

# **PROJECT MANAGEMENT PLAN**

**I-82**

**South Union Gap Interchange-  
Improvement Study  
(Access Point Decision Report)**



**September 2005**

Washington State Department of Transportation  
South Central Region  
Project Development Office

# **WORK PLAN**

**I-82**

## **South Union Gap Interchange- Improvement Study (Access Point Decision Report)**

### **Project Initiation & Team Alignment**



**September 2005**

Washington State Department of Transportation  
South Central Region  
Project Development Office

---

# WORK PLAN

---

*Initiate and Align is the first step in the WSDOT project management process and the first element of the Project Management Plan. This first step builds the team and focuses them on a common project goal.*

## **Project Description:**

*The project description defines the purpose & need for the project as stated on the Project Definition.*

The current configuration of the South Union Gap Interchange does not meet travel demand due to lack of traffic movements to the surrounding roadway systems; it is not a full service interchange. The following is a table of the deficient movements:

- Traffic traveling Westbound on I-82 cannot shift to Southbound SR 97
- There is no exit for Eastbound to I-82 access Main Street in South Union Gap
- Northbound SR 97 traffic cannot transfer to Eastbound I-82
- Main Street in South Union Gap has no access to Westbound I-82.

The Purpose of this project is to design an improved interchange configuration at South Union Gap that will provide all of the traffic movements needed and incorporate the planned beltway linking the Yakima Airport with Union Gap. A successful design will improve the access to and from I-82, improve connections to the local roadway system including the planned beltway, increase capacity, relieve congestion at the Valley Mall Interchange and separate truck traffic from the general commute.

Federal law, FHWA policies, and WSDOT policies require a formal request, or “Access Point Decision Report” for new or revised access points on the Interstate System. WSDOT, in concert with the City of Union Gap and the Yakima Valley Conference of Governments will perform the Interchange Improvement Study, produce the Access Point Decision Report for the proposed interchange modifications, and submit the APDR to the FHWA for consideration.

## **Project Scope:**

The scope of this Work Plan extends from the endorsement of the Project Management Plan to the receipt of the “Finding of Engineering and Operational Acceptability” from FHWA for the South Union Gap Interchange APDR.

## **Team Mission/Assignment:**

*Describe what the team is expected to accomplish.*

The Team Mission is to obtain, interpret, and assemble data to support modifications to the South Union Gap Interchange, prepare, and submit an Access Point Decision Report thoroughly addressing all requirements of the FHWA.

**Identify the Need** - Use existing data and analysis methods to identify and document the need for an improved interchange in this area.

- Coordinate with City, County, Yakama Nation, State and Federal officials
- Research existing alignments.
- Collect and analyze current traffic data.
- Analyze accident data.
- Perform segment analysis of existing alignments.
- Research environmental constraints and opportunities.

**Determine Options that meet the Need** - Produce Access Point Decision Report and supporting documentation consistent with recommended options.

- Evaluate all reasonable options.
- Are proposed options compatible with regional transportation plans?
- Are proposed options consistent with proposed area land use?
- Verify that all options meet full design standards.
- Will new access point(s) adversely affect the operation and safety of the Interstate system?
- Is future community development designed to coordinate with the proposed Interstate system?
- Track the status of Planning and preliminary Environmental documents.
- Research & document environmental constraints and opportunities to the maximum extent practical.

**FHWA Review** - State Design Engineer submits the APDR to FHWA for Approval.

- The APDR is reviewed by the State Access and Hearings Engineer.
- The State Design Engineer reviews the APDR.
- The “*Finding of Engineering and Operational Acceptability*” is submitted by the FHWA

***Which phase of the project are you assigned? (Check the phase that applies for the team you are initiating for this effort)***

APDR

Pre-Construction

Construction

**Team Identification:**

*The project team consists of the project manager, design team members, specialty groups (Real Estate Services, Environmental, Traffic, etc.), consultants, and other organizations or agencies that need to be involved in the development of the project. All groups must be involved in work planning, schedule development and maintenance, and endorsement of the project management plan.*

**Who should be involved? (Rearrange as applicable)**

**Major involvement:**

Environmental Office

Transportation Data Office  
Photogrammetry  
Bridge and Structures Office  
Geotechnical Services  
SCR Hydraulics  
Yakima County  
City of Yakima  
City of Union Gap  
Maintenance

**Minor involvement:**

Real Estate Services  
SCR Traffic Office  
Utilities  
Right of Way  
Program Management  
Yakima County Flood Control District

**Roles & Responsibilities:**

*Role is the specific title or position occupied; such as designer, office engineer, CAD operator. Responsibility is what the person or group is going to do and what product is expected; such as schedules, plan sheets, analysis, reports, etc. Identify all team members for your project; what is their role and what is their responsibility?*

**Project Team -**

**Project Sponsor:** George Hilsinger, P.E., A.R.A for Project Development, is the Project Sponsor. He provides leadership and oversight for delivery of the Region Project Development Program.

**Project Manager:** Troy Suing, P.E., Project Development Office Engineer, is the Engineer of Record for the Interchange Improvement Study. He will act as liaison between the Project Design Team and the Project Sponsor / Stakeholders / Customers. He will also work with the State Access and Hearings Engineer, Assistant State Design Engineer, Federal Highways Administration and the Yakima Valley Conference of Governments, to resolve any issues or roadblocks, provide guidance and advice, maintain the direction and productivity of the team, and oversee the project scope, schedule and budget.

