

Oregon Department of Transportation

# 2015-2018 STIP Enhance Process Evaluation

*Interviews Summary*

by JLA Public Involvement  
9/12/2013



## I. Introduction

The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) implemented a new project selection process for the 2015-2018 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) cycle. This process responded to: 1) a growing interest among ODOT's stakeholders and partners in breaking down the funding "silos" in order to allow a more flexible and holistic approach to funding transportation improvements; 2) changes in federal funding requirements with the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) legislation; 3) a decreasing amount of funding for transportation; and 4) an interest in strengthening the role of ODOT's local partners in the identification of priorities for transportation improvements of statewide and regional importance in their areas.

For the 2015-2018 STIP cycle, several previously separate funds were combined to create the STIP Enhance funding process. In order to evaluate the process, ODOT asked JLA Public Involvement to conduct interviews with individuals who played a key role in the project review and selection process.

A total of 36 individuals were interviewed (see Section IV: Interviewees). These included each ODOT region manager, most area managers and/or planners responsible for guiding the process in their areas, the chairs of the Area Commissions on Transportation (ACTs), the chair of the Region 1 STIP Selection Committee, and the chairs of the statewide review committees (the Oregon Freight Advisory Committee (OFAC), and the joint Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (OBPAC) and the Transportation Enhancement (TE) Committee). Nearly all the interviews were conducted in person.

Specifically, these interviews were meant to assess how well the project selection process worked, how the process could be improved, and whether interviewees believed this approach should be continued. The interviews were held throughout July 2013. Most of the interviews of the ACT chairs were scheduled to occur after the July 17<sup>th</sup> workshop with the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC). All areas had completed their 150% list of projects prior to the interviews; none of the areas had officially finalized the recommended 100% list of projects.

This document summarizes the results of those interviews. Note: In the following discussion, references to ACTs include the Region 1 STIP Project Selection Committee.

## II. Summary of Major Messages

- While the same principles guided the process throughout the state, there was a wide variation in how the STIP Enhance process was conducted by the various committees and groups.
- The ACT interviewees overwhelmingly (but not universally) supported this process as an appropriate path, with some major to minor adjustments. ODOT Region staff and the statewide review committees were more divided; some felt the current process could only lead to degradation of the state system and statewide priorities, while others felt it created great opportunities to develop stronger local partners and/or a more integrated system.
- Perspectives were very mixed about how this process could improve or degrade the variety and/or quality of projects.
- The call for a common set of project review and selection criteria appeared to be driven by two primary factors: 1) a lack of faith that the OTC would not ultimately follow unwritten criteria; and 2) the role of statewide or regional significance needed to be better characterized.
- The most commonly stated problems with the process were:
  - The limited amount of funding
  - The lack of time – primarily for local jurisdictions and the ACTs to strategize in order to submit applications for the best projects with this new approach to funding
  - The potential for politicizing the selection of projects
- The role of the statewide review committees was unclear to the ACTs and to the statewide review committees, and timing of their input resulted in little influence on the ACTs' deliberations.
- Nearly all chairs had high praise for their ODOT staff and expressed a high level of confidence in the combined judgment of their peers on the groups they chaired.

## III. Summary by Question

### 1) *Critical Context*

Question: *What was the process your group followed, and what was your role in the STIP Enhance project selection process?*

The process steps and roles for collecting, reviewing and assessing applications and for selecting projects varied widely not only from region to region, but within regions from area to area.

In a few cases, the differences appeared to stem from different interpretations of the charge, but for the most part these differences appeared to respond to the unique dynamics, resources, needs, and culture of each group or area.

Common practices:

- **Presentations.** Many of the ACTs provided an opportunity for applicants to present their proposals. These presentations were considered at least as helpful, if not more so, than the written applications.
- **Three tiers of projects.** Although each ACT developed their own approach for winnowing the list of projects down to their 150% list and then their 100% list, most ACTs appeared to have independently settled on a similar process of separating the projects into three groups: 1) most important; 2) projects that they would like to see advanced, if possible; and 3) lower priority projects. Most groups were able to include all of their first tier and part, if not all, of their second tier in their 150% list of projects.
- **Proactive communication from ODOT.** In almost all cases the group chair praised the ODOT staff that supported their work. They noted that staff had proactively sought to inform their group about the new process, had worked hard to encourage local jurisdictions to participate, and provided ongoing support to the group and to the applicants.
- **High level of agreement.** Most area interviewees noted that their ACT did not struggle very hard to come to agreement on their 150% list of projects, and did not feel the group would have a very difficult time agreeing on a 100% list.

