### **Legislature –**

- Paula will track project through WSDOT transportation plan development. John Rosenberger will track Oregon's process.
- Paula and John Conrad will take point on leading legislative strategy (funding and project updates, as appropriate).

## **PENDING TEAM DECISIONS AND TASKS**

### **Formation of a CRC Team Office -**

- Clarify payroll and tax for a bi-state team
- Identify a joint office space
- Identify DOT team members
- Identify of other agency team members to join DOT at the new location
- Time line?

### **Pre-EIS Work -**

- Refine project purpose and need in preparation of beginning the EIS process.
- Develop a Federal appropriations strategy to coordinate funding earmarked for each DOT.
- Decide which DOT will "lead" the project. Coordinate with FHWA and FTA.
- Resolve (through consultant work product) whether state constitutions prevent or inhibit tolling on one or both bridges.
- Demonstrate to Joint Commission, consideration to heavy rail issues in pre-EIS work product.
- Determine strategy for gaining approval of 140 foot bridge clearance.
- Develop and regularly update key messages for the DOTs regarding this project, the MOU and the Task Force proposal.





## Washington State and Oregon Departments of Transportation Working Agreement Work Session

August 4–5, 2004  
The Heathman Lodge  
7801 NE Greenwood Drive, Vancouver, Washington 98662

### DRAFT Meeting Summary

#### Part A. August 4, 2004

##### Attendees

Katy Brooks, The JD White Company, Inc. (TWC)  
Kyle Brown, TWC  
John Conrad, Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)  
Rob DeGraff, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)  
Matt Garrett, ODOT  
Bart Gernhart, WSDOT  
Paula Hammond, WSDOT  
Dale Himes, WSDOT  
John Rosenberger, ODOT  
Don Wagner, WSDOT

#### 1. Introductions

Attendees introduced themselves and described their role in the upcoming Columbia River Crossing (CRC) project. Katy Brooks discussed the agenda.

The purpose of the meeting is to prepare two documents for review by the Joint Commission Subcommittee: 1) memorandum of understanding regarding how the Washington Department of Transportation (WSDOT) and Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) will work toward building one project team for the CRC project; and 2) an outline of a forum for stakeholders, agencies and jurisdictions to be involved in the project. Katy added that there were a number of other items to discuss, time permitting.

#### 2. Define Current Phase of the Project & EIS Project Delivery

The attendees developed a collective definition for the CRC project. The attendees reached a consensus that the purpose of the project is to 1) complete the technical, regulatory and funding analysis for the I-5 CRC that was started in the I-5 Partnership Study, and 2) prepare the required federal documentation to enter into a formal Environmental Statement (EIS) for the CRC. ODOT and WSDOT agree to the pre-EIS work activities summarized below and further described in Exhibit A:

- Pre-EIS Departments of Transportation (DOT) Memorandum of Understanding
- Pre-EIS communication plan
- Scoping assumptions, alternatives, and issues for the draft EIS
- Conceptual engineering and environmental analysis
- Traffic and tolling analysis



- Financial issues and funding strategy
- Regulatory issues and statutes affecting project implementation
- Coordination with innovative public partnership program
- Cost estimating validation process

It is the intent of the parties that the decision making and communications protocols implemented during this phase of the CRC project will serve as a foundation to be built upon when the project enters the formal EIS process. See Exhibit B for a detailed outline of the decision-making process, as developed by the group.

The group agreed that a *purpose and need* should be drafted to help inform decisions on what encompasses the project.

Bart Gernhart and Rob DeGraff agreed that they would need to justify why some EIS options were eliminated and will continue to be. Screening level criteria within the EIS process will be established to solve this issue.

Rob stated that the strategic plan proposes a number of improvements to the I-5 Corridor and its affected areas. This plan is a 20- to 30-year vision and will need to be managed as several modules comprise the plan. The CRC is the first of these modules. The question of tolling the I-5 Bridge will impact whether I-205 is also tolled. Paula Hammond agreed with Rob's assessment. John Rosenberger added that tolls are allowed to be used for transit purposes. Katy noted that the attendees will need to develop a unified policy to communicate collectively. Matthew Garrett stated that the data that is collected at the end of the year for the current phase of the study will help inform that unified policy decision.

### **3. Policy Issues/Legislative Relations**

The group discussed roll-out of the Memorandum of Understanding and stakeholder group work products to the commissions of both DOTs. Paula agreed that it would be best to coordinate with Jennifer Ziegler, WSDOT, before the meeting of the Washington Transportation Commission on September 2, 2004. John Conrad and Paula will review the agenda before the meeting.

The attendees discussed issues pertaining to the Joint Commission. The DOT CRC team will collectively identify policy and high visibility issues to be brought before the Joint Commission. John Rosenberger, Matt, John Conrad, Don Wagner, Paula, and Jennifer Ziegler will be responsible for communicating with their respective commissions as well as with the Joint Commission. Don and Matt will be responsible for discussing local issues. A federal appropriations strategy will be needed in order to coordinate funding earmarked for each DOT.

Paula stated that the group will need to assess who has been elected in the upcoming November elections and decide how to best involve them in the process. Not a great deal of turnover is expected in the Oregon House or Senate, nor is the project expected to be politically controversial in Washington.

In addition, there is an issue in regards to the legislative session beginning in January 2005; this conflicts with the project team's delivery of information in September 2005.

### **4. Work Session Assessment Review**

The group discussed areas of agreement and discrepancy based on input from the attendee interviews conducted prior to the work session (see Exhibit C). Some discussion centered around the need for counterparts for DOT teams regarding communications and project development.

Matt stated that he would commit John Osborne, ODOT, to help with project. He is Bart's counterpart and will enable Rob to coordinate with a project development manager.

Matt also said that Pat Cooney is Amy Echols' counterpart on DOT communications for the project.

The group decided to resolve future disagreements during team meetings that included Conrad and Rosenberger (meetings before Joint Commission Subcommittee sessions).

John Rosenberger clarified his tenure and retirement from ODOT and told the group a replacement would be hired before his July 2005 departure date. Their tenures will overlap so that the new person can be brought up to speed on the project.

Matt clarified that Rob's position is temporary due to internal politics and mechanisms that made it necessary to start with a temporary position. ODOT's intent is to staff this position as long as it is needed for the project.

## **5. Memorandum of Understanding**

The group worked together to develop a decision-making flow chart and discussed the coordination of a virtual joint office. To date, Dale and Rob work physically on the project as one team. The group decided to begin taking steps to establish a physical joint office for the project team. Some of the issues needing to be resolved include:

1. Clarification of payroll and tax for a bi-state team
2. Identification of a joint office space
3. Identification of DOT team members
4. Identification of other agency team members to join DOT at the new location

The group proceeded to develop a draft outline of the Memorandum of Understanding. Katy, Rob, and Dale developed a draft based on this discussion for refinement during the next day's session.

## **6. Columbia River Crossing Task Force Charter & Composition**

The group discussed which stakeholders should comprise the Task Force and its charge. Group members collectively agreed on the following guidelines:

### ***Charter***

The role of the I-5 CRC Task Force will be to provide input into the CRC project. Within the context created by the strategic plan, the Task Force will:

1. provide advice to the Joint Commission Subcommittee throughout the EIS until the issuance of the Record of Decision;
2. respond to and advise on technical data (and policy decisions?) leading to an EIS; and
3. represent and report back to their representative organizations.

### ***Composition***

The composition of the I-5 Partnership was used as a foundation for the formation of this Task Force. Due to the scope of influence of the Columbia crossing, the Task Force membership also will include statewide representation from Oregon and Washington as well as from the trucking and freight industries and environmental organizations. John Rosenberger noted that the Commission chair on the Executive Committee advised against legislators on the proposed Task Force. Matthew noted that non-political figures would indeed be preferable.

### ***Selection Process***

The Joint Commission Subcommittee will appoint a co-chair from each state, who will seek assistance from community and business groups in the appointment of other members.



### **Membership**

<i>Co-Chairs (2):</i>	One representative from each state, appointed by WTC and OTC Joint Commission Subcommittee
<i>Public Agencies (10):</i>	Metro, RTC, Tri-Met, C-Tran, Port of Vancouver, Port of Portland, Clark County, Multnomah County, City of Vancouver, City of Portland will appoint members
<i>Trucking Industry (2):</i>	Oregon Trucking Association and Washington Trucking Association will be asked to appoint a member from each organization
<i>Neighborhoods (4):</i>	Oregon delegates appointments to Portland Office of Neighborhood Involvement, Washington delegates appointments to the City of Vancouver and Clark County
<i>Businesses (8):</i>	Oregon delegates appointments to the Oregon Business Council and the Portland Business Alliance, Washington delegates to the Vancouver Chamber of Commerce (2), Identity Clark County and the Columbia River Economic Development Commission
<i>Community Organizations (4):</i>	Oregon will delegate one position appointment to the I-5 Environmental Justice Work Group and will appoint one other representative, Washington will appoint a representative from Clark College and another community organization
<i>Statewide (4):</i>	Oregon will ask the Freight Advisory Committee and AAA to appoint a member, Washington will ask the Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board and AAA to appoint a member
<i>Environmental Organizations (2):</i>	Representatives will be appointed from 1000 Friends of Oregon and Friends of Clark County

### **Responsibilities**

- The CRC Task Force co-chairs will report to the Joint Commission Subcommittee.
- The CRC Task Force will provide input and response to the Joint Commission Subcommittee on work products and information generated by the EIS process.
- Each CRC Task Force member is responsible for representing and communicating with his/her organization.

### **Staffing & Operations**

- The CRC Task Force will be staffed by the ODOT/WSDOT project team.
- The co-chairs will be responsible for developing methods by which the task force will make decisions and conduct meetings.

### **Duration**

- The CRC Task Force will be developed in fall 2004, with the kickoff meeting tentatively scheduled in late fall 2004.
- The CRC Task Force then will meet quarterly.



- The EIS is a multi-year process, and some turnover therefore is to be expected. Duration of tenure should provide consistency of representation for major milestones.

## 7. Issues Critical to the Project

- Tolling decisions: will be a political issue on both sides of the river.
- Metro/JPAC—tolling issues and allocation of funding.
- Clark County—may perceive a disproportionate tolling burden on residents.
- Truckers—potential issues with tolling. Need to see direct benefit.
- Congressman Earl Blumenauer will be interested in incorporating transit.
- I-205 users—want to see benefits if the bridge(s) is/are tolled.
- Clark County Board of Commissioners: perception that tolling may facilitate job growth in Portland—particularly Betty Sue Morris.
- Port of Vancouver Commission—Arch Miller may feel that tolling will export jobs to Portland. His involvement with the Historic Reserve will also influence his opinion.,
- Multnomah County Commission—Serena Cruz will watch for environmental justice issues.
- Dean Lookingbill (RTC), Rex Burkholder (Metro Council), and Don Benton (Washington State Senate)—will have opinions regarding their participation in the project and tolling.
- Vancouver Mayor Royce Pollard—will be interested in the Historic Reserve and preserving downtown access.
- Environmental activists—1000 Friends (Washington) and Sierra Club will likely be interested in the perception of the bridge and future development
- Other—a large number of projects are seeking funding, and this will affect this project.