**Assistant Project Manager:** Jeff Minnick, P.E., Assistant Project Development Office Engineer, will contact specialty groups providing technical data, provide guidance and advice, review draft material, and perform the functions of the Project Manager in his absence.

**Squad C Leader:** John Tevis will provide technical advice and assistance to team members and specialty groups. John will act as liaison with the specialty groups, and provide them with the appropriate project information. He will also report team concerns to the Project Manager, maintain productivity of the team, provide design oversight, and update the team on decisions / recommendations of management.

**Team Leader:** Ron Burke, the project designer, will coordinate project team operations, incorporate products from specialty groups into the Interchange Improvement Study and supporting documents, coordinate scheduling and maintain

the PDIS files. Ron will provide design guidance, ensuring the study meets Federal Highway Administration and State Design Manual requirements.

**Team Members:** All members of the team are responsible for ensuring that the study meets the requirements of the Federal Highways Administration and the State Design Manual. Team members' will:

- Assist with the preparation of Estimates, and Technical Writing.
- Assist with the preparation of the Base Map, Plans, and Displays.
- Help prepare sections of the study and bring concerns and observations to the Squad or Team leaders.
- Provide information, as directed by John Tevis and Ron Burke, to the specialty groups.

### **SCR Specialty Groups –**

*Specialty groups providing products and services critical to project delivery.*

**SCR Environmental:** Preparation of an ERS and early environmental documentation consistent with a Preliminary Engineering/Scoping level effort.

*Specialty groups providing preliminary project support:*

**SCR Hydraulics:** Practical approach(s) to drainage solutions.

**SCR Maintenance:** Field review.

**SCR Program Management:** Confirm programmed funds and track project funding and expenditures.

**SCR Real Estate Services:** Obtain Right of entry and perform a scoping level Right of Way cost estimate.

**SCR Traffic:** Traffic study assistance.

**SCR Utilities:** Existing utilities documentation.

### **HQ Specialty Groups -**

*Specialty groups providing products and services critical to project delivery.*

**HQ Traffic Data Office:** Collect, process and analyze the project data within Scope, Schedule and Budget.

*Specialty groups providing preliminary project support:*

**HQ Bridge & Structures:** Scoping level estimate of new structure(s) costs.

**HQ Geotechnical Services:** Scoping level site assessment.

### **Local Agency Specialty Groups -**

*Specialty groups providing preliminary project support:*

**City of Yakima:** Traffic data, city planning data, etc.

**Yakima County:** Traffic data, city planning data, etc.

**City of Union Gap:** Traffic data, city planning data, etc.

**Yakima County flood Control Zone District:** As needed

## Measures of Success:

*Measures of Success describe what the team must accomplish for this project to be successful. For example: A set of Plans, Specifications, & Estimates delivered to the Plans Review office on the desired date.*

- Maintain an overall open, effective and timely communication within the team, with sponsors, other agencies, stakeholders, and the public.
- Develop a clear understanding of the City of Union Gap and the Yakama Nation growth management plan(s), and directly relate them to the Interchange Improvement Study.
- Conduct a professional, unbiased, and impartial traffic study (*Operational Analysis*) of the mainline, ramps, and off-system intersections of I-82 at Exit 37, including on and off connections to SR 97.
- Develop an APDR that meets Local agency, Regional, Headquarters and FHWA approval.
- Preferred alternative design cutoff date, April 10, 2006.
- Target date for receiving the “Finding of Engineering and Operational Acceptability” letter from the FHWA is July 2007.

## Critical Milestones:

*The project team tracks major milestones, which provide an overview and status to the WSDOT Management & Project Team, Legislature, and the public.*

*Select the major milestones that apply:*

|  | <i>Date:</i>  |
|--|---------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Begin Preliminary Engineering ( <i>Major Milestone</i> )       | July 25, 2005 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Begin Interchange Improvement Study                            | Oct. 28, 2005 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Begin Access Point Decision Report                             | May 5, 2006   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Receive “Finding of Engineering and Operational Acceptability” | July 31, 2007 |

*These milestones are included in the Master Deliverables List and must be tracked in the project schedule. See the Project Control and Reporting Guide (PCRG) for major milestone definitions and guidelines. The PCRG can be found at: [www.wsdot.wa.gov/ProjectReporting/appendix D](http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/ProjectReporting/appendix D)*

## Boundaries:

*Boundaries define the limit of the team’s decision-making authority and are useful for identifying potential risks or change. Boundaries may include:*

- **Project limits** – I-82, MP 37.00 to MP 38.48
- **Funding limits** - Restrict charges to those consistent with an APDR.
- **Legal and Regulatory** – ERS & preliminary environmental documentation.
- **Scheduled delivery date:** July 31, 2007

## **Operating Guidelines:**

*Operating guidelines describe how the team will govern itself.*

### ***Team decision-making process:***

- Contribute, and listen to the contributions of others with respect.
- Accept Squad Leaders decision on Controversial issues.

### ***Team meetings:***

- Design Team will meet monthly to review project status, progress and manage change.

### ***Communication:***

- Communicate changes in a timely manner.
- Early & Continued communication between Team members (internal and external).

### ***Manage team change:***

- Resolve schedule and design conflicts.



