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*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
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:

- Begin Preliminary Engineering *(Major Milestone)*  
  Date: July 25, 2005
- Begin Interchange Improvement Study  
  Date: Oct. 28, 2005
- Begin Access Point Decision Report  
  Date: May 5, 2006
- Receive “Finding of Engineering and Operational Acceptability”  
  Date: 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: wwwi.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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Identification</th>
<th>Qualitative Analysis</th>
<th>Response Strategy</th>
<th>Monitoring and Tracking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Threat: Design Funding Withdrawn</strong></td>
<td><strong>Type</strong>: Schedule</td>
<td><strong>Probability</strong>: Low</td>
<td><strong>Impact</strong>: Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong>: Cost</td>
<td><strong>Risk Multiplier</strong>: Acceptance</td>
<td><strong>Response Strategy</strong>: Monitoring of funding by Program Management</td>
<td><strong>Monitoring and Tracking</strong>: Todd Trepanier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Threat: Old Bridges</strong></td>
<td><strong>Type</strong>: Scope</td>
<td><strong>Probability</strong>: High</td>
<td><strong>Impact</strong>: Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong>: Cost</td>
<td><strong>Risk Multiplier</strong>: Mitigation</td>
<td><strong>Response Strategy</strong>: None to accommodate preferences with alternative</td>
<td><strong>Monitoring and Tracking</strong>: Troy Suing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Threat: Design Issues</strong></td>
<td><strong>Type</strong>: Schedule</td>
<td><strong>Probability</strong>: Very High</td>
<td><strong>Impact</strong>: High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong>: Schedule</td>
<td><strong>Risk Multiplier</strong>: Mitigation</td>
<td><strong>Response Strategy</strong>: Mitigate through design</td>
<td><strong>Monitoring and Tracking</strong>: Troy Suing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Threat: Accelerated Ad date</strong></td>
<td><strong>Type</strong>: Program Management</td>
<td><strong>Probability</strong>: Moderate</td>
<td><strong>Impact</strong>: Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong>: Cost</td>
<td><strong>Risk Multiplier</strong>: Mitigation</td>
<td><strong>Response Strategy</strong>: Use consultants, additional in-house resources, anticipate an early Ad date</td>
<td><strong>Monitoring and Tracking</strong>: Troy Suing, Todd Trepanier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Threat: Reservation Lands</strong></td>
<td><strong>Type</strong>: Scope</td>
<td><strong>Probability</strong>: Very High</td>
<td><strong>Impact</strong>: Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong>: Cost</td>
<td><strong>Risk Multiplier</strong>: Mitigation</td>
<td><strong>Response Strategy</strong>: Early and Often involvement with Yakama Nation</td>
<td><strong>Monitoring and Tracking</strong>: Troy, Tribal Liaison (Scott Goldbeck), 106-Environ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Threat: Unit price increase</strong></td>
<td><strong>Type</strong>: Cost</td>
<td><strong>Probability</strong>: Very High</td>
<td><strong>Impact</strong>: Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong>: Cost</td>
<td><strong>Risk Multiplier</strong>: Mitigation</td>
<td><strong>Response Strategy</strong>: Monitor market fluctuations and overall conditions</td>
<td><strong>Monitoring and Tracking</strong>: Troy Suing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Threat: How to treat unstable hill</strong></td>
<td><strong>Type</strong>: Scope</td>
<td><strong>Probability</strong>: Moderate</td>
<td><strong>Impact</strong>: Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong>: Cost</td>
<td><strong>Risk Multiplier</strong>: Acceptance</td>
<td><strong>Response Strategy</strong>: Try to avoid with design, Accept the risk since it would come with its own funding already in available slope program, Redesign slope</td>
<td><strong>Monitoring and Tracking</strong>: Troy, Todd, Ray</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 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

### Status
Active

### Date Identified
9/19/2005

### Project Phase
Design

### Functional Area
Design/Construc.

### Threat/Opportunity Event
Design: Deviation for less than full service interchange

### SMART Column
Possible that some movements cannot be provided due to geographic conditions (rivers, railroad, predictably). Having a need for an interchange movement but not being able to provide. APDR not accepted due to rail crossing needs for I-3.