## 8. Communication

For the pre-EIS phase of the project, overall project status will be regularly communicated via a project report to the following groups: Joint Subcommittee, Bi-State Coordinating Committee, the Regional Coordinating Committee, and the Executive Committee.

The project report will describe the purpose and need and the current status of the scope, schedule, budget, and corresponding deliverables. Executive summaries will be prepared as necessary. All external communication will be jointly agreed upon and sent under the signature authority of both DOTs.

The group concluded that issues would be handled at the local level as they develop. Rob and Dale will share updates on emerging issues with the project team as part of bi-weekly updates. The team will use e-mail, phone, and person-to-person meetings regularly as the primary modes of communication.

The project team will work to include other key stakeholders, jurisdictions, and agencies in the project. The team recognizes the legal responsibilities of the FHWA, FTA, and MPOs to include the project within their planning and authorization processes. The group discussed consistency, and it was agreed that redundancies in efforts between various agencies— -including Metro—should be prevented. Don stated that he would be meeting with Dean Lookingbill and others to share the developments of the current meeting. It is expected that he will be communicating with the Regional Transportation Council (RTC) regularly.

## 9. Timeline

ODOT and WSDOT are committed to implementing the project on an expedited basis as compared to most traditional approaches to project delivery. Assuming a replacement/ supplemental bridge, the goal for beginning construction is 2010. ODOT and WSDOT agreed to procure the services of an environmental consultant by March 2005 to develop the EIS.

Matt emphasized the importance of presenting a clear timeline to the Joint Commission. Dale stated that he has created a timeline of deliverables and shared it with the group in draft form.

the jd white company, inc.



*Creative Problem Solving*

## Washington State and Oregon Departments of Transportation Working Agreement Work Session

August 4–5, 2004  
The Heathman Lodge  
7801 NE Greenwood Drive, Vancouver, Washington 98662

### Meeting Summary

#### Part II. August 5, 2004

##### Attendees

Katy Brooks, TWC  
Kyle Brown, TWC  
John Conrad, WSDOT  
Rob DeGraff, ODOT  
Matthew Garrett, ODOT  
Bart Gernhart, WSDOT  
Dale Himes, WSDOT  
John Rosenberger, ODOT  
Don Wagner, WSDOT

#### 1. Introduction

Katy welcomed the group to the second day of the session and asked whether members had any non-agenda items they wished to discuss. The group indicated they had none.

#### 2. Project Leadership/Delivery

The group discussed issues regarding project delivery. Matt stressed the importance of showing that the DOTs could complete the project. John Conrad emphasized that the DOTs are at a crucial point in proving they can deliver, and they will have a plan prepared to show the Joint Commission that they intend to do so. John Rosenberger added that interviews conducted by John White at TWC concluded that many believed the DOTs were the only group capable of delivering the project.

A brief discussion occurred around the cost of the EIS. All agreed that it is too early to estimate the cost of the EIS at this time.

John Rosenberger inquired as to the ramifications of either ODOT or WSDOT leading the project in conjunction with FHWA and FTA. The group responded that they were open to whatever the best solution might be. Discussions with the FHWA and FTA on this matter will be held in the near future.

#### 3. Memorandum of Understanding

The group discussed edits and additions to the draft Memorandum of Understanding (see Exhibit B). The input from this discussion was applied to the draft by Katy and forwarded to Dale Himes and Rob DeGraff.

#### 4. Task Force Outline

Refinements were made to the CRC Task Force outline. The updated draft was e-mailed to Dale, Rob, and Bart. Bart was to share the updated draft with Dean Lookingbill the next morning (August 6, 2004).



## 5. Joint Commission Presentation

The group discussed the upcoming Joint Commission agenda for September 2, 2004. The proposed agenda will include:

1. Project update (John Conrad/John Rosenberger)
  - Schedule and project time line review (Dale)
  - Work product and technical analysis (Rob)
2. WSDOT/ODOT Memorandum of Understanding (John Conrad)
3. CRC Task Force (John Rosenberger)
4. Public comment

Needed Materials:

- Dale—project and work product schedule (major milestones only)
- Rob—white paper summary on status of technical reports (broad overview/reiterate how products will support/lead into an EIS)
- John Conrad—Memorandum of Understanding
- John Rosenberger—Task Force outline

Bart stated that it is imperative to emphasize the project's purpose and need.

## 6. Additional Issues

- John Rosenberger asked if the respective state constitutions posed funding issues for projects with transit components. Don stated that the project's aim was to reduce congestion, and transit is one of the solutions available. Rob added that consultants are studying the potential funding conflicts.
- Don stated that a member of the Joint Commission commented that they were interested in heavy rail issues. The team will need to show that it has not neglected the issue.
- Bart added that he would prefer the proposed bridge height be kept at 140 feet in order to lessen impacts on either side. There are up-river historic facilities that may continue to require an additional 50 feet. This is an issue that the team will need to track as the project progresses.
- Don noted that any options impacting steel fabrication will not be supported politically.
- Bart stated that consultants will likely sign contracts with one agency. Subcontracts would then be the responsibility of the prime consultant.
- The group discussed the possibility of a tour in St. Louis, Missouri, in order to learn more about license plate scanning. ODOT recently sent a Commissioner and State Senator Bruce Starr to South Carolina to view a similar project.
- The group discussed coordination with the development of WSDOT's Transportation Plan. This session's plan will be constrained to a set budget. Projects that are not fundable will not be on the list.

## 7. Next Steps

The group agreed to hold a follow-up meeting **November 9, 2004**. Katy will facilitate the meeting on November 9<sup>th</sup> and will include a review of the MOU and the CRC Task Force formation in the agenda.

Katy noted that it is important that the DOTs convey a unified and consistent message in the time leading up to and throughout the project. Consistency is critical in communicating how the DOTs will work together and make decisions and how community leaders (CRC Task Force) will be included in this process.

Consistency of communications and follow through will increase the DOTs credibility. She added that the group's appearance before the Joint Commission on September 2, 2004 will be an opportunity to

demonstrate their teamwork and show that the DOTs are committed to delivering this project. She suggested developing key messages for products of the work session (the Memorandum of Understanding and the Task Force outline).

# Exhibit A—Memorandum of Understanding

WASHINGTON DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

AND

OREGON DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

INTERAGENCY MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

## I-5 COLUMBIA RIVER CROSSING PROJECT (CRCP)

This is a MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING entered into this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 2000 between the Washington State Department of Transportation, hereinafter referred to as "WSDOT" and the Oregon Department of Transportation, hereinafter referred to as "ODOT."

### PURPOSE

The Columbia River Crossing Project (CRCP) is one of a finite list of projects recognized by the Oregon and Washington Departments of Transportation as being significant to the future of the Pacific Northwest.

The CRCP addresses the bottleneck in the I-5 corridor caused by the river crossing.

By modernizing this aging infrastructure, the CRCP will contribute to the economic and freight mobility needs of Oregon and Washington.

The CRCP is a product of the I-5 Partnership Strategic Plan adopted in 2002.

That Plan articulates a 20 to 30-year vision for the I-5 corridor that will be implemented in phases with the Columbia River Crossing being part of the first phase.

WSDOT and ODOT have formed a Project Team for the CRCP to manage the project as one team that works on behalf of both departments of transportation.

The following provisions outline how this project team will interact and manage the project.

NOW THEREFORE IT IS MUTUALLY AGREED between the parties hereto as follows:

- 1. DECISION MAKING.** The CRCP project team will strive toward building consensus through the following decision making process described below and further illustrated graphically in Exhibit "A".
  - **State Transportation Commissions** The Oregon and Washington transportation commissions have formed the Joint Commission Subcommittee to provide oversight of the CRCP. The Project Team



**will report progress to the Joint Commission Subcommittee as well as provide briefings to the full Commissions.**

- Joint Subcommittee Leadership. The Project Team will report to the Joint Subcommittee for project decisions and direction. The purpose of the Subcommittee is to ensure that the efforts of the two state transportation departments in planning for improvements to the Columbia River crossing are well coordinated, that maximum value is obtained from the federal grants received for project planning, and that public officials and citizens in both states are kept abreast of progress.
- Project Team Leadership. Senior leadership will consist of the ODOT Deputy Director, Highway Division and Region 1 Manager, and the WSDOT Assistant Secretary, Engineering and Regional Operations and Southwest Region Administrator. These individuals will provide project oversight and implementation of this MOU. They will resolve issues arising from the project and provide guidance to the Project Team Directors. These senior leaders will also interact with key stakeholders during the course of the project.

The ODOT Deputy Director, Highway Division and the WSDOT Assistant Secretary, Engineering and Regional Operations will meet with the Project Team quarterly to assist with key decisions and receive project updates. The ODOT Region 1 Manager and WSDOT Southwest Region Administrator will meet with the WSDOT/ODOT project directors bi-weekly to oversee project progress.

- Project Directors. The WSDOT Project Director and ODOT Project Director are co-directors of the project and are responsible for overall scope, schedule and budget. They will be responsible for staffing the Columbia River Crossing Task Force and the Project Technical Committee (PTC). The WDOT Project Director and ODOT Project Director will provide the project team with bi-weekly project updates.
- The Columbia River Crossing Task Force's role will be to provide input into the CRCP. Within the context created by the Strategic Plan the Task Force will: respond to and advise the Project Team on technical data leading to an EIS; provide advice to the Joint Subcommittee throughout the EIS until the issuance of the Record of Decision; represent and report back to their representative constituencies.
- The Project Technical Committee (PTC). The Project Team will create a technical committee to assist in the technical analysis of the EIS and related work products.

**OTHER PARTIES** - *The Project Team will work to include other key stakeholders, jurisdictions and agencies in the project. The Project Team recognizes the legal responsibilities of the FHWA, FTA and MPO's regarding inclusion of the project within their planning and authorization processes.*

2. COMMUNICATION. Communication regarding the CRCP will be open, regular, and inclusive. The Project Team will provide regular updates and include input throughout the project.

3. CO-LOCATION. The Project Team Directors are currently co-located. It is the team's intent to co-locate the entire team as the project progresses. The location will include other agencies and project consultants.
4. PROJECT DELIVERY. ODOT and WSDOT are committed to implementing this Project on an expedited basis as compared to most traditional approaches to project delivery.
5. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (EIS) PREPARATION.  
The purpose of the pre-EIS phase is to position the CRCP for a full EIS. The Project Team will refine the concepts from the Strategic Plan, collect and organize technical data on options, and fill technical and financial data gaps in preparation for an EIS. The pre-EIS work activities are summarized below:
  - Pre-EIS Intergovernmental Coordination Plan
  - Pre-EIS Communication Plan
  - Scoping Assumptions, Alternatives and Issues for the DEIS
  - Conceptual Engineering and Environmental Analysis
  - Traffic and Tolling Analysis
  - Tolling Issues
  - Financial Issues and Funding Plan Strategy
  - Regulatory Issues and Statutes Affecting Project Implementation
  - Coordination with Innovative Public Partnership Program
  - Cost Estimating Validation Process
6. FUNDING PLAN. ODOT has dedicated \$3.9M and WSDOT dedicated \$3M, received from federal earmarks, for the Project which amounts will be used primarily for pre-EIS work activities. WSDOT's \$3 million will use toll credits for the local match. The Project Team will coordinate federal funding strategies to advance the project. Finally, a financial operations plan will be developed as additional funds are made available to the CRCP.
7. FUTURE REVISIONS TO THE MOU. It is understood that mutually agreed upon changes may occur to this MOU. The MOU will be updated as needed.
8. PUBLIC PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP. This MOU is not an agreement, pursuant to OAR 731-070-0050(5), allowing ODOT to consider unsolicited proposals for a public private partnership under ORS 367.800 to 367.826.