Variations:

- **Review of applications.** Some of the ACTs formed a subcommittee or technical advisory committee to review all of the applications and/or to listen to presentations and then present recommendations to the full ACT. For several ACTs, each member reviewed every full application. A few ACTs assigned ODOT staff the responsibility of reviewing the applications and presenting findings and/or recommendations on the projects. The two statewide review committees received summary matrices of the projects on the 150% lists. Both groups limited their recommendations to the projects that they most clearly could identify addressed their areas of responsibility. The combined TE/OBPAC group conducted their review by splitting into two subgroups, each of which reviewed half of the projects.
- **Criteria and benefits.** There was a fair amount of angst over the lack of criteria (see Question #8), and while most chairs acknowledged that they eventually understood that a project only needed to meet one of the benefit areas, it was clear that a number of the groups wrestled with how to use the benefits. Some groups established specific criteria for their own use, such as: freight movement, last-dollar-in (i.e. does the

proposal complete a project or system), and legacy (projects that have been high on the area's priority list for a long time). At least one ACT used the benefits as criteria, rating how well each project met each benefit, and selecting projects based on how well and how many benefits the projects met.

- **Emphasis on the statewide system.** The benefit to the state system was interpreted and considered to varying degrees by the different ACTs and committees, but most groups understood it to be just one benefit among others. ODOT staff from each region pointed out that they supported the ACTs while providing them a high level of autonomy. While Region 3 staff echoed this latter point, they also noted that they had stressed to the ACTs from the beginning and throughout the process that the funds that had previously been used for the state system were now the primary part of the Enhance funds; they asked the ACTs to please take this into consideration when setting their priorities. They also worked with their internal staff to ensure ODOT had compelling applications for the ACTs. Possibly as a result, the ACT chairs and Region 3 staff expressed a higher level of confidence that they had appropriately addressed state and regional system needs. (It should be noted that the chairs of both Region 3 ACTs have a long history of serving on statewide policy groups for ODOT.)
- **Statewide Review Committees input.** The set of comments from the statewide review committees was handled somewhat differently in the different ACTs. Some ACT chairs had reviewed the comments with their full membership. Some ACT members were unsure of whether they had seen the comments from the statewide review committees. And several ACTs were not planning on introducing the comments until they met to reduce the list from 150 percent to 100 percent.
- **Level of reliance on ODOT.** While all ACT chairs expressed high regard for their area's ODOT staff, some ACT chairs, particularly those in Regions 4 and 5, stressed that they need to rely heavily on ODOT staff not only for support, but for analysis and recommendations. Given the volunteer nature of their responsibilities, the long distances, and the broad range of responsibilities, these local jurisdictions have developed strong, trusting partnerships with ODOT in order to achieve their mutual goals. Conversely, a number of chairs from other regions expressed gratitude for the hands-off nature of ODOT participation and support.

## **2) Projects**

*Question: Do you think that the Enhance process helped improve the quality and variety of projects considered for funding in the STIP [along with the other former programs now included in the Enhance funds]? Why or why not?*

Many interviewees—including most ACT chairs—were optimistic that the Enhance process holds the promise of improving the variety and quality of projects in the future; however, most believed that this particular pool of projects was not significantly improved over the past. Some believed that without major changes, this approach would ultimately degrade the transportation system due to the lack of focus on the regional and statewide system.

For the first few interviews, the question only referred to the quality and variety of projects funded through the traditional STIP modernization process, and respondents confirmed that this process resulted in greater variety, given the number of bicycle and pedestrian projects. However, several people noted that the comparison was unfair without considering the other “pots” of funding now included in the STIP Enhance process, so the question was expanded. After expanding the question, a few still agreed there was greater variety, but most interviewees generally felt there was little additional overall variety. A few suggested that with the preponderance of smaller local projects and the lack of state system projects resulting from the 2015-2018 process, there may be less variety. Similarly, most interviewees did not feel that this round of the STIP Enhance process produced projects of a higher quality than past rounds.

