bluecrane

Management Consulting

for

State and Local

Governments

Quality Assurance

Executive Advisement

Project Oversight

Project Management

Independent Verification and Validation (IV&V)

Risk Reduction

Quality Assurance Readiness Assessment

for the

Columbia River Gorge Commission (CRGC)

Access Database Replacement (ADR) Project

August 2022

Prepared by

Bluecrane, Inc.

bluecrane ®

Corporate Headquarters
655 Deep Valley Drive, Suite 300
Rolling Hills Estates, CA 90274
www.bluecranesolutions.com
310-793-0000

August 11, 2022

Ms. Krystyna Wolniakowski
Executive Director
Columbia River Gorge Commission
P.O. Box 730
White Salmon, WA 98672

Dear Ms. Wolniakowski:

bluecrane is pleased to present you with our Quality Assurance (QA) Readiness Assessment for the Columbia River Gorge Commission's Access Database Replacement (ADR) Project. This readiness assessment is provided to you in compliance with the State of Washington's Minimum QA Activities – Readiness Assessment 132.20 Policy.

Please contact me with any questions or comments.

Sincerely,

Allen Mills

Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary

1.1 Assessment Summary

In late June 2022, the Columbia River Gorge Commission (CRCG or "Gorge Commission") engaged Bluecrane, Inc. ("*bluecrane*") to provide Quality Assurance (QA) services for the Commission's Access Database Replacement (ADR) Project from June – August of 2022. Our services during this period include: (1) assessing the quality of the Feasibility Study developed for ADR and (2) conducting a Readiness Assessment for the ADR Project in compliance with the State of Washington's Minimum QA Activities – Readiness Assessment 132.20 Policy. This report documents the results of our QA Readiness Assessment.

CRGC is a bi-state compact regulatory agency charged with managing land use in the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area (NSA). The National Scenic Area Act was passed by Congress in 1986 to protect 292,500 acres of land along 85 miles on both sides of the Columbia River.

In accordance with the National Scenic Area Act, CRGC must review land use applications and approve land use permits in Klickitat County, Washington, and oversee/review permit applications issued by the other five counties in the NSA that adopted the NSA Management Plan as an ordinance in their county (Wasco, Hood, and Multnomah Counties in Oregon, and Clark and Skamania Counties in Washington).

To carry out their day-to-day work, CRGC must track and monitor all contact with landowners; all permit applications, denials, and approvals; and for those permits approved, compliance with all permit conditions. CRCG must also track the locations of all proposed and existing developments within the NSA, findings with respect to permit applications (past and present), impacts on resources, and all correspondence in electronic and written forms. CRGC currently relies on an outdated Microsoft Access database to perform this work. After an initial review and several discussions with the Washington State Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO) and the Washington Department of Technology (WaTech), it was determined that the Gorge Commission's Access database system should be replaced.

Based on the activities completed to-date and the activities currently underway, our assessment found that the project is in good health and has been consistently making steady progress on many fronts.

We found that CRGC has been supportive of the project's activities, the project's governance structure is active and dedicated, the Executive Sponsor is supportive and engaged, and the project team is consistently achieving its milestones.

The project manager has done an excellent job of documenting the project's plans, including scope, schedules, risks, and other standard project management "artifacts." The level of detail in the planning is exemplary and more than adequate for a project of the size and scope of the ADR Project.

The scope of Organizational Change Management (OCM), which is typically an area of concern and risk on many government projects, is a relatively limited one as the user community consists of CRGC staff and potentially county staff in the three Washington counties of Klickitat County, Clark, and Skamania and the three Oregon counties of Wasco, Hood, and Multnomah. From our initial

interviews of management and staff at CRGC, there is wide-spread enthusiasm for the new solution. ADR's Project Management Plan includes sections on roles and responsibilities, communications, and meetings. As the project progresses, we encourage the project to develop a specific plan for engaging the user community to create awareness of, interest in, support for, and knowledge about the new solution.

In addition, there are no dependencies with other agencies external to CRGC nor with other major CRGC projects. There is a rather unique dependence on obtaining the approval of two state governments to each provide 50 percent of the project's funding. All government projects face the obvious risk of obtaining funding for their work, but the need to obtain approval from two totally independent sources is more than a bit unusual.

Our readiness assessment results are summarized in an Executive Dashboard tabular format in the next section of this Executive Summary.

Following the Executive Summary, the remainder of this document includes the following:

- A description of the ADR Project
- A description of *bluecrane's* readiness assessment methodology
- Our detailed assessment results

1.2 Executive Dashboard

In this section, we summarize our readiness assessment findings in an Executive Dashboard, which includes the areas that we assessed and our high-level summarized findings.