**PROJECT RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN**

**Project Title** South Union Gap Interchange - (I3) Improvements

**Project PIN #** 508201S

**Date** 9/22/2005

**Project Mngr** Troy Suing, P.E.

**Telephone Number** (509) 577-1703

| PROJECT RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN |                     |      |                          |                       |                                    |  |  |                           |             |           |                   |            |   |                           |  |                                    |                                  |
|------------------------------|---------------------|------|--------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|---------------------------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|------------|---|---------------------------|--|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Priority                     | Risk Identification |      |                          |                       |                                    |  | Qualitative Analysis   |                           |             |           | Response Strategy |            |   | Monitoring and Tracking   |  |                                    |                                  |
|                              | Status              | ID # | Date Identified          | Functional Assignment | Threat/Opportunity Event           | SMART Column   | Risk Trigger   | Type                      | Probability | Impact    | Risk Matrix       | Strategy   | Response Actions including advantages and disadvantages   | Affected Project Activity | Responsibility (Task Manager)                        | Status Interval or Milestone Check | Date, Status and Review Comments |
| (1)                          | (2)                 | (3)  | (4)                      | (5)                   | (6)                                | (7)  | (8)  | (9)                       | (10)        | (11)      | (12)              | (13)       | (14)  | (15)                      | (16)   | (17)                               | (18)                             |
| X                            | Dormant             |      | 9/19/2005<br>Scoping     | Design                | Threat: Design Funding Withdrawn   | Funding may be affected due to political issues within and outside of the State of Washington (Hurricane Katrina)-funding will need to be found or project shelved.  | If the Federal Government (act of Congress) withdraws funding to rebuild storm damage. | Schedule<br>Cost          | Low         | Very High |                   | Acceptance | Monitoring of funding by Program Management   |                           | Todd Trepanier                                       |                                    |                                  |
| X                            | Dormant             |      | 9/19/2005<br>Scoping     | Design                | Threat: Old Bridges                | Time sensitive budget, sensitive decision to remove (delayed decision) Functionally Obsolete 1941 and 1981 (need to verify data). If more than 50 yrs old, need to consult the HAER registry for historical eligibility. | If old bridges need to be modified or replaced.  | Scope<br>Schedule<br>Cost | High        | Low       |                   | Mitigation | Have to accommodate pedestrians with alternative.   |                           | Troy Suing   |                                    |                                  |
|                              | Dormant             |      | 9/22/2005<br>Design/PS&E | Design                | Threat: Design Issues              | Depending on the preferred alternative chosen, design issues such as geotechnical, hydraulic, hydrologic, etc. may be greater in cost and design time.   | Selected preferred alternative   | Schedule<br>Schedule      | Very High   | Very High |                   | Mitigation | Mitigate through design.  |                           | Troy Suing   |                                    |                                  |
| X                            | Dormant             |      | 9/22/2005<br>Design/PS&E | Design                | Threat: Accelerated Ad date.       | Ad date may be accelerated if funding sources are required in a certain biennium.  | Program Management   | Schedule<br>Cost          | Moderate    | Very High |                   | Mitigation | Use consultants, additional in-house resources, anticipate an early Ad date.  |                           | Troy Suing, Todd Trepanier                           |                                    |                                  |
| X                            | Dormant             |      | 9/19/2005<br>Scoping     | Design                | Threat: Reservation Lands          | Having to deal with Tribal Groups, gaining concurrences on design decisions.   | If project encroaches on Reservation Lands.  | Cost<br>Scope<br>Schedule | Very High   | Very High |                   | Mitigation | Early and Often involvement with Yakama Nation.   |                           | Troy, Tribal Liaison (Scott Goldbeck), 106- Environ. |                                    |                                  |
| X                            | Dormant             |      | 9/22/2005<br>Scoping     | PS&E and Construction | Threat: Unit price increase        | Unit price increases due to fuel and production pricing increases.   | Country economic health.   | Cost                      | Very High   | Very High |                   | Mitigation | Monitor market fluctuations and overall conditions.   |                           | Troy Suing   |                                    |                                  |
| X                            | Dormant             |      | 9/19/2005<br>Scoping     | Design                | Threat: How to treat unstable hill | Alignment encroachment, decision to use contract dollars to stabilize hillside.  | If new alignments encroach on hill.  | Scope<br>Schedule<br>Cost | Moderate    | Moderate  |                   | Acceptance | Try to avoid with design. Accept the risk since it would come with its own funding. Already in unstable slope program. Redesign slope |                           | Troy, Todd, Ray                                      |                                    |                                  |