The undersigned hereby acknowledges, agrees, and accepts the provisions as set forth in this MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.

---

Bruce Warner, Director, Oregon Department of Transportation

---

Douglas MacDonald, Washington State Secretary of Transportation



# Exhibit B—Columbia River Crossing Task Force Chart

## DRAFT

### I-5 COLUMBIA RIVER CROSSING TASK FORCE

8-5-04

#### 8. CHARTER

The Interstate 5 Columbia River Crossing Task Force's role will be to provide input into the Columbia River Crossing Project. Within the context created by the Strategic Plan the Task Force will provide; advice to the Joint Commission Subcommittee throughout the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) until the issuance of the Record of Decision; respond to and advise on technical data leading to an EIS; represent and report back to their representative organizations.

#### *COMPOSITION*

The composition of the I-5 partnership was used as a foundation for the formation of this Task Force. Due to the scope of influence of the Columbia crossing, the task force membership will also include statewide representation from Oregon and Washington as well as from the trucking and freight industries and environmental organizations.

#### **Selection Process -**

The Joint Commission Subcommittee will appoint a co-chair from each state. They will seek assistance from community and business groups in the appointment of other members.

#### **Membership -**

- Co-Chairs - 2

One representative from each state, appointed by WTC and OTC Joint Commission Subcommittee

- Public Agencies – 10

Metro, RTC, Tri-Met, C-Tran, Port of Vancouver, Port of Portland, Clark County, Multnomah County, City of Vancouver, City of Portland will appoint members

- Trucking Industry – 2

Oregon Trucking Association and Washington Trucking Association will be asked to appoint a member from each organization

- Neighborhoods – 4

Oregon delegates appointments to Portland Office of Neighborhood Involvement, Washington delegates appointments to the City of Vancouver and Clark County

- Businesses – 8

Oregon delegates appointments to the Oregon Business Council and the Portland Business Alliance, Washington delegates to the Vancouver Chamber of Commerce –2, Identity Clark County and the Columbia River Economic Development Commission

- Community Organizations – 4

Oregon will delegate one position appointment to the I-5 Environmental Justice Work Group and will appoint one other representative, Washington will appoint a representative from Clark College and another community organization)

- Statewide –4

Oregon will ask the Freight Advisory Committee and AAA to appoint a member, Washington will ask the Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board and AAA to appoint a member

- Environmental Organizations –2

Representatives will be appointed from 1000 Friends of Oregon and Friends of Clark County

### ***RESPONSIBILITIES***

- The Columbia River Crossing Task Force will provide input and response to the Joint Commission Subcommittee on work products and information generated by the EIS process.
- The task force co-chairs will report input to the Joint Commission Subcommittee.
- Each Task Force member is responsible for representing and communicating with their organization.

### **STAFFING & OPERATIONS**

- The Columbia River Crossing Task Force will be staff by the ODOT/WSDOT project team.
- The co-chairs will be responsible for developing methods by which the task force will make decisions and conduct meetings.

### ***DURATION***

- The Task Force shall be developed in fall 2004, with the kickoff meeting tentatively scheduled in late fall 2004.
- The Task Force will then meet quarterly.
- The EIS is a multi-year process. Therefore some turnover is to be expected. Duration of tenure should provide consistency of representation for major milestones.

## **Exhibit C - Attendee Interview Assessment**

	<b>Agreement</b>	<b>Discrepancies</b>
<p><b>PROJECT UNDERSTANDING FOR CURRENT PHASE</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop an agreement as to how the DOTs will work together.</li> <li>• Provide a plan addressing how to involve key stakeholders.</li> <li>• Prepare needed information to begin the EIS.</li> <li>• Narrow the alternatives/decide what the project will encompass.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include the I-205 Corridor in the project.</li> <li>• Include the LRT/Transit Loop in the project.</li> <li>• Type of information needed to begin EIS – what is necessary?</li> </ul>



ROLE & RESPONSIBILITY CLARIFICATION	Agreement	Discrepancies
Project Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Himes/DeGraff</b> – project directors that manage consultants, partner/stakeholder relations.</li> <li>• <b>Gernhart</b> – Assists Himes with project development and contracting. Also interacts with agency partners regarding the project.</li> <li>• <b>Legry</b> – Provides assistance regarding political and community interests in the project. Reports to Wagner.</li> <li>• <b>Echols</b> – Communications lead for WSDOT</li> <li>• <b>Wagner/Garrett</b> – Manage Himes and DeGraff, participate in the Regional Coordinating Committee. Also interact with agency partners regarding project. Report to Conrad/Rosenberger on this project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responsibility for external partner relations is conducted by several WSDOT and ODT staff. Who is lead?</li> <li>• Internal ODOT counterpart to Echols regarding ODOT communications. Echols and Pat have not communicated.</li> <li>• Wagner appears to have more delegated responsibility for the project than Garrett due to the structure of WSDOT.</li> </ul>
Project Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Conrad/Rosenberger</b> – Provide direction on more major decisions, report to state leadership and sometimes to the commission. Report to MacDonald and Warner.</li> <li>• <b>Hammond</b> – Responsible for communicating with the Washington legislature, reports to MacDonald. Also interacts with the WSDOT Commission.</li> <li>• <b>MacDonald/Warner</b> – Included in policy decisions and interact with the Commission.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rosenberger is in focused exclusively on the Columbia Crossing Project. He is retired and may end his position in summer, 2005. Unclear as to his successor.</li> <li>• Differentiation in Conrad and Rosenberger's involvement</li> <li>• Counterpart to Paula Hammond?</li> </ul>
Consultant's Role	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide technical work under the direction of ODOT and WSDOT.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ODOT contractor receiving guidance from more than one manager. Rosenbergers role unclear now that DeGraff is on board.</li> <li>• Gernharts role in management of consultants is unclear.</li> <li>• Some concern that consultants are leading the project.</li> </ul>
Commission Roles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WSTC and OTC have agreed to form a Joint Subcommittee for the project.</li> <li>• WSTC and OTC have given direction to management for this project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OTC is more involved in overseeing project delivery</li> <li>• WSTC role is more policy oriented, rather than project oriented.</li> <li>• WSTC is not part of WSDOT transportation, has own budget and staff. Has no "management" responsibility for WSDOT.</li> </ul>

	Agreement	Discrepancies
<b>DECISION MAKING</b>		
Daily Project Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delegated to Himes and DeGraff.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unclear what is designated as "day to day" decisions and how they are communicated.</li> </ul>
Milestone Decisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Go up the chain of command – ODOT DeGraff, Garrett, Rosenberger, Warner. WSDOT Himes, Gernhart, Wagner, Conrad, MacDonald</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WSDOT appears to have extra layers of management.</li> <li>Unclear how decisions are made and communicated.</li> </ul>
Bi-State Policy Decisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy decisions made by commissions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unclear how each DOT discusses and forwards recommendations to the commission.</li> <li>WSDOT commission structure is different than ODOT.</li> </ul>
Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy decisions and project direction</li> </ul>	
Joint Sub-Committee Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Three commissioners from each state dedicated to ensuring coordination between two states, maximum value obtained from federal grants, inform public officials in both states.</li> </ul>	
FHWA/FTA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assist DOTs on lessons learned from other states, clarify federal EIS requirements.</li> </ul>	
MPO's	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review work on pre-EIS and advise whether it satisfies regional transportation objectives.</li> <li>Take any necessary formal action.</li> </ul>	
Local Jurisdictions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review work on pre-EIS and advise whether it supports local transportation objectives.</li> <li>Take any necessary formal action.</li> </ul>	
Executive Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review work on pre-EIS and advise whether it satisfies bi-state transportation objectives and to make recommendations to the Joint Subcommittee of the WTC/OTC.</li> </ul>	
Bi-State Coordination Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review work on pre-EIS and advise whether it satisfies bi-state transportation objectives.</li> <li>Make recommendations to MPO's, transit agencies and local governments</li> </ul>	
Regional Coordination Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review and evaluate the technical documentation developed by the consultant team.</li> </ul>	
Project Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Responsible for overall scope, schedule and budget, managing consultants.</li> </ul>	
Senior Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide overall project oversight.</li> </ul>	

	Agreement	Discrepancies
<p><b>ORGANIZATIONAL &amp; OPERATIONAL DIFFERENCES</b></p>		
<p><b>Project Management</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dale Himes and Rob DeGraff serve as project directors</li> <li>• Region and state management engaged in project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rob DeGraff is a temporary employee (1 year contract) and Dale Himes is permanent.</li> <li>• Addition of Bart Gernhart as co-director</li> <li>• Don Wagner appears to have more delegated project management responsibility/decision making expectations than Matt Garrett due to DOT structural differences.</li> <li>• John Rosenberger primarily assigned to this project for the next year, whereas John Conrad has multiple projects and is permanent.</li> <li>• Counterpart to Paula Hammond (Chief of Staff) in ODOT?</li> <li>• Amy Echols's role/ODOT counterpart?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Commission Structure &amp; Purview</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both DOT commissions involved in project/participating on Joint Subcommittee.</li> <li>• Authority on policy decisions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WSDOT TC typically involved in more policy decisions. Legislature provides funding and input on projects.</li> <li>• WSDOT TC is separate from DOT. Has its own budget and staff. No direct oversight of DOT management.</li> <li>• ODOT TC typically more involved in project decisions as well as policy.</li> </ul>



	Agreement	Discrepancies
<b>COMMUNICATION</b>		
<b>Internal</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communication protocol to project teams unclear.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communication to senior leadership and commissions different due to DOT structures.</li> </ul>
<b>Between DOTS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communication regarding project technical decisions from the regional coordinating committee unclear.</li> </ul>	
<b>Stakeholders / Partners</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communication protocol to stakeholders and partners is unclear.</li> </ul>	

	Agreement	Discrepancies
<p><b>FUTURE ITEMS NEEDING RESOLUTION</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree on a project direction.</li> <li>• How the DOTs will work together.</li> <li>• Roles and responsibilities.</li> <li>• How to make and communicate decisions more effectively.</li> <li>• How to resolve differences as they occur.</li> <li>• Develop one project team.</li> <li>• Involving external partners, stakeholders and the public.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Future funding decisions and financial responsibilities.</li> <li>• Lead agency identification</li> <li>• Timing of developing one project team.</li> <li>• Agreement on what technical information is needed to complete current phase.</li> </ul>

### *Bi-State Follow Up Recommendations*

- Develop key messages and WSDOT/ODOT position.
- Meet with respective Joint Commission Subcommittee chairs and discuss utilizing input from the Bi-State meeting and gain concurrence on next steps.
- Communicate to the bi-state that you heard their suggestions\which ones you will support.
- One-on-One meetings (Don and Matt)  
ASAP - Don and Matt meet jointly with Royce Pollard, Craig Pridemore, Rex Burkholder, Dean Lookingbill and John Gillam to communicate the importance of the Bi-State's ongoing participation on the Task Force. You may also want to meet with Neil McFarland (Phil Sellinger) and Lynne Griffith(?)
- Possible one-on-one meetings between Commission Sub-committee chairs and Pollard, Pridemore and Burkholder (possibly Fransisconi).