Area of Assessment	Risk Level	At-a-Glance Assessment
Project Management and Sponsorship		
Business Case	**No Risk Identified**	Our review of the business case, as documented in (1) the State of Oregon Enterprise Information Services (EIS) IT Investment Form of July 29, 2020, and (2) the State of Washington Decision Package (DP) of September 4, 2020, found that it is: (1) consistent with industry best practices, (2) comprehensive, and (3) measurable.
Measures of Success	**No Risk Identified**	"Quantifying Results" are documented in the September 4, 2020 State of Washington DP. The success criteria are reasonable, appropriate, and measurable.
Project Sponsorship and Governance	**No Risk Identified**	The project's current governance structure is providing adequate direction and guidance to the project. The Executive Sponsor and Steering Committee members are enthusiastic about the project.
Project Planning and Objectives	**No Risk Identified**	The project's current planning activities are detailed and quite complete.

Area of Assessment	Risk Level	At-a-Glance Assessment
Project Management and Sponsorship (continued)		
Project Management Methodologies and Practices	**No Risk Identified**	The project is using "best practices" for project management (e.g., schedule management, risk management, issue management, and others). For a project of this size, the project management approach being utilized is more than adequate.
Commitment of Project Resources	**No Risk Identified**	Internal CRGC resources and contracted staff from ESA Sitka have been committed to the project. The project plans to hire a public records clerk for a limited-duration position if its 2023-2025 budget request is funded. CRGC is likely to encounter the difficulties of recruiting and hiring in the current job market that other state projects in the Pacific Northwest are confronting. However, at this early juncture, the risk is not noteworthy.
Communication Strategy	**No Risk Identified**	The project's strategy for communications is documented in Section 2.5 of the ADR Project Management Plan and is consistent with common project management practices.
Acquisition Planning	**No Risk Identified**	The project has already acquired the services of ESA Sitka for developing a feasibility study and assistance with project initiation and planning. It is anticipated that the project will conduct a procurement for Commercial-Off-the-Shelf (COTS) software as the primary element of the new solution. The COTS software procurement is planned for Phase 2 of the project, assuming the project's 2023-2025 budget request is funded.
Vendor Management Planning	**No Risk Identified**	The project is utilizing standard practices in managing ESA Sitka's contract.

Area of Assessment	Risk Level	At-a-Glance Assessment
People		
Adequate Project Staff Resources	**No Risk Identified**	Numerous government projects in the Pacific Northwest are currently struggling with finding, hiring, and retaining needed technical talent. CRGC's ADR Project has mitigated this risk by contracting with ESA Sitka for key project management and technical assistance.
OCM	**No Risk Identified**	The "user community" of the ADR solution is a relatively limited one consisting of CRGC staff and potentially county staff in the three Washington counties of Klickitat County, Clark, and Skamania and the three Oregon counties of Wasco, Hood, and Multnomah. From our initial interviews of management and staff at CRGC, there is wide-spread enthusiasm for the new solution. ADR's Project Management Plan includes sections on roles and responsibilities, communications, and meetings. As the project progresses, we encourage the project to develop a specific plan for engaging the user community to create awareness of, interest in, support for, and knowledge about the new solution.
Agency Awareness	**No Risk Identified**	The current state of CRGC awareness is adequate for the project's current activities and stage in its lifecycle. As noted above, from our initial interviews of management and staff at CRGC, there is wide-spread enthusiasm for the new solution.
Stakeholder Engagement	**No Risk Identified**	To-date, the project's stakeholder engagement activities have been consistent with common project management practices and appear to be adequate for its current activities.

Area of Assessment	Risk Level	At-a-Glance Assessment
Solution		
Solution Selection that Meets Business Needs	**No Risk Identified**	CRGC intends to procure a software solution in Phase 2 of the project. The feasibility study outlines solution alternatives and identifies a preferred alternative that is highly likely to meet CRGC's business needs.
Requirements Development	**No Risk Identified**	The feasibility study developed by ESA Sitka in collaboration with CRGC documents business, functional, and technical requirements for the new solution.
Data		
Data Strategy	**No Risk Identified**	The same data sources that are utilized by the legacy system will be used for the new solution. CRGC anticipates conversion of 35 years of legacy data from paper files and historical information from the existing Access system. Conversions of paper-based data and migrations of electronic information that needs extensive "clean-up" have inherent risks which the ADR Project will need to assess, monitor, and mitigate. However, in terms of "readiness" at this early stage, the ADR Project is doing a good job of planning for these efforts.
Infrastructure		
Infrastructure Implementation	**No Risk Identified**	The preferred solution identified in the feasibility study is a "cloud-based" one. Requirements for infrastructure at CRGC are minimal.