**PROJECT RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN**

**Project Title** South Union Gap Interchange - (I3) Improvements

**Project PIN #** 508201S

**Date** 9/22/2005

**Project Mngr** Troy Suing, P.E.

**Telephone Number** (509) 577-1703

| PROJECT RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN |                     |      |                                  |                          |  |  |   |                           |             |           |                   |            |  |                              |                                  |                                       |                                     |
|------------------------------|---------------------|------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|---|---------------------------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|------------|--|------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Priority                     | Risk Identification |      |                                  |                          |  |  | Qualitative Analysis  |                           |             |           | Response Strategy |            |  | Monitoring and Tracking      |                                  |                                       |                                     |
|                              | Status              | ID # | Date Identified<br>Project Phase | Functional<br>Assignment | Threat/Opportunity Event                                 | SMART Column   | Risk Trigger  | Type                      | Probability | Impact    | Risk Matrix       | Strategy   | Response Actions including<br>advantages and disadvantages                                     | Affected Project<br>Activity | Responsibility<br>(Task Manager) | Status Interval or<br>Milestone Check | Date, Status and Review<br>Comments |
| (1)                          | (2)                 | (3)  | (4)                              | (5)                      | (6)  | (7)  | (8)   | (9)                       | (10)        | (11)      | (12)              | (13)       | (14)   | (15)                         | (16)                             | (17)                                  | (18)                                |
| X                            | Active              |      | 9/19/2005<br>Scoping             | Design                   | Threat: Deviation for less than full service interchange | It is possible that some movements cannot be provided due to geographic conditions (rivers, railroad, practicality).                                     | Having a need for an interchange movement but not being able to provide it. APDR not accepted due to not meeting needs for I/c. | Scope                     | Low         | Very High |                   | Mitigation | Accommodate all movements in design.   |                              | Troy Suing                       |                                       |                                     |
| X                            | Active              |      | 9/22/2005<br>Scoping             | Design/Construction      | Threat: Shallow Water Table                              | This area has a shallow water table and could have a large impact to new utilities, existing utilities that have to be moved, and other design issues.   | Geotechnical boring log reports   | Schedule<br>Cost          | Very High   | Very High |                   | Mitigation | Monitoring the water table, try to avoid utility work. Wetland mitigation benefit for design.  |                              | Troy Suing                       |                                       |                                     |
| X                            | Active              |      | 9/19/2005<br>Scoping             | Design                   | Threat: High Voltage Power Lines                         | Failure to avoid poles or lines will necessitate negotiation with power company to mitigate damage.  | Probably the height of a fly-over or an alignment of the highway.   | Scope<br>Cost             | Very High   | Very High |                   | Mitigation | Early involvement.   |                              | Troy, Jamil                      |                                       |                                     |
| X                            | Active              |      | 9/19/2005<br>Scoping             | Design                   | Threat: Large Underground Fiber Optic Line               | Failure to avoid lines, or damage to lines by construction, will necessitate negotiation with fiber optic company.                                       | If any excavation encroaches on fiber optic lines.  | Scope<br>Schedule         | Very High   | Low       |                   | Mitigation | Early identification and scheduling. Work would have to be done with the job.                  |                              | Troy, Jamil                      |                                       |                                     |
| X                            | Dormant             |      | 9/19/2005<br>Scoping             | Design                   | Threat: Railroad   | Failure to avoid railroad will necessitate negotiation with the railroad company.  | If project encroaches on railroad or railroad Right of Way.   | Scope<br>Schedule<br>Cost | Very High   | Very High |                   | Mitigation | Right of Way issues, early involvement and accommodate schedule for agreements and permitting. |                              | Troy, Jamil, Larry               |                                       |                                     |
|                              | Dormant             |      | 9/22/2005                        |                          | Flood Control Zone District                              |  | Deposition zone because of dam, 100 year flood level.   |                           |             |           |                   |            |  |                              |                                  |                                       |                                     |
| N                            |                     |      | 9/22/2005<br>Design/PS&E         | All project phases       | Threat: Business/Community support                       | This project is under the support of the Trans-Action committee, therefore any new alternatives will have to be presented to that group for concurrence. | Selection of a preferred alternative  | Schedule                  | Low         | High      |                   | Mitigation | Adjust design and work with Trans-Action committee.  |                              | Troy Suing                       |                                       |                                     |

**PROJECT RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN**

Project Title South Union Gap Interchange - (I3) Improvements

Project PIN # 508201S

Date 9/22/2005

Project Mngr Troy Suing, P.E.

Telephone Number (509) 577-1703

| PROJECT RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN |                     |      |                               |                       |  |   |   |                      |             |           |             |                   |  |                           |   |                                    |                                  |
|------------------------------|---------------------|------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|--|---|---|----------------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|-------------------|--|---------------------------|---|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Priority                     | Risk Identification |      |                               |                       |  |   |   | Qualitative Analysis |             |           |             | Response Strategy |  |                           | Monitoring and Tracking                 |                                    |                                  |
|                              | Status              | ID # | Date Identified Project Phase | Functional Assignment | Threat/Opportunity Event                                 | SMART Column  | Risk Trigger  | Type                 | Probability | Impact    | Risk Matrix | Strategy          | Response Actions including advantages and disadvantages                          | Affected Project Activity | Responsibility (Task Manager)           | Status Interval or Milestone Check | Date, Status and Review Comments |
|                              | (1)                 | (2)  | (3)                           | (4)                   | (5)  | (6)   | (7)   | (8)                  | (9)         | (10)      | (11)        | (12)              | (13)   | (14)                      | (15)                                    | (16)                               | (17)                             |
| N                            |                     |      | 9/22/2005<br>Design/PS&E      | Design/Environmental  | Threat: Yakama Nation Fisheries Plan                     | Making sure that the preferred alternative has addressed any issues that may affect the Yakama Nation Fisheries Plan.   | If the preferred alternative has any impact on the Yakama Nation Fisheries Plan | Schedule<br>Cost     | Very High   | Very High |             | Mitigation        | Work with Yakama Naion early in the design process.                              |                           | Troy Suing, Scott Goldbeck, Gary Beeman |                                    |                                  |
| N                            |                     |      | 9/22/2005<br>Construction     | Construction          | Threat: Construction Funding                             | Construction Funding may be affected due to political issues within and outside of the State of Washington.   | Legislature   | Schedule<br>Cost     | Very High   | Very High |             | Acceptance        |  |                           |   |                                    |                                  |
| N                            | Retired             |      | 9/22/2005<br>Construction     | Construction          | Threat: Gas Tax getting rescinded                        | If the new gas tax is rescinded in November, the project may not have construction funding.   | New Gas Tax   | Cost                 | Very High   | Very High |             | Acceptance        |  |                           |   |                                    |                                  |
|                              |                     |      | 9/22/2005<br>Design/PS&E      | Design                | Opportunity: An APDR may not be required                 | Depending on the preferred alternative, an Access Point Decision Report may not be needed (if there are no new ramps and new access points are designed from existing connections). | HQ Access Office and FHWA   | Cost<br>Schedule     | Moderate    | Very High |             | Mitigation        | Communicate with Access Office and FHWA early in the design process.             |                           | Troy Suing, Darlene Sharar, FHWA        |                                    |                                  |
| N                            |                     |      | 9/22/2005<br>Design/PS&E      | Design                | Threat: Pedestrians and Bicyclists                       | Incorporating pedestrian and bike traffic into the interchange design may be complicated depending on the interchange alternative.  | Selection of the preferred alternative  | Cost                 | Very High   | Moderate  |             | Mitigation        | Accomplish through 4Fand 6F mitigation.  |                           | Troy Suing, Gary Beeman                 |                                    |                                  |
| N                            |                     |      | 9/22/2005                     |                       | Threat: Not able to secure agreements in a timely manner |   |   | Cost<br>Schedule     | Moderate    | Very High |             | Transference      | Early involvement and coordination of the Environmental and Real Estate Offices. |                           | Troy Suing, Gary Beeman, Larry Hook     |                                    |                                  |
| N                            |                     |      | 9/22/2005                     |                       |  |   |   |                      |             |           |             |                   |  |                           |   |                                    |                                  |