DOH

# DRAFT

## COLUMBIA RIVER CROSSING TASK FORCE

8-5-04

### CHARTER

*Define project . . . . .*

The Columbia River Crossing Task Force's role will be to provide input into the Columbia River Crossing Project. Within the context created by the Strategic Plan the Task Force will provide; advice to the Joint Subcommittee throughout the EIS until the issuance of the Record of Decision; respond to and advise on technical data leading to an EIS; represent and report back to their representative constituencies; and act as advocates, where appropriate, for funding and support.

*Categories*

### COMPOSITION

*Total of ~~3670~~ 38 Core is from original group! then ~~re~~ re-nominate members.*

- Co-Chairs - 2 (one from each state, appointed by WTC and OTC Joint Subcommittee)
- Public Agencies - 12 (MPO's, transit, port, large cities, <sup>counties</sup> small cities from each state)
- Trucking Industry - 2 (one based in each state)
- Neighborhoods - 4 (2 from each state)
- Businesses - 8 (4 from each state)
- Community Organizations - 4 (2 from each state)
- Statewide - 4 (2 from each state) - ~~Freight~~ AAA

*Freight Advisory Committee  
Environmental reps  
- Friends of C.C. - WIA*

*Contact ET work Group*

### REPORTING RESPONSIBILITIES

- The Columbia River Crossing Task Force will provide input and advice to the Joint Subcommittee.
- Each Task Force member is responsible for representing and communicating with their constituencies

### DURATION

*November late*

- The Task Force shall be developed in ~~summer~~ fall '04, with the kickoff meeting tentatively scheduled in ~~October~~ 2004. (*before next meeting of Joint Committee*)
- The Task Force will then meet quarterly, or as needed as the EIS progresses.

*Timeline*

*Org chart between OTC, Task Force, Project Team, Constituencies*



## DAY 1 - AUGUST 4

### AGENDA

#### Washington State and Oregon Departments of Transportation Working Agreement Work Session

**The Heathman Lodge**  
7801 NE Greenwood Drive  
Vancouver, WA 98662 - 7900  
(360) 254-3100

**9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.**

- 9:00 – 12:00 Introductions
- Review agenda
  - Discuss ground rules
  - Identify individual criteria for success for this agreement
  - Review interview assessment
  - Define this phase of the project and EIS project delivery
- 1:00 – 5:00 Roles, Responsibilities and Decision Tree
- DOTs:
    - State transportation commissions
    - Joint subcommittee leadership
    - Senior leadership
    - Project leadership
    - Project teams
  - Agencies and Jurisdictions:
    - FHWA/FTA
    - MPO's
    - Local jurisdictions and agencies
    - Executive Committee
    - Bi-State Coordinating Committee
    - Regional Coordinating Committee
    - Public

\* break and lunch time will be included

the jd white company, inc.



*Creative Problem Solving*

## DAY 2 – AUGUST 5

### AGENDA

#### Washington State and Oregon Departments of Transportation Working Agreement Work Session

**The Heathman Lodge**  
7801 NE Greenwood Drive  
Vancouver, WA 98662 - 7900  
(360) 254-3100

**8:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.**

- 8:00 – 12:00 Recap/finalize decisions from August 4
- Roles, responsibilities and decision tree, continued
  - Finalize decision tree
  - Dispute resolution mechanism
  - Communication protocol
- 1:00 – 4:00 Project decisions
- Finalize agreement
  - Identify potential joint ODOT/WSDOT project team organization/logistics
  - Develop funding plan decision path
  - Refine list of items needing near and long-term resolution

#### Next Steps

- Agree on how/when to address outstanding decisions
- Schedule follow up session

*Proposed Agenda For Joint Commission, Sept 2nd*

\* break and lunch time will be included



**DRAFT**

**Pre-work Session Situational Assessment  
Washington State and Oregon Departments of Transportation  
Columbia Crossing Project Agency Agreement**

July 26, 2004

Prepared for:  
the Washington State Department of Transportation and the Oregon Department of Transportation

This report summarizes interviews with Columbia Crossing project team members and WSDOT and ODOT management conducted between July 13–22, 2004. One-on-one interviews were conducted with a total of 11 individuals, who are listed below.

List of interviewees:

#### WSDOT

- Paula Hammond, Chief of Staff
- John Conrad, Engineering and Regional Operations Director
- Don Wagner, Regional Administrator
- Bart Gernhart, Program Development Manager
- Dale Himes, Project Director
- Mary Legry, Community Vision/Support Services Manager
- Amy Echols, Communications Manager

#### ODOT

- John Rosenberger, Deputy Director (Retired)
- Matt Garrett, Region Manager
- Dave Williams
- Geoff Larkin, The Larkin Group, Inc.

#### Methodology

Stakeholder interviews were held with individuals identified by the DOT Columbia Crossing Project Directors as members of the key management structure for the project. Interviews were conducted one-on-one using a questionnaire that included seven areas of inquiry. These areas were: project understanding, role clarification, decision-making, organizational differences, communication protocol, needed changes in how the project is managed, and components of the Intergovernmental Agreement or Memorandum of Understanding.

#### Observations

The following observations are based on areas of agreement and identify discrete areas of discrepancy to prepare for a work session to form a working agreement.

#### Project Understanding

Preparing for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS): Although consensus exists on the general understanding that the current phase includes work to prepare for beginning an EIS for the project, interviewees have significantly less clarity on the technical work and other infrastructure to be conducted to that end. Some diversity of understanding can be attributed to ambiguity regarding what technical analysis will be required and what pathway will lead to a list of alternatives for the type of structure to be studied in the EIS.

External partners: Each interviewee agreed that the DOTs must immediately address how to involve agency and jurisdictional partners. It is understood that there is much work to be done on involving these partners in the project and improving relations.

Financial structure: Most interviewees cited development of a funding structure and identification of a project lead (Oregon or Washington) as a key element of the current phase of work.

Commission directives: There is unanimous understanding that the WSDOT and ODOT Transportation Commissions have directed their respective management teams to identify how the two DOTs will work together efficiently, and to develop a plan to include agency, jurisdictions, key community partners, and the public in the project. There is a high degree of pressure on management to succeed.

Time line for delivery: There appear to be differences in the understanding of the expected time line for project delivery. Some interviewees want to complete the current phase quickly and begin the EIS before the end of this phase (before summer, 2005), targeting a 5- to 10-year project completion. Others do not see an EIS beginning before the current phase is complete and suggest a 10- to 15-year timeline.

Project commitment: There is concern from ODOT that the project is not a priority with WSDOT senior leadership. Conversely, there is concern at WSDOT that ODOT is taking too much of a leadership role in the technical development and political agenda.

#### Role Clarification

DOT teams: The DOTs agree that they must begin working as one project team, beginning with the two project directors running day-to-day management. There is significant ambiguity about the roles of many members of the management team, as well as about the apparent temporary status of some members of the team. Several people on each DOT team interact with agency and jurisdictional partners, further confusing and straining external relations.

Consultant work: Interviewees are unanimous in their belief that consultants' work be shared freely between the DOTs. Many interviewees mentioned that the way consultants have been hired and managed in the past must change to reflect true joint management of the project. Some discrepancy exists about the degree of co-management, with some believing that including the other DOT at decision points makes better sense, while others suggest complete co-management.

#### Decision-Making

Interviewees agree that day-to-day decisions rest with the project directors. However, there was limited discussion on defining what a day-to-day decision actually is. The joint DOT meetings are cited as the place where joint decisions are made, but, when asked how project team members are directed from this group, there appears to be little communication as to what decisions have been made and how to act on them.

Senior project leaders are seen as setting project direction, assisting with policy decisions and communicating with the Joint Subcommittee and Commissions. There is great variation in understanding in each DOT as to how decisions are made (by both states), communicated up the chain of command, and acted upon.

#### Organizational Differences

DOT structure: The different management and decision structures within the organization of each DOT further complicate the decision-making process. For example, as Regional Administrator, Don Wagner is responsible for more project management than is Matt Garrett, his counterpart at ODOT, because project decision-making structure at ODOT lies with management, not with the Commission. ODOT's Commission typically is more involved in projects and has Transportation



Department management purview, as opposed to the WSDOT Commission, which is a separate entity from the Transportation Department and deals primarily with transportation policy.

Team composition: There are also differences in the composition of project teams between the two states. Drawing direct chain-of-command lines to counterparts across the river is not always functional. These differences also cause concerns and confusion regarding matching decision-making and responsibilities with management titles and counterparts.

#### Communication Protocol

Communicating decisions: Many project decisions are communicated verbally. The general hierarchical structure of how decisions are supposed to be made is mostly understood, but there are few examples of how this structure works within the project. Both DOTs do not have a decision-reporting structure in place that communicates what decisions were made and how to proceed on them. This has caused confusion and at times inertia in moving the project forward.

External communications: External communications are sketchy and inconsistent. Some of those interviewed believe that external partners, jurisdictions, and the public is confused and frustrated because there is unclear leadership in the community regarding project decisions on behalf of each DOT, or from both DOTs.

#### Tasks to Accomplish

Several areas were listed by nearly each interviewee:

- Establish a clear project delivery path
- Develop a decision-making process
- Develop a mechanism to resolve differences as they appear
- Clarify roles and responsibilities
- Develop a plan to engage agency and jurisdictional partners
- Develop an integrated team
- Decide on how to pursue funding
- Establish a project lead (ODOT or WSDOT)
- Identify how consultants are selected and managed

#### Conclusions

##### Project Understanding

There is significant discrepancy in the understanding of what work should be done and to what end for this phase of the project. Although there is agreement that preparatory work is being conducted, there are differences in what technical information is needed and what outcomes will be available. It is essential to have consensus on defining the project and a decision-making structure in place to expedite resolution on what the DOTs expect from this phase, how it will prepare the project for an EIS, and what technical, financial and communications infrastructure needs to be in place to begin an EIS within a year.

##### Role Clarification

Project team roles need to be clarified internally and with the other DOT. New project team members need to define their roles and communicate them to the bi-state team. There is also

concern regarding the temporary nature of some project team members. John Rosenberger's retirement and imminent exit from the project have created concern, as has the temporary status of Rob DeGraff's position at ODOT. The addition of Bart Gernhart to WSDOT's project team also has created some confusion for ODOT team members. Each team member should be aware of his/her role and responsibilities and be able to clearly communicate them internally and externally. This should be finalized during the 2-day work session.