2. ADR Project Background

To implement the National Scenic Area Act, the bi-state CRGC is responsible for tracking implementation of the National Scenic Area (NSA) Management Plan, including:

- Ensuring *compliance* with all aspects of the Management Plan and land use rules among the six counties in the NSA
- *Monitoring* development trends, implementation effectiveness, and agency activities in the six counties in the NSA
- *Tracking* all the development that occurs in the six counties in the NSA
- *Enforcing* compliance and issuing notice of violations if landowners are out of compliance with permit conditions, and working with them to resolve the violations
- *Tracking* and comparing scenic, natural, cultural, recreational, and economic data to create a Climate Change Action Plan for the NSA to respond to priorities of the governors of both Washington and Oregon to address and mitigate climate change
- *Responding* to public records requests easily and efficiently within a short timeframe
- Satisfying *Performance Measures* (for both Oregon and Washington)

For at least 15 years, the CRGC has relied upon Microsoft Access as the main database system to store, maintain, and track the information needed to fulfill these requirements. Over time, the Access database has been altered and adapted to include additional data fields while other fields have been "orphaned." There are currently over 100 fields in the Access database, many of which have not been used consistently over time. Thus, values for a given field may vary widely as different users have entered data with different meanings. This variability and inconsistency make searching data and performing analytical work difficult at best. Many data fields require information from CRGC's Geographic Information System (GIS), but since it is not possible to integrate Access and GIS, fields cannot be automatically populated with accurate and consistently formatted data. Instead, the data must be manually entered which requires more time and is susceptible to human error. The CRGC also stores hundreds of boxes of historic paper documents that have not been digitized and indexed, making earlier records practically impossible to retrieve without countless hours of searching.

The ADR Project is intended to make CRGC data easily searchable and linked to the agency's GIS. The envisioned new solution will be configured for CRGC's current and future needs, providing better organized information and allowing CRGC to be more responsive to stakeholder needs. CRGC will be able to better serve residents and county planning departments who need information about specific parcels of land and development impacts on resources.

Specifically, replacing the Access database will improve efficiency by standardizing CRGC's operating procedures in digital/online forms and eliminating cumbersome manual data entry/re-entry work for CRGC's planners, county planners in the NSA, and landowners who require timely permits. The new

solution will allow CRGC to centralize historic case work, land use permit files, and correspondence to enable both CRGC's planners and legal team to respond to requests for development reviews, permits, and public records more quickly and accurately. It will also facilitate reporting of metrics used to assess how well CRGC is implementing the NSA Act to protect Gorge resources and support economic development.

Phase 1 of the ADR Project was funded at $425,000 in the 2021-2023 biennium (50 percent from the State of Oregon and 50 percent from the State of Washington). Phase 1 included business workflow and gap analyses, a feasibility study, a technical assessment, and a recommended solution. In Phase 1, the ADR Project, in collaboration with ESA Sitka, concluded that a "cloud-based" Commercial-Off-the-Shelf (COTS) permitting platform will be the best solution to replace the obsolete legacy Microsoft Access Database.

Oversight of Phase 1 was provided by the Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO) in Washington and EIS in Oregon using a gated funding process and quality assurance reviews. CRGC provided all deliverables and met all timeline commitments in the approved technology budget. The technology budget divided expenditures and tasks ("deliverables") across four "gates," with the requirement that the deliverables within each gate be completed and approved by the state oversight teams before funds could be released for the next gate; items below in **bold** have been completed as of the writing of this readiness assessment:

1. **Gate 1 – Planning & Initiation**
    a. **0.5 FTE Internal Staff Project Coordinator Established**
    b. **Project Management and Business Analyst Vendor Procured**: CRGC submitted a Request for Proposals (RFP) during November 2021, with Portland firm Sitka Technologies (now dba Environmental Science Associates or "ESA") selected as the successful bidder
    c. Established **Project Roles & Responsibilities**
    d. Developed **Investment Plan**
    e. Developed **Project Management Plan**
    f. Developed of **Governance Criteria**
    g. **Established a weekly meeting schedule** with the project team
    h. Formed an **Executive Steering Committee** comprised of ESA and CRGC staff along with representatives from Oregon EIS and Washington OCIO. Meetings are held monthly and facilitated by the CRGC Project Coordinator
2. **Gate 2 – Needs Assessment**
    a. **To-Be Workflows** – Improved process diagram for the three categories of workflows