The primary reasons stated for this were:

- The small amount of funds available restricted the types of projects that could be funded.
- The short notice for the change in process resulted in turning to smaller projects that were “already on the shelf,” which included a number of smaller local projects. Many interviewees felt that as the local jurisdictions, ACTs and ODOT look toward future STIP cycles, they will be able to more strategically plan and coordinate projects.
- The process was new. Despite admittedly strong outreach by ODOT staff, interviewees felt that applicants and reviewers were often unclear, skeptical and/or confused about the objectives of the new process. Several cited “mixed messages” from the OTC. Many felt that with time, experience, and “proof” (evidence that ODOT management and the OTC would accept the recommendations of the ACTs), the pool of projects could improve.
- There was a lack of clarity about, or understanding of, how to define regional and/or statewide significance and what role it should play in the selection of projects.
- The motive to spread the benefits within an area was cited as a key driver by both supporters and detractors of the process. With the ACTs playing the major role in project selection, many feared the process was too politically driven. Most ACT chairs stressed that their members are committed to looking beyond their own jurisdictional boundaries and finding the best projects overall; however, many did refer to a need to provide benefits to more of their member jurisdictions.

Many interviewees qualified their answer to this question with the caution that the process was not yet complete.

### **3) Conversation by Mode vs. Best Overall Projects**

Question: *Do you think that the Enhance process was effective in helping change the conversation from projects by mode to finding the best projects overall? Why or why not?*

While a few ACT chairs emphasized that their ACT was a seasoned group that already had successfully transitioned to a multimodal outlook, most interviewees felt that the process did advance a more holistic, multimodal consideration of projects. However, while bicycle, pedestrian and local transportation enhancement projects appeared to have fared well in this round of the STIP, several ACT chairs and statewide review committee chairs expressed concern that the combination of funds may put funding for these and other alternative transportation modes at risk in the future. While nearly all ACT chairs acknowledged the value of a multimodal approach for most areas, several ACT chairs from frontier rural counties noted that their primary struggle was with just preserving their lifelines of existing roads. Conversely, Region 1 staff noted that while this process had placed a spotlight on their multimodal efforts, the region and its partners have a strong history of working to achieve multimodal objectives with all their projects, and that this STIP cycle for their region had instead focused on smaller local projects to the exclusion of the projects of regional significance that could only be funded through the STIP.

### **4) Reviewers' Expertise and Support**

Question: *Do you think that your review committee had the right people, expertise, and resources to undertake the review of Enhance applications? If not, what would you have changed or added?*

Most committee chairs—area and statewide—and most region staff answered this question with a confident “yes.” Most expressed a high level of confidence in the effectiveness of their respective review committees, as well as their members’ judgment, ability to look beyond their own interests and borders, and understanding of modes.

Regarding additions of other modal representatives to the ACTs, many chairs noted that the new members had added to the conversation. Some mentioned that the other modes had already been part of the conversation; they just had not officially been at the table. Several noted that the newer members, while welcomed, had not yet learned how to look beyond their own area of advocacy, but the chairs felt this would come in time, as it had for the jurisdictional representatives. Several chairs noted that the jurisdictional representatives were already knowledgeable about and committed to multimodal planning due to their individual

responsibilities for their respective jurisdictions' transportation system plans; one ACT chose therefore to place the new modal representatives on the technical advisory committee rather than the ACT itself.

Trucking was specifically mentioned most often when interviewees discussed what additional representation would benefit their ACT. Several noted that while trucking is represented on statewide policy committees, it is difficult to engage that perspective at the regional and local level; thus, proposals are developed at the local level that are challenged in Salem.

The committee chairs noted that ODOT staff and local technical staff were an essential part of their process and worked to secure the groups, resources and information they needed to complete their reviews.

### **5) *Statewide review committees***

*Question: What are your thoughts on the role of the statewide review committees? Did the statewide review committees' comments come at the right time? Did the statewide review committees' comments affect your review process?*

This was an area that most interviewees acknowledged was very problematic.

#### **a) Perspectives of the chairs of the statewide review committees**

Representatives of the statewide review committees that had, through their past work, developed clear principles and policies for identifying priority projects from a statewide perspective found it difficult to assess the value of many of the projects. The challenges they cited included: the sheer number of projects to review, the amount of time in which to complete the review, and the summary information they were given on the projects. The OFAC chair and vice chair particularly emphasized that without local knowledge and/or more information, their committee was not able to adequately assess the benefits or impacts to freight for most of the projects.