#### Decision-Making

Here is where a great deal of work needs to be done. There are structured levels of decision-makers for the project, but neither DOT understands the decision tree pathways, and their use is unclear. There is consensus that decisions must be shared, but a pathway needs to be developed and refined in order to be a functional method of project management. Developing the decision tree as well as how decisions are communicated will be critical pieces of the joint work session. Structural differences in how each DOT makes decisions must be delineated and addressed in order to make the decision tree effective.

Once the decision-making structure is in place, it is important to communicate it not only within each DOT team, but also between the two DOTs and their external partners and stakeholders. This will help establish structure and communicate an organized effort in moving the project forward (see communications section below).

#### Resolving Differences

A mechanism for resolving differences needs to be developed and agreed upon in advance. This mechanism should be defined and agreed upon within the work session in order to set a pathway to work through areas of disagreement that are already surfacing. As the project progresses and the issues become more controversial, the opportunity for disagreement will grow.

#### Organizational Differences

Management and oversight structures vary between the two DOTs. These nuances should be clarified at the work session and a plan developed to work within these structures for decision-making and project management. These structural differences will mostly affect milestone and policy decisions.

#### Communication Protocol

Internal communications: Communications protocol regarding DOT decisions would be very helpful in empowering project team members to move forward based on their shared understanding of what a decision is, and what is still under study and/or debate. Communicating and reinforcing the use of a decision tree within each DOT and within a bi-state structure would clarify decision paths and allow team members to work more effectively and with confidence. The next step is to use this process regularly and demonstrate results consistently over time.

External communications: It is critical that the DOTs determine how they will communicate with their respective MPOs, local jurisdictions, agencies, and the public. Communication with these groups needs to begin with defining how these groups will be included in the decision-making process of the project. Interviewees from both DOTs are deeply concerned about relations with partners and jurisdictions and believe that there is significant loss of trust in regards to the DOTs' ability to manage the Columbia Crossing project. A word of caution: include these partners in the

development of how they will be involved, rather than dictating a decision on their behalf. Communicating how the DOTs will involve the community side-by-side with external partners is significantly more effective.

#### Tasks to Accomplish

The priorities for the planned 2-day work session with project team management includes:

- Clarifying work product and expectations for the current phase of work
- Clarifying roles and responsibilities of project team members
- Developing effective and defensible decision trees for both DOTs and for bi-state decisions
- Developing communications protocol
- Deciding on how external partners will be involved and who will be charged with communicating/interacting with them regarding this project
- Listing immediate and subsequent decisions to be made (funding/financing structures, technical work to be done in this phase, follow-up work with the executive/external partners committee, identifying which state will lead the next phase, etc.)



## CAC (“Executive Committee”) Options

On the above referenced topic, we have talked with Matt Garrett and been privy to conversations between John Rosenberger and Don Wagner on this topic. We have spoken to Pat Serie, WSDOT’s communications consultant on our Crossing project who has also been involved in the citizen involvement element of Seattle’s Alaska Way Viaduct project. We have met with Identity Clark County, the Portland Business Alliance, TriMet and PDOT and talked broadly about this issue. We have also reviewed the research ODOT did in order to develop the oversight structure for the I-5 Partnership effort and what Kate Deane has developed for the Delta Park effort.

There is no “right” format for one of these groups. Perhaps the most important aspect of them is that in their formation, the various stakeholders have the opportunity to comment on the size and make up of the group. In the absence of that input, the group may not have the same legitimacy in the community, calling its recommendations into question. Thus, we would recommend that before the DOTs settle on a structure, we “shop” the following concepts to our regional partners and other stakeholders, getting their feedback regarding preferred options, time commitments, leadership, etc. with the goal of developing the structure for the CAC, incorporating those comments for which there is broader support, by late September.

This approach has the benefit of putting this CAC effort on a timeline that we believe makes more sense for this whole effort. Given the technical work we are doing for the next six months, we do not have substantive work necessary to keep a CAC engaged. We are not making decisions until scoping which begins, at the earliest, next winter – six months away. Thus, forming a CAC is premature at this point (and we fear settling on a CAC structure in August will create pressure to empanel it prior to when we need to which we would predict is the beginning of next calendar year).

### Option 1 – Expanded BCC

Take the Bi-state Coordinating Committee (13) and expand it to be more representative of the broader community adding neighborhood representatives (4), community group (EJ) representatives (2), business representatives (4) and six (6) legislators (3 from each side of the river). Total committee membership = 29

#### Advantages:

- Addresses BCC desire to be foundation of advisory group
- Cross fertilization of ideas and perspectives between public officials and citizens
- Relatively manageable size

## Disadvantages:

- Only 10 of 29 are true civilian/citizens, group potentially dominated by public entities
- Lack of breadth of citizen participants - Over-representation of N/NE PDX (Burkholder/Cruz represent districts based in that area, plus this outline assumes those same neighborhoods are represented by neighborhood reps)
- Differences in expertise, desire/need to delve into details between public officials and citizens (a difference observed in the I-5 Partnership Task Force)
- Question of chairpersonship/ political issues associated with BCC leadership

**Option 1-A Citizen Majority including BCC**

Add ten more citizens divided among business (4), neighborhood (2) and community (4) groups to bring the size to 39. Select co-chairs from business or community leaders.

## Advantages:

- Stronger citizen voice, more citizen leadership
- More geographic/interest diversity among citizen participants possible
- Overcomes politics associated with BCC leadership

## Disadvantages:

- Size and its manageability
- Question of chairpersonship/ political fallout from passing over BCC for leadership

**Option 2 – Two groups**

Have two groups to report to – one the public sector made up of the BCC and state legislators (19); the second being broadly representative of the community including business leaders, neighborhood representatives, EJ community, and other community groups (# 20 participants). Led by co-chairs made up of business or community leaders. Groups meet together for some briefings, separately when that makes sense. This is basically what is being done at Delta Park.

## Advantages:

- Community has “table” of its own that is equal to that of the public sector.

## Disadvantages:

- More demands on staff to support two separate meetings
- Lose the cross fertilization between public sector reps and citizens found useful in I-5 Partnership
- Resistance from public sector – belief they “represent” the community
- Will neighborhood reps resist participating in group led by business?



	Agreement	Discrepancies
<b>PROJECT UNDERSTANDING FOR CURRENT PHASE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Develop an agreement as to how the DOTs will work together.</li><li>• Provide a plan addressing how to involve key stakeholders.</li><li>• Prepare needed information to begin the EIS.</li><li>• Narrow the alternatives/decide what the project will encompass.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Include the I-205 Corridor in the project.</li><li>• Include the LRT/Transit Loop in the project.</li><li>• Type of information needed to begin EIS – what is necessary?</li></ul>





ROLE & RESPONSIBILITY CLARIFICATION	Agreement	Discrepancies
Project Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Himes/DeGraff</b> – project directors that manage consultants, partner/stakeholder relations.</li> <li>• <b>Gernhart</b> – Assists Himes with project development and contracting. Also interacts with agency partners regarding the project.</li> <li>• <b>Legry</b> – Provides assistance regarding political and community interests in the project. Reports to Wagner.</li> <li>• <b>Echols</b> – Communications lead for WSDOT</li> <li>• <b>Wagner/Garrett</b> – Manage Himes and DeGraff, participate in the Regional Coordinating Committee. Also interact with agency partners regarding project. Report to Conrad/Rosenberger on this project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responsibility for external partner relations is conducted by several WSDOT and ODT staff. Who is lead?</li> <li>• Internal ODOT counterpart to Echols regarding ODOT communications. Echols and Pat have not communicated.</li> <li>• Wagner appears to have more delegated responsibility for the project than Garrett due to the structure of WSDOT.</li> </ul>
Project Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Conrad/Rosenberger</b> – Provide direction on more major decisions, report to state leadership and sometimes to the commission. Report to MacDonald and Warner.</li> <li>• <b>Hammond</b> – Responsible for communicating with the Washington legislature, reports to MacDonald. Also interacts with the WSDOT Commission.</li> <li>• <b>MacDonald/Warner</b> – Included in policy decisions and interact with the Commission.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rosenberger is in focused exclusively on the Columbia Crossing Project. He is retired and may end his position in summer, 2005. Unclear as to his successor.</li> <li>• Differentiation in Conrad and Rosenberger's involvement</li> <li>• Counterpart to Paula Hammond?</li> </ul>
Consultant's Role	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide technical work under the direction of ODOT and WSDOT.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ODOT contractor receiving guidance from more than one manager. Rosenbergers role unclear now that DeGraff is on board.</li> <li>• Gernharts role in management of consultants is unclear.</li> <li>• Some concern that consultants are leading the project.</li> </ul>
Commission Roles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WSTC and OTC have agreed to form a Joint Subcommittee for the project.</li> <li>• WSTC and OTC have given direction to management for this project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OTC is more involved in overseeing project delivery</li> <li>• WSTC role is more policy oriented, rather than project oriented.</li> <li>• WSTC is not part of WSDOT transportation, has own budget and staff. Has no "management" responsibility for WSDOT.</li> </ul>



	Agreement	Discrepancies
<b>DECISION MAKING</b>		
Daily Project Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delegated to Himes and DeGraff.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unclear what is designated as "day to day" decisions and how they are communicated.</li> </ul>
Milestone Decisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Go up the chain of command – ODOT DeGraff, Garrett, Rosenberger, Warner. WSDOT Himes, Gernhart, Wagner, Conrad, MacDonald</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WSDOT appears to have extra layers of management.</li> <li>Unclear how decisions are made and communicated.</li> </ul>
Bi-State Policy Decisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy decisions made by commissions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unclear how each DOT discusses and forwards recommendations to the commission.</li> <li>WSDOT commission structure is different than ODOT.</li> </ul>
Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy decisions and project direction</li> </ul>	
Joint Sub-Committee Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Three commissioners from each state dedicated to ensuring coordination between two states, maximum value obtained from federal grants, inform public officials in both states.</li> </ul>	
FHWA/FTA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assist DOTs on lessons learned from other states, clarify federal EIS requirements.</li> </ul>	
MPO's	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review work on pre-EIS and advise whether it satisfies regional transportation objectives.</li> <li>Take any necessary formal action.</li> </ul>	
Local Jurisdictions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review work on pre-EIS and advise whether it supports local transportation objectives.</li> <li>Take any necessary formal action.</li> </ul>	
Executive Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review work on pre-EIS and advise whether it satisfies bi-state transportation objectives and to make recommendations to the Joint Subcommittee of the WTC/OTC.</li> </ul>	
Bi-State Coordination Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review work on pre-EIS and advise whether it satisfies bi-state transportation objectives.</li> <li>Make recommendations to MPO's, transit agencies and local governments</li> </ul>	
Regional Coordination Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review and evaluate the technical documentation developed by the consultant team.</li> </ul>	
Project Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Responsible for overall scope, schedule and budget, managing consultants.</li> </ul>	
Senior Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide overall project oversight.</li> </ul>	