b. **Gap Analysis** – Analysis completed to identify the gaps between the current processes and ideal to-be processes

c. **Target State Objectives** – Eight objectives were developed for a new system that addresses gaps and inefficiencies in current system and processes

d. **Request For Information (RFI)** – Posted March 21 and resulted in 13 responses which were then scored. The top four vendors were selected for demos based on applicability of solution type and estimated cost of implementation

e. **Business & Technical Requirements** – Requirements developed that specify what the solution must provide to meet CRGC's objectives, vision, and goals and requirements that specify how the solution's architecture and interfaces with other systems and software must function to meet the business requirements

f. **Risks and Impacts** – Six categories of risks and impacts were analyzed: Funding, Staff Capacity, Data Migration, Vendor Solution, Procurement, and Partner and Community Engagement

g. **Solution Alternatives** (see Tables 1 and 2 below)

h. **Recommended Access Database Replacement Solution**

i. **Recommendation for the Decision Package 2023-25 Biennium** – An informed but high-level estimate of the costs to implement the new database solution was developed. Costs for the COTS vendor, software, and support were derived from the responses to the RFI (described above). While developed specifically for informing the Washington State Decision Package, the categories and costs are applicable to this Policy Option Package as well. Table 1 is a summary of this deliverable (note that these are total project costs, with Oregon and Washington equally splitting that total)

3. **Gate 3 – Decision Package Development**

   a. **Procure Quality Assurance Vendor**

   b. Prepare **Oregon Policy Option Package and Washington Decision Package** for 2023-25 Biennium

4. Gate 4 – Phase 2 Planning & Closeout of Phase 1

   a. Develop System Functional and Technical Requirements

   b. Prepare Request for Proposals for the Implementation Vendor

   c. Draft Investment Plan for Phase 2

At the time of the writing of this Readiness Assessment, Phase 2 funding is being requested for implementation of the recommended solution. Work will include reviewing and indexing 35 years of paper and digital records; migration of data and files into the new platform; implementation of software and licenses; development of a data governance strategy and organizational change management

process to train and adapt to the new system; and implementation and initial maintenance and operation (M&O) of the new solution.

3. Readiness Assessment Methodology

Our QA Readiness Assessments typically begin by using a framework or "taxonomy" of areas for review and assessment. In performing QA reviews over the past 18 years, we have found this framework to be a valuable tool for: (1) summarizing assessments into the key areas that all stakeholders can "get their arms around" and (2) expanding discussions to a level of detail that is appropriate for specific management and technical audiences. Typically, our QA assessment taxonomy encompasses five areas as listed below:

- People
- Project Management and Sponsorship
- Solution
- Data
- Infrastructure

Table 2. *bluecrane's* Definition and Description of Readiness Assessment Risk Categories

Risk Category	Definition and Description
Project Management and Sponsorship	
Business Case	✓ A well-understood and universally-accepted reason for undertaking the Access Database Replacement (ADR) Project. ✓ Inclusion of descriptions of the business and/or technical problems that the project will attempt to remedy and the business opportunities that the new solution will provide to the CRGC.
Measures of Success	✓ Criteria—either quantifiable or qualitative—that demonstrate to stakeholders the high-level business outcomes that undertaking the project will achieve for the CRGC. ✓ These measures should be included in the business case or documents that are provided to the Steering Committee. ✓ Ultimately, these success measures should be further refined and included in future project documents.

Risk Category	Definition and Description
Project Management and Sponsorship (continued)	
Project Sponsorship and Governance	✓ A framework for the relationships between the project's management, the project's Sponsor, and other CRGC stakeholders. ✓ The framework should identify the Sponsor, her role and responsibilities for the project, and a process for governing, directing, and approving the project's key activities.
Project Planning and Objectives	✓ An approach for how the project will proceed with its planning or readiness activities and identification of the project's key objectives during that time period. ✓ Currently, it should include the immediate activities that the project team is conducting in order to proceed with planning to formally initiate and secure approval of the project within the CRGC's governance structure.
Project Management Methodologies and Practices	✓ The methods, practices, and formal plans for managing the project and its processes. ✓ One of the primary outputs from the ADR Project's readiness phase should be formally-approved plans for managing the project during its execution phase.
Commitment of Project Resources	✓ The process that the project will use to ensure that it will receive adequate resources (budget, staff, Subject Matter Experts, facilities, supplies, etc.) to successfully configure, implement, and operate a new database solution. ✓ The process should include: (1) a method for estimating its needs, (2) a formal review of those estimates, (3) a formal approval of those estimated resources, and (4) a process for securing the resources.
Communication Strategy	✓ A strategy for how the project will keep its stakeholders informed about its activities, goals, and opportunities.