### Risk Trigger
Scope

### Type
Low

### Probability
Very High

### Impact
VL

### Risk Matrix
VL L M H VH

### Strategy
Mitigation

### Response Actions (including advantages and disadvantages)
Accommodate all movements in design.

### Affected Project Activity
Design/PS&E

### Responsibility Task Manager
Troy Suing

### Status Interval or Milestone Check
9/19/2005

### Date, Status and Review Comments
9/19/2005

### Design/Construc.

### Impact
Mitigation

### Mitigation
Monitoring the water table, try to avoid water work. Winland mitigation benefit for design.

### Schedule
High

### Cost
Dormant

### Design Threat: Railroad

### Failure to avoid railroad or alignment of the highway. Project encroaches on railroad or railroad Right of Way.

### Design Threat: Large Underground Fiber Optic Line

### Failure to avoid lines or damage to lines by construction, will necessitate negotiation with fiber optic company to mitigate damage.

### Design Threat: High Voltage Power Lines

### Failure to avoid poles or lines will necessitate negotiation with power company, to mitigate damage. Probabilty the height of a fly over or an alignment of the highway.

### Design Threat: Deviation for less than full service interchange

### It is possible that some movements cannot be provided due to geographic conditions (rivers, railroad, predictably). Having a need for an interchange movement but not being able to provide. APDR not accepted due to rail crossing needs for I-3.

### Design Threat: Flood Control Zone District Deposition zone because of dam, 100 year flood level. Dormant

### All project phases

### Threat: Business/Community support

### The project is under the support of the Trans-Action committee, therefore any new alternatives will have to be presented to that group for approval.

### Design/PS&E

### Selection of a preferred alternative

### Low

### High

### Monitoring and Tracking

### Rights of Way issues, early involvement and accommodate schedule for agreements and permitting.

### Troy, Jamil, Larry

### Monitoring the water table, try to avoid water work. Winland mitigation benefit for design.

### Troy Suing

### Troy, Jamil

### Accommodate all movements in design.

### Troy Suing

### Troy, Jamil, Larry

### Troy Suing
## Project Risk Management Plan

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

### Project PIN #
508201S

### Date
9/22/2005

### Project Mgr
Troy Suing, P.E.

### Telephone Number
(509) 577-1703

### Risk Identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Identified</th>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Functional Assignment</th>
<th>Threat/Opportunity Event</th>
<th>Risk Trigger</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Risk Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/22/2005</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Design/PS&amp;E</td>
<td>Opportunity: An APDR may not be required</td>
<td>HQ Access Office and FHWA</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Mitigation: Communicate with Access Office and FHWA early in the design process.</td>
<td>Troy Suing, Darlene Sharar, FHWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/22/2005</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Design/PS&amp;E</td>
<td>Threat: Pedestrians and Bicyclists</td>
<td>Selection of the preferred alternative</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Mitigation: Accomplish through 4F and 6F mitigation</td>
<td>Troy Suing, Gary Beeman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/22/2005</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Design/PS&amp;E</td>
<td>Threat: Not able to secure agreements in a timely manner</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Transfer of and Real Estate Office</td>
<td>Troy Suing, Gary Beeman, Larry Hook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Date Identified</td>
<td>Task Assignment</td>
<td>Functional Assignment</td>
<td>Threat/Opportunity Event</td>
<td>SMART Column</td>
<td>Risk Trigger</td>
<td>Probability</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormant</td>
<td>9/19/2005</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic Mill</td>
<td></td>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormant</td>
<td>9/19/2005</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td>Creek Channel Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormant</td>
<td>9/19/2005</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fulbright Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>9/22/2005</td>
<td>Design/P/SE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Creek Channel Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Historic Landmark**

Wide Hollow Creek is a Historic Landmark that uses Wide Hollow Creek to produce a unique product, it is listed as a 4F area for fish habitat as well as historic status. Ship in operation minus the wheel.

**Design Threat: Historic Mill**

- Project encroaches on Mill or its water source.
- Mitigation: Address through 4F mitigation, possibly move structure to AG museum.