ORGANIZATIONAL & OPERATIONAL DIFFERENCES	Agreement	Discrepancies
<p align="center"><b>Project Management</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dale Himes and Rob DeGraff serve as project directors</li> <li>• Region and state management engaged in project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rob DeGraff is a temporary employee (1 year contract) and Dale Himes is permanent.</li> <li>• Addition of Bart Gernhart as co-director</li> <li>• Don Wagner appears to have more delegated project management responsibility/decision making expectations than Matt Garrett due to DOT structural differences.</li> <li>• John Rosenberger primarily assigned to this project for the next year, whereas John Conrad has multiple projects and is permanent.</li> <li>• Counterpart to Paula Hammond (Chief of Staff) in ODOT?</li> <li>• Amy Echols's role/ODOT counterpart?</li> </ul>
<p align="center"><b>Commission Structure &amp; Purview</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both DOT commissions involved in project/participating on Joint Subcommittee.</li> <li>• Authority on policy decisions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WSDOT TC typically involved in more policy decisions. Legislature provides funding and input on projects.</li> <li>• WSDOT TC is separate from DOT. Has its own budget and staff. No direct oversight of DOT management.</li> <li>• ODOT TC typically more involved in project decisions as well as policy.</li> </ul>





	Agreement	Discrepancies
<b>COMMUNICATION</b>		
<b>Internal</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communication protocol to project teams unclear.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communication to senior leadership and commissions different due to DOT structures.</li> </ul>
<b>Between DOTS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communication regarding project technical decisions from the regional coordinating committee unclear.</li> </ul>	
<b>Stakeholders / Partners</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communication protocol to stakeholders and partners is unclear.</li> </ul>	



	Agreement	Discrepancies
<b>FUTURE ITEMS NEEDING RESOLUTION</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Agree on a project direction.</li><li>• How the DOTs will work together.</li><li>• Roles and responsibilities.</li><li>• How to make and communicate decisions more effectively.</li><li>• How to resolve differences as they occur.</li><li>• Develop one project team.</li><li>• Involving external partners, stakeholders and the public.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Future funding decisions and financial responsibilities.</li><li>• Lead agency identification</li><li>• Timing of developing one project team.</li><li>• Agreement on what technical information is needed to complete current phase.</li></ul>



the jd white company, inc.



*Creative Problem Solving*

## MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** 7-13-04  
**TO:** Dale Himes, WSDOT; Rob DeGraff, ODOT  
**FROM:** Katy Brooks  
**RE:** **WSDOT/ODOT Draft Questionnaire**  
TWC Project #04-115

---

### Project Interview Questions

#### UNDERSTANDING OF THE PROJECT

- How would you describe the current phase of the project?
- What will be produced in this phase?
- What is your understanding of the Joint Committee (TC) expectations?
- What are the project's next steps/phases

#### ROLE CLARIFICATION

- What is your understanding of ODOT's technical lead and WSDOT's communication lead for this phase?
- Do you see these leads changing as the project progresses?
- What is WSDOT/ODOT team's job descriptions for project?
- What role do consultants play in this stage? How should they interact and communicate with ODOT/WSDOT team members?

#### DECISION MAKING

- What is the WSDOT/ODOT decision tree?
- How are day-to-day decisions made?
- What is the role of the project directors (Dale Himes and Rob DeGraff)?
- How is work authorized?

#### ORGANIZATIONAL DIFFERENCES

- Briefly, what is the project delivery structure for this project?
- How will your transportation commission be involved?
- What do you think the funding structure will look like as the project progresses?



Dale Himes, WSDOT; Rob DeGraff, ODOT.

Re: IGA Interviews

Date 7-7-04

Page 2

#### **COMMUNICATION PROTOCOL**

- How does your agency communicate about this project?
- How is your agency engaging key stakeholders?

#### **NEEDED CHANGES**

- What do you think are the most important changes that need to occur regarding how WSDOT and ODOT are working together on this project?
- What is your perception of the cost of failing to deliver a Columbia River crossing project?

#### **IGA COMPONENTS**

- What considerations, checks and balances should be included?
- What obstacles will there be?

the jd white company, inc.



*Creative Problem Solving*

July 7, 2004

Dale Himes, Project Director  
Columbia River Crossing  
Washington State Department of Transportation  
11018 NE 51st Circle  
PO Box 1709  
Vancouver, Washington 98668-1709

**RE: Proposal to Provide Professional Facilitation and Mediation Services**

Dear Dale:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide the attached information relating to the provision of facilitation and mediation services for the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) and the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) to develop a Columbia Crossing Working Agreement.

Attached you will find the scope of services and our standard professional rate and expense schedule. Please review the package and, if acceptable, provide us with a contract to perform the services identified. We will commence work on the project upon receipt of a fully executed contract.

Again, we appreciate the opportunity to submit this proposal, which is valid for 60 days. If you have any questions, please contact me at (360) 696-1338. We look forward to working with you on this project.

Sincerely,

**The JD White Company, Inc.**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John D. White".

John D. White  
President

JDW/

Enclosures: scope of services, professional rate and expense schedule

**THE JD WHITE COMPANY, INC.**  
**SCOPE OF SERVICES FOR**  
**WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**June 28, 2004**

The following constitutes a proposal by The JD White Company, Inc. (TWC) to provide professional mediation and facilitation services for the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) (hereinafter named "Client") on behalf of the development of a Columbia Crossing Working Agreement.

***SCOPE OF WORK***

**TASK 1: MEETINGS WITH WSDOT & ODOT PROJECT DIRECTORS**

WSDOT and the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) are interested in developing a working agreement as a basis for bi-state cooperation for the potential construction of Columbia Crossing. Katy Brooks, TWC Project Manager, will meet collectively with project directors representing WSDOT and ODOT to discuss any existing and foreseeable gaps in information and support, areas of concern, and means of sustaining and enhancing the environment of collaboration between the two agencies. Additional meetings with the WSDOT and ODOT project directors will be required to review the results of the WSDOT/ODOT team interviews and confirm the agenda for the proposed work session outlined in Task 3. TWC will develop a brief memorandum clarifying roles and agency organization and assessing procedures and protocol for use during the WSDOT/ODOT work session. The memorandum will be used as a starting point for discussion and negotiation toward a draft agreement.

*Required Information*

- General job descriptions of both project directors
- Background information on working relationship between ODOT and WSDOT to date
- Contact information for all participating parties
- Sample bi-state agreements

*Deliverables*

- Four 4-hour meetings with both project directors
- Written 4-page assessment summarizing line of questions and outline of assessment prior to interviews

*Cost estimate:*

\$2,805.00

**TASK 2: WSDOT/ODOT INTERVIEWS**

Katy Brooks will interview key Columbia Crossing players listed below to determine areas of concern, organizational structure of WSDOT/ODOT project management, perspectives on bi-state cooperation, and ideas for improved collaboration. WSDOT staff to be interviewed will include, but not be limited to, Don Wagner, Bart Gernhart, Mary Legry, and John Conrad. ODOT staff to be interviewed will include, but not be limited to Matt Garrett, John Rosenberger,, Geoff Larkin and Dave Williams. Input from Dale Himes and Rob DeGraff will be gathered during project manager meetings in Task 1 and included in the interview assessment. These interviews will serve as background for the development of the working agreement. The interviews will be followed by a written situation assessment (10-12 pages) summarizing



comments of those interviewed and will include common themes, areas of agreement, concerns and other comments of note. More significantly, the assessment will outline potential areas of an agreement, while identifying potential bumps in the road with suggestions of what needs to be resolved to avoid them. This report will be provided to Dale Himes and Rob DeGraff for their review and comment with the recommendation of sharing it with the rest of the attendees prior to the work session.

*Deliverables*

- Eight interviews before the development of the work session agenda
- Situation assessment based on interviews

*Cost estimate:*

\$7,325.00

**TASK 3: WSDOT/ODOT DRAFT AGREEMENT OUTLINE**

Dale Himes and Rob DeGraff will draft the outline of a two-part proposed agreement based on previous drafts of WSDOT/ODOT intergovernmental agreements and input from interviews in Task 2. Katy Brooks will contribute insights based on interviews in Task 2 and in preparation for the facilitated WSDOT/ODOT work session to follow. Drawing on the interviews, Part 1 of the draft agreement outline will 1) outline Columbia Crossing project goals and objectives as seen by the agencies, 2) their understanding of agency roles and responsibilities, 3) organizational and administrative differences and opportunities, 4) a detailed outline of potential components of the agreement. Part 2 of the draft agreement outline will propose potential solutions to areas of disagreement for discussion at the work session to follow.

*Deliverables*

- Provide input on structure of draft agreement outline for review by WSDOT and ODOT
- Review final draft agreement (post Task 4)

*Cost estimate:*

\$3,000.00

**TASK 4: WSDOT/ODOT WORK SESSION**

The work session will require up to two days of meeting with all key players. The session will include a facilitated discussion of role clarification, areas needing improved collaboration and WSDOT and ODOT organizational and project structures. This discussion will be followed by the mediated development of a working agreement or course of action regarding collaboration of staff, resources, information and other areas affecting a concerted effort between WSDOT and ODOT to advance the Columbia Crossing Project. TWC will facilitate the work session and mediate the development of the draft agreement. TWC also will be responsible for meeting invitations and reminder call-downs, developing the agenda and meeting handouts, note-taking. A revised draft agreement based on the work session will be provided by TWC and delivered to each participant. TWC will follow the work session with a memorandum provided to all participants for their information that summarizes the work session and recommended next steps.

*Required Information*

- The Partnering Workshop will be held on August 4-5 from 9-4:30 p.m.(possibly at the Heathman Lodge in Vancouver.
- WDOT will secure the meeting location and arrange for refreshments.

*Deliverables*

- Work session agenda and background materials
- Two-day facilitated work session and mediated draft agreement/course of action
- Revised draft agreement
- Meeting logistics (letters of invitation, handouts, reminder call-downs, and note-taking)
- Follow-up memorandum summarizing work session and recommended next steps.

*Cost estimate:*

\$7,580.00

**TASK 5: WSDOT/ODOT AGREEMENT FOLLOW-UP**

At the work session, WSDOT and ODOT will have come to a working agreement or mutually agreeable course of action for the Columbia Crossing project. Katy Brooks will assess its success by talking with project directors and those who participated in the work session, and getting their comments on remaining gaps or areas needing attention. Additionally, a 4 – 6-hour follow up work session will be scheduled with the original participants to discuss progress, make adjustments and outline next steps.

*Required Information*

- *Time, place, date and location of follow-up work session*

*Deliverables*

- *Brief meetings/discussion with key players via telephone or in person*
- *Facilitated work session and mediated draft agreement/course of action (4-6 hours)*
- *Follow-up summary and recommended next steps*

*Cost estimate:*

\$5,505.00

***COST ESTIMATE***

Professional fees *including* expenses will be billed as incurred and are estimated to total \$26,290.00.

The JD White Company, Inc. is pleased submit this proposal to provide services, which is valid for 60 days. Please contact our office if you have any questions regarding the above information.



the jd white company, inc.



*Creative Problem Solving*

**April 1, 2004-June 30, 2004**

Charges for employees will correspond with the hourly rates listed below.