**PROJECT RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN**

| Priority | PROJECT RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN |      |                                  |                          |  |   |   |                           |             |           |             |                   |  |                              |  |                                       |                                     |
|----------|------------------------------|------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|---|---------------------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|-------------------|--|------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
|          | Risk Identification          |      |                                  |                          |  |   |   | Qualitative Analysis      |             |           |             | Response Strategy |  |                              | Monitoring and Tracking                                  |                                       |                                     |
|          | Status                       | ID # | Date Identified<br>Project Phase | Functional<br>Assignment | Threat/Opportunity Event                       | SMART Column  | Risk Trigger  | Type                      | Probability | Impact    | Risk Matrix | Strategy          | Response Actions including<br>advantages and disadvantages   | Affected Project<br>Activity | Responsibility<br>(Task Manager)                         | Status Interval or<br>Milestone Check | Date, Status and Review<br>Comments |
| (1)      | (2)                          | (3)  | (4)                              | (5)                      | (6)  | (7)   | (8)   | (9)                       | (10)        | (11)      | (12)        | (13)              | (14)   | (15)                         | (16)   | (17)                                  | (18)                                |
|          | Dormant                      |      | 9/19/2005<br>Scoping             | Design                   | Threat: Historic Mill                          | Historic Landmark that uses Wide Hollow Creek to produce a unique product. Is listed as a 4F area for fish habitat as well as historic status. Still in operation minus the wheel.  | If project encroaches on Mill or it's water source. | Scope<br>Schedule<br>Cost | High        | High      |             | Mitigation        | Address through 4F mitigation, possibly move structure (to AG museum).   |                              | Troy Suing, Gary Beeman                                  |                                       |                                     |
|          | Dormant                      |      | 9/19/2005<br>Scoping             | Design                   | Threat: Creek Channel Change                   | Wide Hollow Ck. and Ahtanum Ck., Risk from delayed decision to re-align Creek Channel, Environmental Challenges, Species Impacts, Wetlands, substantial permitting. Ahtanum Ck is the boundary of the reservation (north side). Ahtanum ck is designated as a steelhead habitat, etc. | If project encroaches on existing creek alignments. | Scope<br>Schedule<br>Cost | Very High   | Very High |             | Mitigation        | Early involvement of Yakama Nation, Environmental, etc., allow adequate time on schedule for permitting and studies. |                              | Troy Suing, Gary Beeman, Tribal Liaison (Scott Goldbeck) |                                       |                                     |
|          | Dormant                      |      | 9/19/2005<br>Scoping             | Design                   | Threat: Fulbright Park                         | Environmental time line, 4F (public owned) Permitting, mitigation.  | How does the preferred alternative affect the park? | Scope<br>Schedule<br>Cost | Very High   | Very High |             | Avoidance         | Early and Often involvement with Yakama Nation.  |                              | Troy Suing, Gary Beeman                                  |                                       |                                     |
|          | Active                       |      | 9/19/2005<br>Scoping             | Design                   | Threat: Environmental Impact Statement         | Efforts to mitigate to a lesser document fail, or negotiation with city doing an EIS fails.   | Failure to negotiate a lesser document.             | Scope<br>Schedule<br>Cost | Very High   | Very High |             | Acceptance        | Work with all of the affected agencies. Make accommodations in schedule.   |                              | Troy Suing, Gary Beeman                                  |                                       |                                     |
|          | Active                       |      | 9/22/2005<br>Design/PS&E         | Design                   | Threat: Lead time for Environmental Permitting |   |   | Scope<br>Schedule<br>Cost | Moderate    | Very High |             | Mitigation        | Early involvement and coordination with the Environmental Office.  |                              | Troy Suing, Gary Beeman                                  |                                       |                                     |
|          |                              |      |                                  |                          |  |   |   | Scope<br>Schedule<br>Cost |             |           |             |                   |  |                              |  |                                       |                                     |
|          |                              |      |                                  |                          |  |   |   | Scope<br>Schedule<br>Cost |             |           |             |                   |  |                              |  |                                       |                                     |

Project Title South Union Gap Interchange - (I3) Improvements

Project PIN # 508201S

Date 9/22/2005

Project Mngr Troy Suing, P.E.