The OBPAC current and incoming chairs noted that, given the nature of the application, many applicants indicated their project had many benefits, including bicycle and pedestrian benefits, so it was difficult to assess which were genuinely and primarily bicycle and pedestrian projects. The respective chairs of the joint meetings of the OBPAC and the Transportation Enhancement Committee also noted that their statewide review committees were familiar with many of the projects from past applications and expressed concern that projects that ranked low on a statewide level had ranked high at a local level and vice versa. These chairs were pleased with the success of so many bicycle and pedestrian and transportation enhancement projects, but suggested there should be clear criteria for prioritizing these projects. In other words, there

needed to be a clear way to ensure that these types of projects were selected based on regional or statewide benefit, distinct from a project that should be funded with local funds.

All the statewide review committee chairs suggested that the applications be modified to provide information that could help the committees better assess their value related to the issues these committees were charged to address. They noted that their ODOT support staff had been very helpful and that, with more time for preparation, the staff could help the committees by conducting a preliminary review based on specific factors or criteria.

These chairs faced a dilemma when asked about the best timing for their review and input: they acknowledged that it would require an enormous effort to review all the original applications before the ACTs selected their 150% lists; however, the chairs also recognized that once the 150% lists were adopted, most ACTs would have already established priorities and would be unlikely to change much based on the statewide review committees' input.

#### b) Perspectives of the ACT chairs and ODOT region staff

ACT chairs generally acknowledged that the review of the statewide review committees had little to no effect, and, in a couple of cases, offended the ACTs. As noted under Question 1, a number of the groups had not yet seen the comments from the statewide review committees, but noted that once the group had developed their 150% list, their priorities were pretty well understood and unlikely to change.

With only one exception, the ACT chairs and ODOT staff stated that in order to affect the project selection, the statewide review committees would need to provide input sooner in the process. Recognizing this would be difficult to do given the large number of overall applications, interviewees suggested either focusing the statewide review committees' input on policies that would help the ACTs identify important projects, or by identifying and/or suggesting specific projects to be considered by the ACTs. Several interviewees noted that whatever the process, it would need to be designed in such a way as to make it apparent that the statewide review committees would not automatically trump the priorities of the ACTs.

Several of the interviewees noted that the greatest impact of the statewide review committees came through the members of the statewide review committees that sat on the ACTs.

#### **6) ODOT Communication with Reviewers**

*Question: Do you think that communications between ODOT and the review committees were enough for the committees to understand and undertake their review? What do you think might have improved this communication?*

ACT chairs and statewide review committee members praised the communications by ODOT region, area and division staff that supported their work. While there were some concerns about the reliability and/or consistency of messages from the OTC and ODOT headquarters, reviewers consistently praised the staff with whom they developed working relationships. Based on their descriptions of their processes, it was apparent that most of the groups had a solid understanding of the overall purpose of the Enhance process and their group's role. A few messages, such as the role of the benefits included in the application, need for statewide and regional significance, and role of the statewide review committees, appeared not to have been as consistently understood.

### **7) ODOT Communications with Potential Applicants**

Question: *Do you think that communications between ODOT and applicant jurisdictions were enough for them to feel comfortable applying?*

Most interviewees did not feel that they were in a position to know whether applicants felt they had received enough communication to feel comfortable applying. They were able to confirm that they had not heard many complaints. Many also noted that they knew the area manager had proactively reached out to many of the communities. One ACT chair noted that their area had initially been told that *all projects must* be multimodal, which discouraged some applications in that area.

### **8) Basis for Prioritization**

Question: *Do you think that the Enhance applications and instructions provided enough information and guidance for reviewers to successfully prioritize projects? If not, what additional information or guidance do you think would have helped reviewers?*

Responses to this question were mixed but for the ACTs, the primary responses included:

- Yes; the ACT, with the technical staff, developed a good process for reviewing and ranking applications based on the information in the application, the presentations, the instructions, and the deliberations of the group.
- Yes, because the amount of funding was so limited that there was only so much that could be done, and/or the projects had been in plans long enough that they were well known priorities. Many emphasized that those at the local level know best what is needed for their area.
- No. There was not enough information on what the OTC felt was important. For instance, if the OTC wanted projects on the state system, that should have been clear in the instructions.