<i>Employee</i>	<i>Hourly Rate</i>
John D. White, President	\$190 per hour
Helen Devery, Planning Manager	\$140 per hour
Karen Ciocia, Public Involvement Manager	\$140 per hour
Kent E. Snyder, Ph.D., Natural Resources Manager	\$140 per hour
Katy Brooks, Senior Project Manager	\$140 per hour
Ron Mah, Senior Planner/Landscape Architect/Urban Designer	\$135 per hour
Karyn Criswell, Senior Public Involvement Project Manager	\$110 per hour
Don Hardy, Senior Planner	\$110 per hour
Corrinne Humphrey, AICP, Senior Planner	\$110 per hour
Christy Osborn, AICP, Senior Planner	\$110 per hour
Edward Strohmaier, Associate Ecologist	\$85 per hour
Richard Nardine, Senior Public Involvement Project Manager	\$80 per hour
Leandra Cleveland, Associate Ecologist	\$75 per hour
Madeleine Dulemba, Technical Writer	\$70 per hour
Juanita Rogers, Urban Design/AutoCAD/GIS	\$70 per hour
Ed Knight, AutoCAD/GIS	\$65 per hour
Tabitha Reeder, Ecologist	\$65 per hour
Kyle Brown, Public Involvement Coordinator	\$65 per hour
Jessica Stalberger, Public Involvement Coordinator	\$65 per hour
Gwen Alley, Ecologist	\$60 per hour
Dan Gunderson, Ecologist	\$60 per hour
Amber Gibbon, Planner	\$55 per hour
Shelly Nieman, Finance Associate	\$50 per hour
Kim Pierce, Graphics/Administration	\$50 per hour
Laura Townsend, Document Production	\$45 per hour
Lindsay Wack, Research Assistant/Project Assistant	\$45 per hour
Jason Myers, Research Assistant/Project Assistant	\$40 per hour
Bonnie Caouette, Administration	\$45 per hour
<i>Expense Schedule</i>	<i>Cost</i>
Mileage	Current federal standard
In-house Photocopies (Black and White)	\$0.10 cents per page
In-house Photocopies (Color) 8 1/2 x11-11x17	\$1.00-2.00 per page
Facsimile	\$1.00 per page
Plotter	Up to \$5.00 per S.F.
Clark County GIS Data	\$15.00 per section
Portland Metro Area (tri-county) GIS Data	\$50.00 per section
Services of a Subcontractor	Services billed as incurred + 7%
Direct Expenses/Reimbursables Including Outside Reproduction/Printing, Postage, Title Company, Travel/Lodging/Meals, Parking, Long Distance, Film, Film Processing	Charges billed as incurred + 7%
Jurisdictional Filing Fees	Direct payment requested + 7%
Digital Camera Usage	\$10.00 per day



## MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** 7-7-04  
**TO:** Dale Himes, WSDOT; Rob DeGraff, ODOT  
**FROM:** Katy Brooks  
**RE:** TWC Project #04-115  
**CC:**

---

### **WSDOT/ODOT IGA DEVELOPMENT Project Interview Discussion Guideline**

#### **UNDERSTANDING OF THE PROJECT**

- How each agency describes the current phase of the project
- Joint Committee (TC) expectations
- Next steps/phases
- Description of products – what will be produced in this phase?

#### **ROLE CLARIFICATION**

- Technical and communication management –WSDOT/ODOT
- Individual job descriptions for project for respective teams/management
- Role of consultants

#### **DECISION MAKING**

- WSDOT/ODOT decision trees
- Day-to-day decision trees
- Work authorization process

#### **ORGANIZATIONAL DIFFERENCES**

- Project management/delivery structure
- Commission oversight
- Funding

#### **COMMUNICATION PROTOCOL**

- Internal mechanisms
- Key external stakeholder involvement

Dale Himes, WSDOT; Rob DeGraff, ODOT.  
Re: IGA Interviews  
Date 7-7-04  
Page 2

**NEEDED CHANGES**

- General input on what can be done differently
- Cost of failing to deliver

**IGA COMPONENTS**

- Considerations, checks and balances to be included
- Identify obstacles

***Setting up interviews:***

Forward the questions, my bio and memo/letter from Rob and Dale



the jd white company, inc.



Creative Problem Solving

**DRAFT**

**AGENDA**

**Washington State and Oregon Departments of Transportation  
Working Agreement Work Session**

**August 4 & 5, 2004  
9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.**

**AUGUST 5**

8:00

~~9:00~~ – 12:00 Recap/finalize decisions from August 4

- Roles, responsibilities and decision tree, continued
- Dispute resolution mechanism
- Communication protocol

~~12:00~~ ~~4:30~~

~~12:00~~ – 5:00 Project decisions

~~8:00~~ ~~9:00~~

12:00 – 4:00

- Identify potential joint ODOT/WSDOT project team organization/logistics
- Develop funding plan decision path
- Refine list of items needing near and long-term resolution

Next Steps

- Finalize agreement
- Agree on how/when to address outstanding decisions
- Schedule follow up session

O:\Data\TWC\CLIENTS\WSDOT Columbia River Crossing 04-115\WSDOT ODOT Draft  
Agenda - 8-4 5.doc





**DRAFT**

**AGENDA**

**Washington State and Oregon Departments of Transportation  
Working Agreement Work Session**

*Heathman Lodge*  
**August 4 & 5, 2004**

**9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.**

**AUGUST 4**

9:00 – 12:00 Introductions

- Discuss ground rules
- Identify individual criteria for success for this agreement
- Review interview assessment
- Define this phase of the project and EIS project delivery

*Lunch*

~~4:30~~  
12:00 – ~~5:00~~ Roles, Responsibilities and Decision Tree

*5:00*

- DOTs:
  - State transportation commissions
  - Joint subcommittee leadership
  - Senior leadership
  - Project leadership
  - Project teams
- Agencies and Jurisdictions:
  - FHWA/FTA
  - MPO's
  - Local jurisdictions and agencies
  - Executive Committee
  - Bi-State Coordinating Committee
  - Regional Coordinating Committee
  - Public

**DRAFT**

**Pre-work Session Situational Assessment  
Washington State and Oregon Departments of Transportation  
Columbia Crossing Project Agency Agreement**

July 26, 2004

Prepared for:  
the Washington State Department of Transportation and the Oregon Department of Transportation

This report summarizes interviews with Columbia Crossing project team members and WSDOT and ODOT management conducted between July 13–22, 2004. One-on-one interviews were conducted with a total of 11 individuals, who are listed below.

List of interviewees:

#### WSDOT

- Paula Hammond, Chief of Staff
- John Conrad, Engineering and Regional Operations Director
- Don Wagner, Regional Administrator
- Bart Gernhart, Program Development Manager
- Dale Himes, Project Director
- Mary Legry, Community Vision/Support Services Manager
- Amy Echols, Communications Manager

#### ODOT

- John Rosenberger, Deputy Director (Retired)
- Matt Garrett, Region Manager
- Dave Williams
- Geoff Larkin, The Larkin Group, Inc.

#### Methodology

Stakeholder interviews were held with individuals identified by the DOT Columbia Crossing Project Directors as members of the key management structure for the project. Interviews were conducted one-on-one using a questionnaire that included seven areas of inquiry. These areas were: project understanding, role clarification, decision-making, organizational differences, communication protocol, needed changes in how the project is managed, and components of the Intergovernmental Agreement or Memorandum of Understanding.

#### Observations

The following observations are based on areas of agreement and identify discrete areas of discrepancy to prepare for a work session to form a working agreement.

#### Project Understanding

Preparing for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS): Although consensus exists on the general understanding that the current phase includes work to prepare for beginning an EIS for the project, interviewees have significantly less clarity on the technical work and other infrastructure to be conducted to that end. Some diversity of understanding can be attributed to ambiguity regarding what technical analysis will be required and what pathway will lead to a list of alternatives for the type of structure to be studied in the EIS.

External partners: Each interviewee agreed that the DOTs must immediately address how to involve agency and jurisdictional partners. It is understood that there is much work to be done on involving these partners in the project and improving relations.

Financial structure: Most interviewees cited development of a funding structure and identification of a project lead (Oregon or Washington) as a key element of the current phase of work.



Commission directives: There is unanimous understanding that the WSDOT and ODOT Transportation Commissions have directed their respective management teams to identify how the two DOTs will work together efficiently, and to develop a plan to include agency, jurisdictions, key community partners, and the public in the project. There is a high degree of pressure on management to succeed.

Time line for delivery: There appear to be differences in the understanding of the expected time line for project delivery. Some interviewees want to complete the current phase quickly and begin the EIS before the end of this phase (before summer, 2005), targeting a 5- to 10-year project completion. Others do not see an EIS beginning before the current phase is complete and suggest a 10- to 15-year timeline.

Project commitment: There is concern from ODOT that the project is not a priority with WSDOT senior leadership. Conversely, there is concern at WSDOT that ODOT is taking too much of a leadership role in the technical development and political agenda.

#### Role Clarification

DOT teams: The DOTs agree that they must begin working as one project team, beginning with the two project directors running day-to-day management. There is significant ambiguity about the roles of many members of the management team, as well as about the apparent temporary status of some members of the team. Several people on each DOT team interact with agency and jurisdictional partners, further confusing and straining external relations.

Consultant work: Interviewees are unanimous in their belief that consultants' work be shared freely between the DOTs. Many interviewees mentioned that the way consultants have been hired and managed in the past must change to reflect true joint management of the project. Some discrepancy exists about the degree of co-management, with some believing that including the other DOT at decision points makes better sense, while others suggest complete co-management.

#### Decision-Making

Interviewees agree that day-to-day decisions rest with the project directors. However, there was limited discussion on defining what a day-to-day decision actually is. The joint DOT meetings are cited as the place where joint decisions are made, but, when asked how project team members are directed from this group, there appears to be little communication as to what decisions have been made and how to act on them.

Senior project leaders are seen as setting project direction, assisting with policy decisions and communicating with the Joint Subcommittee and Commissions. There is great variation in understanding in each DOT as to how decisions are made (by both states), communicated up the chain of command, and acted upon.

#### Organizational Differences

DOT structure: The different management and decision structures within the organization of each DOT further complicate the decision-making process. For example, as Regional Administrator, Don Wagner is responsible for more project management than is Matt Garrett, his counterpart at ODOT, because project decision-making structure at ODOT lies with management, not with the Commission. ODOT's Commission typically is more involved in projects and has Transportation

Department management purview, as opposed to the WSDOT Commission, which is a separate entity from the Transportation Department and deals primarily with transportation policy.

Team composition: There are also differences in the composition of project teams between the two states. Drawing direct chain-of-command lines to counterparts across the river is not always functional. These differences also cause concerns and confusion regarding matching decision-making and responsibilities with management titles and counterparts.

#### Communication Protocol

Communicating decisions: Many project decisions are communicated verbally. The general hierarchical structure of how decisions are supposed to be made is mostly understood, but there are few examples of how this structure works within the project. Both DOTs do not have a decision-reporting structure in place that communicates what decisions were made and how to proceed on them. This has caused confusion and at times inertia in moving the project forward.

External communications: External communications are sketchy and inconsistent. Some of those interviewed believe that external partners, jurisdictions, and the public is confused and frustrated because there is unclear leadership in the community regarding project decisions on behalf of each DOT, or from both DOTs.