Telephone Number (509) 577-1703

**PROJECT RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN**

| Priority | PROJECT RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN |      |                 |                       |                            |  |  |                      |             |          |             |                   |   |                           |                               |                                    |                                  |
|----------|------------------------------|------|-----------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|--|--|----------------------|-------------|----------|-------------|-------------------|---|---------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
|          | Risk Identification          |      |                 |                       |                            |  |  | Qualitative Analysis |             |          |             | Response Strategy |   |                           | Monitoring and Tracking       |                                    |                                  |
|          | Status                       | ID # | Date Identified | Functional Assignment | Threat/Opportunity Event   | SMART Column   | Risk Trigger   | Type                 | Probability | Impact   | Risk Matrix | Strategy          | Response Actions including advantages and disadvantages | Affected Project Activity | Responsibility (Task Manager) | Status Interval or Milestone Check | Date, Status and Review Comments |
| (1)      | (2)                          | (3)  | (4)             | (5)                   | (6)                        | (7)  | (8)  | (9)                  | (10)        | (11)     | (12)        | (13)              | (14)  | (15)                      | (16)                          | (17)                               | (18)                             |
|          | Dormant                      |      | 9/22/2005       | Design/Construction   | Threat: Existing Utilities | Depending on the alternative chosen, there could be greater utility impacts that affect cost and possibly the construction schedule. | Selected preferred alternative and the utility companies | Schedule             | High        | High     |             | Mitigation        |   |                           | Troy Suing/Jamil Anabtawi     |                                    |                                  |
|          |                              |      |                 |                       |                            |  |  | Scope                | Very High   | Moderate |             |                   |   |                           |                               |                                    |                                  |
|          |                              |      |                 |                       |                            |  |  | Scope                |             |          |             |                   |   |                           |                               |                                    |                                  |
|          |                              |      |                 |                       |                            |  |  | Schedule             |             |          |             |                   |   |                           |                               |                                    |                                  |
|          |                              |      |                 |                       |                            |  |  | Cost                 |             |          |             |                   |   |                           |                               |                                    |                                  |
|          |                              |      |                 |                       |                            |  |  | Scope                |             |          |             |                   |   |                           |                               |                                    |                                  |
|          |                              |      |                 |                       |                            |  |  | Schedule             |             |          |             |                   |   |                           |                               |                                    |                                  |
|          |                              |      |                 |                       |                            |  |  | Cost                 |             |          |             |                   |   |                           |                               |                                    |                                  |
|          |                              |      |                 |                       |                            |  |  | Scope                |             |          |             |                   |   |                           |                               |                                    |                                  |
|          |                              |      |                 |                       |                            |  |  | Schedule             |             |          |             |                   |   |                           |                               |                                    |                                  |
|          |                              |      |                 |                       |                            |  |  | Cost                 |             |          |             |                   |   |                           |                               |                                    |                                  |

Project Title South Union Gap Interchange - (I3) Improvements

Project PIN # 508201S

Date 9/22/2005

Project Mngr Troy Suing, P.E.

Telephone Number (509) 577-1703

**PROJECT RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN**

| Priority | PROJECT RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN |      |                 |                       |                                |  |  |                      |             |           |             |                   |   |                           |                               |                                    |                                  |
|----------|------------------------------|------|-----------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|----------------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|-------------------|---|---------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
|          | Risk Identification          |      |                 |                       |                                |  |  | Qualitative Analysis |             |           |             | Response Strategy |   |                           | Monitoring and Tracking       |                                    |                                  |
|          | Status                       | ID # | Date Identified | Functional Assignment | Threat/Opportunity Event       | SMART Column   | Risk Trigger                                       | Type                 | Probability | Impact    | Risk Matrix | Strategy          | Response Actions including advantages and disadvantages | Affected Project Activity | Responsibility (Task Manager) | Status Interval or Milestone Check | Date, Status and Review Comments |
| (1)      | (2)                          | (3)  | (4)             | (5)                   | (6)                            | (7)  | (8)  | (9)                  | (10)        | (11)      | (12)        | (13)              | (14)  | (15)                      | (16)                          | (17)                               | (18)                             |
|          | Dormant                      |      | 9/22/2005       | Real Estate Services  | Threat: Right of Way purchases | If any parcels go into condemnation, early Right of Way purchases may have to wait until construction. | Property owners and businesses in the design area. | Schedule             | Very High   | Very High |             | Acceptance        | Early acquisition is not an option.                     |                           | Troy Suing, Larry Hook        |                                    |                                  |
|          |                              |      |                 |                       |                                |  |  | Scope                | Very High   | Moderate  |             |                   |   |                           |                               |                                    |                                  |
|          |                              |      |                 |                       |                                |  |  | Scope                |             |           |             |                   |   |                           |                               |                                    |                                  |
|          |                              |      |                 |                       |                                |  |  | Schedule             |             |           |             |                   |   |                           |                               |                                    |                                  |
|          |                              |      |                 |                       |                                |  |  | Cost                 |             |           |             |                   |   |                           |                               |                                    |                                  |
|          |                              |      |                 |                       |                                |  |  | Scope                |             |           |             |                   |   |                           |                               |                                    |                                  |
|          |                              |      |                 |                       |                                |  |  | Schedule             |             |           |             |                   |   |                           |                               |                                    |                                  |
|          |                              |      |                 |                       |                                |  |  | Cost                 |             |           |             |                   |   |                           |                               |                                    |                                  |
|          |                              |      |                 |                       |                                |  |  | Scope                |             |           |             |                   |   |                           |                               |                                    |                                  |
|          |                              |      |                 |                       |                                |  |  | Schedule             |             |           |             |                   |   |                           |                               |                                    |                                  |
|          |                              |      |                 |                       |                                |  |  | Cost                 |             |           |             |                   |   |                           |                               |                                    |                                  |