- No. There should have been criteria to help ensure applicants and reviewers throughout the state, or throughout the region, were making apples-to-apples choices consistent with state policies and needs.
- No. The applications were too complex. Applicants felt they needed to address every benefit, so it was not always clear from the application what the true purpose of the project was.
- Generally, yes, but additional information would have been helpful. Examples of the more common suggestions for additional information included:
  - criteria (see below)
  - project’s ability to be phased
  - more accurate initial cost estimates
  - regional and statewide significance.

Criteria was one of the most commonly discussed issues by everyone—those who felt more specific criteria were needed as well as those who did not.

It became evident that for many interviewees and/or those they represented that the greatest problem with lack of criteria was a concern that there were actually some unwritten criteria that would be used by either the OTC or ODOT management to undermine the local decision-making process. Similarly, applicants had a difficult time accepting that they did not need to address every benefit area. Several chairs noted this may be addressed in time with experience and as participants learn that the OTC honors the results of the ACT processes.

Other interviewees discussed the need for more specific criteria to ensure an apples-to-apples basis for decision-making across the state or within a region. Several of these individuals suggested adding specific criteria just to help define statewide or regional significance. Some interviewees, including statewide review committee representatives, suggested adding modally-specific criteria; they noted that it would be difficult for one set of criteria to address all types of projects.

Distinct from the discussion of whether or not there should be criteria, a number of interviewees simply referred to the benefits as criteria. Although most of these interviewees did not appear to have used the benefits as literal screening or evaluation criteria, a few did assume that was how the benefits were intended to be used.

## **9) Overall Success of the Enhance Process**

*Question: In what ways do you think that the 2015-2018 STIP Enhance project selection process was most successful? In what ways was it least successful? Overall, do you believe this STIP process puts ODOT on the right “path”?*

a) Overall direction

While all interviewees identified problems that need to be addressed, most interviewees stated that the STIP Enhance process holds promise.

ACT interviewees almost all supported this as an appropriate path. They consistently commented that this process places more of the decision-making in the hands of those who know and use the system in their area most.

The statewide review committees and ODOT Region staff were more divided: some felt the current process could only lead to degradation of the state system and statewide priorities; others felt it created great opportunities to develop stronger local partners and/or a more integrated system.

b) Strengths

Interviewees all agreed that a major benefit of the process was the greater collaboration it created among ODOT and its partner jurisdictions, and the greater number of people the process brought to the table. They also agreed that an important benefit of the process was that it strengthened the ACTs by giving them a more substantial role. Most agreed that the Enhance process allowed for a more integrated discussion of the system. Although most did not believe this cycle made major advances in creating a more integrated system, many believed that in time it would. Most of the ACTs also noted that projects would be more responsive to local needs.

c) Weaknesses

Many of the suggested weaknesses have already been discussed. The primary concerns were:

- Lack of money and time—particularly time to prepare for the new process. These were the most universally mentioned concerns.
- How to review and select projects. Many discussed the need for criteria and/or the confusion about how to navigate the process.
- Neglect of or lack of clarity about the definition of significance to the state or regional system.
- Politicizing the process by putting more of the decision-making in the hands of local elected officials who are primarily accountable to their own communities.
- Lack of a clear and effective role for the statewide review committees.
- Efficiency of the process. Some found the process to be very straight forward, while others felt the applications were too complex. Some more rural ACTs/regions that historically accomplished this with more informal discussions felt that this process was unnecessarily labor intensive for applicants, ACTs and ODOT.

- Concern about loss or weakening of Safe Routes to School, Transportation Enhancement, and/or the Bicycle and Pedestrian programs.

d) Grade

The average grade that interviewees gave the process was a C+/B-. Most interviewees gave the process a grade between D and B+. There was one F, one A and one E for effort.

**10) Additional Comments**

Question: *Is there anything else you'd like to tell ODOT about your experiences with or thoughts on the 2015-2018 STIP Enhance process?*

Other issues and suggestions raised at this point included the following.