**Design Threat: Creek Channel Change**

- Project encroaches on existing creek alignments.
- Mitigation: Early involvement of Yakama Nation. Environmental, etc., allow adequate time on schedule for permitting and studies.

**Design Threat: Fulbright Park**

- Environmental issues line 4F (public owned) Permitting, mitigation.
- Early involvement of Yakama Nation. Environmental, etc., allow adequate time on schedule for permitting and studies.

**Design Threat: Creek Channel Change**

- Project encroaches on existing creek alignments.
- Mitigation: Early involvement of Yakama Nation. Environmental, etc., allow adequate time on schedule for permitting and studies.

**Design Threat: Creek Channel Change**

- Project encroaches on existing creek alignments.
- Mitigation: Early involvement of Yakama Nation. Environmental, etc., allow adequate time on schedule for permitting and studies.

**Design Threat: Creek Channel Change**

- Project encroaches on existing creek alignments.
- Mitigation: Early involvement of Yakama Nation. Environmental, etc., allow adequate time on schedule for permitting and studies.

**Design Threat: Creek Channel Change**

- Project encroaches on existing creek alignments.
- Mitigation: Early involvement of Yakama Nation. Environmental, etc., allow adequate time on schedule for permitting and studies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Date Identified</th>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Functional Assignment</th>
<th>Threat/Opportunity Event</th>
<th>SMART Column</th>
<th>Risk Trigger</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Risk Matrix</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Responses Actions including advantages and disadvantages</th>
<th>Affected Project Activity</th>
<th>Responsibility Task Manager</th>
<th>Status Interval or Milestone Check</th>
<th>Date, Status and Review Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dormant</td>
<td>9/22/2005</td>
<td>Design/Construction</td>
<td>Threat: Existing Utilities</td>
<td>Expanding on the alternative chosen, there could be greater utility impacts, especially if the alternative involves existing utilities affecting the construction schedule.</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
<td>Troy Suing, Jamil Anabtawi</td>
<td>Depending on the alternative chosen, there could be greater utility impacts, especially if the alternative involves existing utilities affecting the construction schedule.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN

Risk Identification | Qualitative Analysis | Response Strategy | Monitoring and Tracking

Risk Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scope: Depending on the alternative chosen, there could be greater utility impacts, especially if the alternative involves existing utilities affecting the construction schedule.
## PROJECT RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN

### Risk Identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Functional Assignment</th>
<th>Threat/Opportunity Event</th>
<th>SMART Column</th>
<th>Risk Trigger</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Risk Matrix</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Response Actions including advantages and disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design/PS&amp;E</td>
<td>Real Estate Services</td>
<td>Right of Way purchases</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>Early acquisition is not an option.</td>
<td>Troy Suing, Larry Hook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Qualitative Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Functional Assignment</th>
<th>Threat/Opportunity Event</th>
<th>SMART Column</th>
<th>Risk Trigger</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Risk Matrix</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Response Actions including advantages and disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design/PS&amp;E</td>
<td>Real Estate Services</td>
<td>Right of Way purchases</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>Early acquisition is not an option.</td>
<td>Troy Suing, Larry Hook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Response Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Functional Assignment</th>
<th>Threat/Opportunity Event</th>
<th>SMART Column</th>
<th>Risk Trigger</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Risk Matrix</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Response Actions including advantages and disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design/PS&amp;E</td>
<td>Real Estate Services</td>
<td>Right of Way purchases</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>Early acquisition is not an option.</td>
<td>Troy Suing, Larry Hook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Monitoring and Tracking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Functional Assignment</th>
<th>Threat/Opportunity Event</th>
<th>SMART Column</th>
<th>Risk Trigger</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Risk Matrix</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Response Actions including advantages and disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design/PS&amp;E</td>
<td>Real Estate Services</td>
<td>Right of Way purchases</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>Early acquisition is not an option.</td>
<td>Troy Suing, Larry Hook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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://www1.wsdot.wa.gov/ProjectReporting/PCR_Links.htm#PCF
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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.”
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