# **CHANGE MANAGEMENT PLAN**

**I-82**

## **South Union Gap Interchange- Improvement Study (Access Point Decision Report)**

### **Project Initiation & Team Alignment**



**September 2005**

Washington State Department of Transportation  
South Central Region  
Project Development Office

---

# CHANGE MANAGEMENT PLAN

---

During the Access Point Decision Report for the South Union Gap Interchange Improvement Study, there will be change to the study's scope, schedule, and/or budget. The source of change may be internal or external. The project team will initiate internal change. Stakeholders, customers, specialty groups and consultants will initiate external change.

Whether the effects of changes are positive or negative, acknowledging and managing change during the project is a critical factor of success. Managing change will require planning, discipline, and communication among the project team members, their customers, and stakeholders. As the Change Management Plan is executed, the following should occur:

- Improved communication with, and between, customers, suppliers and stakeholders.
- A reduced potential for conflicts that can delay or increase the cost of project delivery.
- Improved utilization of financial and other resources.
- Enhanced project teamwork and team performance.

The following defines the plan this Team will use to Manage Change.

## Documentation of Change

All project change will be documented in a Change Log (see K:/Change Log.xls). The Change Log is a notebook containing change log sheets, backup documents, and any Project Control Forms needed for the project. The change log entries provide a continuous record of project changes for use during the project, and later filed with the project documentation.

All Change Log entries will have the following fields:

**Change #:** All changes will be given a sequential number with the first being #1.

**Change Description:** Describe the change, including why it happened.

**Type of Change:** Is the change a scope change, a schedule change and/or a Budget change.

**Action Items:** What are the action items that need to take place?

**Who?:** Who is responsible for completing the action item(s)?

**When?:** When is the action item planned to be completed?

**PCF #:** If needed, (Project Control Forms) are numbered and that number is documented here.

*Support groups will decide if each change is significant enough to be reported to the Project manager. The Project Manager will start a Change Log entry for every change reported to him. If the Project Manager believes that the change requires Region approval, the change will be brought before region management. If region management believes that the change requires Headquarters' approval, a Change Management Form will be filled out, approved by Program Management, and brought before Headquarters' management.*

*The link to the Change Management Form is:*

[http://wwwi.wsdot.wa.gov/ProjectReporting/PCR\\_Links.htm#PCF](http://wwwi.wsdot.wa.gov/ProjectReporting/PCR_Links.htm#PCF)



# **COMMUNICATION PLAN**

**I-82**

## **South Union Gap Interchange- Improvement Study (Access Point Decision Report)**

### **Project Team & Specialty Groups**



**September 2005**

Washington State Department of Transportation  
South Central Region  
Project Development Office

---

# COMMUNICATION PLAN

---

The Communication Plan for the project consists of two categories, External and Internal Communication. External and Internal participants in the project acknowledge that the project vision and mission will not/cannot be realized without the timely and accurate exchange of information and understanding.

In order to assure successful delivery of this project, it will be necessary for the Project Team to accurately inform each other of updates, timelines, and of their needs. Conversely, “Specialty Groups” the suppliers of deliverables, will need to keep the Project Team informed of their needs and provide timely updates to the status of their respective deliverables. We also recognize that effective communication demands effective listening and viewing project decisions from our customer’s perspective.

The list below identifies the involved entity, the deliverable, the primary contact, how and when information moves and meetings are scheduled.

## **External Communication**

The timely and meaningful exchange of information to external customers, suppliers, specialty groups and stakeholders is critical to project approval.

The following is a list of project related meetings that will be required to complete the Interchange Improvement Study:

- FHWA District Engineer / Project Team
  - *Purpose:* To provide FHWA with project specific data, and to receive APDR recommendations and guidance.
  - *Who:* Bryan Dillon / George Hilsinger, Troy Suing, Jeff Minnick, John Tevis and/or Ron Burke
  - *When:* When Needed
  
- City of Union Gap / Project Team
  - *Purpose:* To update the City of Union Gap and Management Team of current project status as relating to information needs, level of completion and needed guidance.
  - *Who:* Dennis Henne / Troy Suing, Jeff Minnick, John Tevis and/or Ron Burke
  - *When:* When needed
  
- Yakima County / Project Team
  - *Purpose:* To update Yakima County and Management Team of current project status as relating to information needs, level of completion and needed guidance.
  - *Who:* Gary Ekstedt / Troy Suing, Jeff Minnick, John Tevis and/or Ron Burke
  - *When:* When Needed

- Yakima County Flood Control District / Project Team
  - *Purpose:* To update Yakima County Flood Control District and Management Team of current project status as relating to information needs, level of completion and needed guidance.
  - *Who:* Joe Frudenthal / Troy Suing, Jeff Minnick, John Tevis and/or Ron Burke
  - *When:* When Needed
  