- The State's 20% reserve was a major point of interest. Many interviewees wanted to know how projects for that funding would be identified and asked that the ACTs have a chance to weigh in on the selection. A number of ACT representatives noted that their ACT struggled with assigning their Enhance funding to projects that they thought might be funded with the 20%. Several suggested identifying the projects of major statewide significance first; then the ACTs could plan accordingly.
- Some interviewees noted that there may be a problem with matching the selected projects with the requirements of the available funding pots.
- Several individuals expressed a concern that transit operations equipment are essential and largely predictable expenses and suggested they should not be lumped in with the Enhance funding.
- Several of the ACT chairs noted that they chose not to fund a bicycle and pedestrian project that local advocates promoted but could not justify as connected to a system. They pointed out that their decision may have been different if a long-term plan for connected regional or statewide routes were in place and these projects could be shown to support those routes.
- The scoping of the projects was a challenge for most of the regions. The cost estimates for many, if not most, of the projects increased, sometimes by orders of magnitude. While most ACT chairs seemed to understand the differences, they acknowledged that some of the applicants balked at the changes, and several ODOT staff noted that they struggled with having to be the "bad guy." However, many ACT and ODOT interviewees noted the value of ensuring comparable scoping while leaving the detailed scoping process out of the application process to allow smaller jurisdictions to still apply. Region 5 staff noted that having a neutral consultant do the scoping made the results of the process more acceptable to all.

By far, the most frequent comment at this point in the interview was praise for ODOT and the OTC: praise for the staff that assisted the groups, appreciation for the OTC's and ODOT's attempt at a more multimodal, collaborative process, and/or appreciation for the respect and consideration the OTC showed to its local partners at its July meeting.

#### IV. Interviewees

The chart below lists the individuals that participated in the 2015-2018 STIP Enhance Process Evaluation interviews. All interviews were conducted in person, unless otherwise indicated.

Group	Names of Interviewees	Interview date
<b>Northwest ACT</b>	Shirley Kalkhoven, ACT Chair	July 18, 2013
<b>Mid-Willamette Valley ACT</b>	Cathy Clark, ACT Vice-Chair	July 29, 2013
<b>Cascades West ACT</b>	Linda Modrell, ACT Chair	July 11, 2013
<b>Lane ACT</b>	Kitty Piercy, ACT Chair Hillary Wylie, ACT Vice-Chair	July 15, 2013
<b>Rogue Valley ACT</b>	Mike Montero, ACT Co-Chair Stan Wolfe, ACT Co-Chair	July 30, 2013
<b>Southwest ACT</b>	Martin Callery, ACT Chair	July 17, 2013
<b>Lower John Day ACT</b>	Gary Thompson, ACT Chair	July 17, 2013
<b>Central Oregon ACT</b>	Alan Unger, ACT Chair	July 31, 2013
<b>South Central Oregon ACT</b>	Brad Winters, ACT Chair	July 31, 2013
<b>Northeast ACT</b>	Mike Hayward, ACT Chair	July 23, 2013
<b>Southeast ACT</b>	Steve Grasty, ACT Chair Boyd Britton, Vice Chair (follow-up by phone)	July 22, 2013
<b>Region 1 STIP Project Selection Committee</b>	Bill Wyatt, Chair	July 2, 2013
<b>Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee</b>	Jerry Zelada, Outgoing Chair Jenna Stanke, Incoming Chair	July 15, 2013
<b>Transportation Enhancement Advisory Committee</b>	John Oberst, Chair	July 9, 2013
<b>Oregon Freight Advisory Committee</b>	Susie Lahsene, Chair Martin Callery, Vice-Chair (by phone)	July 2, 2013
<b>ODOT Region 1</b>	Jason Tell, Region Manager Rian Windsheimer, Planning & Development Manager Jeff Flowers, Enhance Coordinator	July 25, 2013
<b>ODOT Region 2</b>	Sonny Chickering, Region Manager Terry Cole, Enhance Coordinator Tim Potter, Area Manager	July 9, 2013

<b>ODOT Region 2</b>	Amy Ramsdell, Area Manager Frannie Brindle, Area Manager Larry McKinley, Area Manager	July 10, 2013 (conference call)
<b>ODOT Region 3</b>	Frank Reading, Region Manager Art Anderson, Area Manager	July 30, 2013
<b>ODOT Region 4</b>	Bob Bryant, Region Manager Gary Farnsworth, Area Manager Butch Hansen, Area Manager (by phone)	July 31, 2013
<b>ODOT Region 5</b>	Monte Grove, Region Manager Craig Sipp, Area Manager	July 23, 2013