#### Tasks to Accomplish

Several areas were listed by nearly each interviewee:

- Establish a clear project delivery path
- Develop a decision-making process
- Develop a mechanism to resolve differences as they appear
- Clarify roles and responsibilities
- Develop a plan to engage agency and jurisdictional partners
- Develop an integrated team
- Decide on how to pursue funding
- Establish a project lead (ODOT or WSDOT)
- Identify how consultants are selected and managed

#### Conclusions

##### Project Understanding

There is significant discrepancy in the understanding of what work should be done and to what end for this phase of the project. Although there is agreement that preparatory work is being conducted, there are differences in what technical information is needed and what outcomes will be available. It is essential to have consensus on defining the project and a decision-making structure in place to expedite resolution on what the DOTs expect from this phase, how it will prepare the project for an EIS, and what technical, financial and communications infrastructure needs to be in place to begin an EIS within a year.

##### Role Clarification

Project team roles need to be clarified internally and with the other DOT. New project team members need to define their roles and communicate them to the bi-state team. There is also



concern regarding the temporary nature of some project team members. John Rosenberger's retirement and imminent exit from the project have created concern, as has the temporary status of Rob DeGraff's position at ODOT. The addition of Bart Gernhart to WSDOT's project team also has created some confusion for ODOT team members. Each team member should be aware of his/her role and responsibilities and be able to clearly communicate them internally and externally. This should be finalized during the 2-day work session.

#### Decision-Making

Here is where a great deal of work needs to be done. There are structured levels of decision-makers for the project, but neither DOT understands the decision tree pathways, and their use is unclear. There is consensus that decisions must be shared, but a pathway needs to be developed and refined in order to be a functional method of project management. Developing the decision tree as well as how decisions are communicated will be critical pieces of the joint work session. Structural differences in how each DOT makes decisions must be delineated and addressed in order to make the decision tree effective.

Once the decision-making structure is in place, it is important to communicate it not only within each DOT team, but also between the two DOTs and their external partners and stakeholders. This will help establish structure and communicate an organized effort in moving the project forward (see communications section below).

#### Resolving Differences

A mechanism for resolving differences needs to be developed and agreed upon in advance. This mechanism should be defined and agreed upon within the work session in order to set a pathway to work through areas of disagreement that are already surfacing. As the project progresses and the issues become more controversial, the opportunity for disagreement will grow.

#### Organizational Differences

Management and oversight structures vary between the two DOTs. These nuances should be clarified at the work session and a plan developed to work within these structures for decision-making and project management. These structural differences will mostly affect milestone and policy decisions.

#### Communication Protocol

Internal communications: Communications protocol regarding DOT decisions would be very helpful in empowering project team members to move forward based on their shared understanding of what a decision is, and what is still under study and/or debate. Communicating and reinforcing the use of a decision tree within each DOT and within a bi-state structure would clarify decision paths and allow team members to work more effectively and with confidence. The next step is to use this process regularly and demonstrate results consistently over time.

External communications: It is critical that the DOTs determine how they will communicate with their respective MPOs, local jurisdictions, agencies, and the public. Communication with these groups needs to begin with defining how these groups will be included in the decision-making process of the project. Interviewees from both DOTs are deeply concerned about relations with partners and jurisdictions and believe that there is significant loss of trust in regards to the DOTs' ability to manage the Columbia Crossing project. A word of caution: include these partners in the



development of how they will be involved, rather than dictating a decision on their behalf. Communicating how the DOTs will involve the community side-by-side with external partners is significantly more effective.

#### Tasks to Accomplish

The priorities for the planned 2-day work session with project team management includes:

- Clarifying work product and expectations for the current phase of work
- Clarifying roles and responsibilities of project team members
- Developing effective and defensible decision trees for both DOTs and for bi-state decisions
- Developing communications protocol
- Deciding on how external partners will be involved and who will be charged with communicating/interacting with them regarding this project
- Listing immediate and subsequent decisions to be made (funding/financing structures, technical work to be done in this phase, follow-up work with the executive/external partners committee, identifying which state will lead the next phase, etc.)

	Agreement	Discrepancies
<b>PROJECT UNDERSTANDING FOR CURRENT PHASE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Develop an agreement as to how the DOTs will work together.</li><li>• Provide a plan addressing how to involve key stakeholders.</li><li>• Prepare needed information to begin the EIS.</li><li>• Narrow the alternatives/decide what the project will encompass.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Include the I-205 Corridor in the project.</li><li>• Include the LRT/Transit Loop in the project.</li><li>• Type of information needed to begin EIS – what is necessary?</li></ul>



	Agreement	Discrepancies
ROLE & RESPONSIBILITY CLARIFICATION		
<b>Project Management</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Himes/DeGraff</b> – project directors that manage consultants, partner/stakeholder relations.</li> <li>• <b>Gernhart</b> – Assists Himes with project development and contracting. Also interacts with agency partners regarding the project.</li> <li>• <b>Legry</b> – Provides assistance regarding political and community interests in the project. Reports to Wagner.</li> <li>• <b>Echols</b> – Communications lead for WSDOT</li> <li>• <b>Wagner/Garrett</b> – Manage Himes and DeGraff, participate in the Regional Coordinating Committee. Also interact with agency partners regarding project. Report to Conrad/Rosenberger on this project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responsibility for external partner relations is conducted by several WSDOT and ODT staff. Who is lead?</li> <li>• Internal ODOT counterpart to Echols regarding ODOT communications. Echols and Pat have not communicated.</li> <li>• Wagner appears to have more delegated responsibility for the project than Garrett due to the structure of WSDOT.</li> </ul>
<b>Project Leadership</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Conrad/Rosenberger</b> – Provide direction on more major decisions, report to state leadership and sometimes to the commission. Report to MacDonald and Warner.</li> <li>• <b>Hammond</b> – Responsible for communicating with the Washington legislature, reports to MacDonald. Also interacts with the WSDOT Commission.</li> <li>• <b>MacDonald/Warner</b> – Included in policy decisions and interact with the Commission.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rosenberger is in focused exclusively on the Columbia Crossing Project. He is retired and may end his position in summer, 2005. Unclear as to his successor.</li> <li>• Differentiation in Conrad and Rosenberger's involvement</li> <li>• Counterpart to Paula Hammond?</li> </ul>
<b>Consultant's Role</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide technical work under the direction of ODOT and WSDOT.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ODOT contractor receiving guidance from more than one manager. Rosenbergers role unclear now that DeGraff is on board.</li> <li>• Gernharts role in management of consultants is unclear.</li> <li>• Some concern that consultants are leading the project.</li> </ul>
<b>Commission Roles</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WSTC and OTC have agreed to form a Joint Subcommittee for the project.</li> <li>• WSTC and OTC have given direction to management for this project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OTC is more involved in overseeing project delivery</li> <li>• WSTC role is more policy oriented, rather than project oriented.</li> <li>• WSTC is not part of WSDOT transportation, has own budget and staff. Has no "management" responsibility for WSDOT.</li> </ul>



	Agreement	Discrepancies
<b>DECISION MAKING</b>		
Daily Project Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delegated to Himes and DeGraff.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unclear what is designated as "day to day" decisions and how they are communicated.</li> </ul>
Milestone Decisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Go up the chain of command – ODOT DeGraff, Garrett, Rosenberger, Warner. WSDOT Himes, Gernhart, Wagner, Conrad, MacDonald</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WSDOT appears to have extra layers of management.</li> <li>Unclear how decisions are made and communicated.</li> </ul>
Bi-State Policy Decisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy decisions made by commissions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unclear how each DOT discusses and forwards recommendations to the commission.</li> <li>WSDOT commission structure is different than ODOT.</li> </ul>
Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy decisions and project direction</li> </ul>	
Joint Sub-Committee Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Three commissioners from each state dedicated to ensuring coordination between two states, maximum value obtained from federal grants, inform public officials in both states.</li> </ul>	
FHWA/FTA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assist DOTs on lessons learned from other states, clarify federal EIS requirements.</li> </ul>	
MPO's	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review work on pre-EIS and advise whether it satisfies regional transportation objectives.</li> <li>Take any necessary formal action.</li> </ul>	
Local Jurisdictions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review work on pre-EIS and advise whether it supports local transportation objectives.</li> <li>Take any necessary formal action.</li> </ul>	
Executive Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review work on pre-EIS and advise whether it satisfies bi-state transportation objectives and to make recommendations to the Joint Subcommittee of the WTC/OTC.</li> </ul>	
Bi-State Coordination Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review work on pre-EIS and advise whether it satisfies bi-state transportation objectives.</li> <li>Make recommendations to MPO's, transit agencies and local governments</li> </ul>	
Regional Coordination Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review and evaluate the technical documentation developed by the consultant team.</li> </ul>	
Project Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Responsible for overall scope, schedule and budget, managing consultants.</li> </ul>	
Senior Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide overall project oversight.</li> </ul>	



	Agreement	Discrepancies
<b>ORGANIZATIONAL &amp; OPERATIONAL DIFFERENCES</b>		
<b>Project Management</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dale Himes and Rob DeGraff serve as project directors</li> <li>• Region and state management engaged in project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rob DeGraff is a temporary employee (1 year contract) and Dale Himes is permanent.</li> <li>• Addition of Bart Gernhart as co-director</li> <li>• Don Wagner appears to have more delegated project management responsibility/decision making expectations than Matt Garrett due to DOT structural differences.</li> <li>• John Rosenberger primarily assigned to this project for the next year, whereas John Conrad has multiple projects and is permanent.</li> <li>• Counterpart to Paula Hammond (Chief of Staff) in ODOT?</li> <li>• Amy Echols's role/ODOT counterpart?</li> </ul>
<b>Commission Structure &amp; Purview</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both DOT commissions involved in project/participating on Joint Subcommittee.</li> <li>• Authority on policy decisions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WSDOT TC typically involved in more policy decisions. Legislature provides funding and input on projects.</li> <li>• WSDOT TC is separate from DOT. Has its own budget and staff. No direct oversight of DOT management.</li> <li>• ODOT TC typically more involved in project decisions as well as policy.</li> </ul>



	Agreement	Discrepancies
<b>COMMUNICATION</b>		
<b>Internal</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communication protocol to project teams unclear.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communication to senior leadership and commissions different due to DOT structures.</li> </ul>
<b>Between DOTS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communication regarding project technical decisions from the regional coordinating committee unclear.</li> </ul>	
<b>Stakeholders / Partners</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communication protocol to stakeholders and partners is unclear.</li> </ul>	





	Agreement	Discrepancies
<b>FUTURE ITEMS NEEDING RESOLUTION</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Agree on a project direction.</li><li>• How the DOTs will work together.</li><li>• Roles and responsibilities.</li><li>• How to make and communicate decisions more effectively.</li><li>• How to resolve differences as they occur.</li><li>• Develop one project team.</li><li>• Involving external partners, stakeholders and the public.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Future funding decisions and financial responsibilities.</li><li>• Lead agency identification</li><li>• Timing of developing one project team.</li><li>• Agreement on what technical information is needed to complete current phase.</li></ul>