- Yakama Nation Indian Reservation / Project Team
  - *Purpose:* To update the Yakama Nation and Management Team of current project status as relating to information needs, level of completion and needed guidance.
  - *Who:* Derold Ortloff / Troy Suing, Jeff Minnick, John Tevis and/or Ron Burke
  - *When:* When Needed
  
- City of Yakima / Project Team
  - *Purpose:* To update the City of Yakima and Management Team of current project status as relating to information needs, level of completion and needed guidance.
  - *Who:* K.W. Adams, Joan Davenport / Troy Suing, Jeff Minnick, John Tevis and/or Ron Burke
  - *When:* When needed
  
- HQ Hearings and Access Engineer / Project Team
  - *Purpose:* To provide the Access Engineer with project specific data and to receive APDR recommendations and guidance.
  - *Who:* Darlene Sharar / George Hilsinger, Troy Suing, Jeff Minnick, John Tevis and/or Ron Burke
  - *When:* When Needed
  
- HQ Bridge and Structures Office / Project Team
  - *Purpose:* To provide the Bridge Office with project specific data and to receive guidance.
  - *Who:* J.A. Weigel / George Hilsinger, Troy Suing, Jeff Minnick, John Tevis and/or Ron Burke
  - *When:* When Needed
  
- HQ TDO Travel Analysis Branch Manager / SCR Specialty Groups / Project Team
  - *Purpose:* To inform TDO of specific project needs.
  - *Who:* Dave Bushnell, John Bump / Rick Gifford, Jim Mahugh, Corey Hert, Gary Beeman, Jason Smith, Troy Suing, Jeff Minnick, John Tevis and/or Ron Burke
  - *When:* First meeting took place July 13, 2005. (No other meetings scheduled.)
  
- HQ Geotechnical Services Division/ Project Team
  - *Purpose:* To perform a scoping level field review of the Interchange Improvement Study's proposed interchange footprint options.

- *Who:* Tim Allen, Jim Cuthbertson/ Troy Suing, Jeff Minnick, John Tevis and/or Ron Burke
- *When:* When Needed

### **Internal Communication**

Effective internal communication is open, honest and continuous.

- SCR Environmental Office / Project Team
  - *Purpose:* Preparation of Preliminary N.E.P.A. documentation consistent with a Preliminary Engineering/Scoping level effort.
  - *Who:* Gary Beeman, Jason Smith, Larry Mattson / Troy Suing, Jeff Minnick, John Tevis and/or Ron Burke
  - *When:* When Needed
- SCR Hydraulics Engineer / Project Team
  - *Purpose:* To provide the Hydraulics Engineer with project specific data and to receive guidance.
  - *Who:* Julie Heilman-Suarez / Troy Suing, Jeff Minnick, John Tevis and/or Ron Burke
  - *When:* When Needed
- SCR Maintenance Engineer / Project Team
  - *Purpose:* To provide the Maintenance Engineer with project specific data and to receive guidance.
  - *Who:* Casey McGill / Troy Suing, Jeff Minnick, John Tevis and/or Ron Burke
  - *When:* When Needed
- SCR Program Management / Project Team
  - *Purpose:* Confirm program funds are consistent with project scope and schedule. Manage and track project funding and expenditures.
  - *Who:* Todd Trepanier / Troy Suing, Jeff Minnick, John Tevis and/or Ron Burke
  - *When:* When Needed
- SCR Real Estate Services / Project Team
  - *Purpose:* To obtain right of entries and perform a scoping level estimate of property values if needed.
  - *Who:* Larry Hook, Bill Hicks/ Troy Suing, Jeff Minnick, John Tevis and/or Ron Burke
  - *When:* When Needed
- SCR Traffic Office / Project Team
  - *Purpose:* To update the Traffic Office on project status. Receive recommendations and guidance on future efforts.
  - *Who:* Rick Gifford, Jim Mahugh, Corey Hert / Troy Suing, Jeff Minnick, John Tevis and/or Ron Burke
  - *When:* When Needed

- SCR Utilities Engineer / Project Team
  - *Purpose:* To provide the Utilities Engineer with project specific data and to receive guidance.
  - *Who:* Jamil Anabtawi / Troy Suing, Jeff Minnick, John Tevis and/or Ron Burke
  - *When:* When Needed
  
- SCR Pre-Contract Activity Meeting (Region Staff): “Confidence Report”
  - *Purpose:* Update Region Management on project status and change.
  - *Who:* Project Manager and Regional staff.
  - *When:* Monthly

**Team Endorsement Statement**

“We approve this Project Management Plan, and are committed to actively supporting it. We accept responsibility for fulfilling every aspect of the plan that applies to us, including providing resources, actively participating, and effectively communicating. We know what to do, and are prepared to act. Our endorsement is an active and positive statement that we are committed to fulfilling the responsibilities as designated.”

**Project Team Members**

- \_\_\_\_\_ George Hilsinger, (Project Sponsor)  
A.R.A. for Development
  
- \_\_\_\_\_ Troy Suing, (Project Manager)  
Development Branch Project Engineer
  
- \_\_\_\_\_ Jeff Minnick, (Assistant Project Manager)  
Asst. Development Branch Project Engineer
  
- \_\_\_\_\_ John Tevis, (Squad C Leader)
  
- \_\_\_\_\_ Ron Burke, (Design Team Leader)
  
- \_\_\_\_\_ Jeanine Riley, (Design Team Member)

**SCR Specialty Group Managers**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Gary Beeman, Environmental Program Manager

**HQ Specialty Group Managers**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Dave Bushnell, TDO Travel Analysis Branch Manager