Risk Category	Definition and Description
Project Management and Sponsorship (continued)	
Acquisition Planning	✓ Development of an approach for acquiring the new solution.
Vendor Management Planning	✓ A strategy for how the project will hold its vendor partners accountable for delivery of services and/or a high-quality system.
People	
Adequate Project Staff Resources	✓ A strategy for fully staffing the project team for the duration of the project.
OCM	✓ A framework for managing the effect of transformed business processes on CRGC's personnel and organizations.
Agency Awareness	✓ The degree to which the CRGC is aware of the project. ✓ A strategy for how the project plans to inform and prepare various CRGC entities and key stakeholders of its planning and readiness activities.
Stakeholder Engagement	✓ A framework for engaging the project's stakeholders. ✓ The framework's activities should include planning for how and when stakeholders will be engaged.
Solution	
Solution Selection that Meets Business Needs	✓ Selection of a solution that meets the needs of the business operations being supported by the solution.
Requirements Development	✓ Approach to developing requirements and encouraging identification of efficiency and effectiveness opportunities while managing any expansion ("creep") of project scope.
Data	
Data Strategy	✓ A strategy for how data will be prepared and eventually migrated to the new solution. Eventually, the tactical steps to implement the strategy need to be defined, such as data clean-up (if any) and data migration "rehearsals" or practice runs prior to the final migration and cutover.

Risk Category	Definition and Description
Infrastructure	
Infrastructure Implementation	✓ A strategy for establishing the infrastructure for developing, testing, and running the new solution.

Based on these definitions for each identified area, we then performed the following evaluations:

- Planning – is the project formulating an acceptable level of planning?
- Executing – is the project executing its planning activities in a reasonable and acceptable manner?
- Results – are those planning results likely to be realized? A project that does a good job of planning and executing their plans but does not realize the results expected by participating partners and other stakeholders, is a less than successful project. Ultimately, results are what the project is all about!

Once we conducted our assessments and then evaluated those activities in view of the project's ability to plan, execute, and produce actual results, we developed an assessed status at a macro-level using the scale shown in Table 3 below.

Table 3. *bluecrane's* Readiness Assessment Status Color Coding Definitions

Assessed Status	Meaning
High Risk	A risk that project management must address or the entire planning effort is at risk of failure; these risks are "show-stoppers"
Risk	A risk that is significant enough to merit management attention but not one that is deemed a "show-stopper"
Risk Being Addressed	A risk that is being adequately mitigated. The risk may be ongoing with the expectation it will remain blue for an extended period of time, or it may be sufficiently addressed so that it becomes green as the results of the corrective actions are realized

Assessed Status	Meaning
No Risk Identified	Readiness activities are not encountering any risks
Not Started	This particular activity has not yet started or is not yet assessed

4. Readiness Assessment Results

Using the methodology and definitions described in Section 3 above, our assessment found that the project is in good health and has been consistently making good progress on many fronts.

Our detailed readiness assessment results follow below.

Table 4. Detailed Readiness Assessment Findings and Recommendations

Assessment Area	Risk Level	Status	*bluecrane's* Findings & Recommendations
Project Management and Sponsorship			
Business Case	**No Risk Identified**	✓ The business case for the project is documented in (1) the State of Oregon Enterprise Information Services (EIS) IT Investment Form of July 29, 2020, and (2) the State of Washington Decision Package (DP) of September 4, 2020.	✓ Our review of the draft business case found that it is: (1) consistent with industry best practices, (2) comprehensive, and (3) measurable.
Measures of Success	**No Risk Identified**	✓ "Quantifying Results" are documented in the September 4, 2020 State of Washington DP. ✓ "Target State Objectives" are described in Section 3.3.1 of the ADR Project's Feasibility Study.	✓ The success criteria are reasonable, appropriate, and easily measurable.

Assessment Area	Risk Level	Status	*bluecrane's* Findings & Recommendations
Project Management and Sponsorship (continued)			
Project Sponsorship and Governance	**No Risk Identified**	✓ Project Governance is administered by the Executive Sponsor and the Steering Committee. ✓ Roles and responsibilities are enumerated in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of the ADR Project Management Plan.	✓ The project's current governance structure is providing adequate direction and guidance to the project. ✓ The Executive Sponsor and Steering Committee members are enthusiastic about the project.
Project Planning and Objectives	**No Risk Identified**	✓ The project's current planning activities are detailed and quite complete.	✓ We are impressed with the level of detailed planning done by the project manager and his team in collaboration with ESA Sitka, as well as the documentation of the planning results on the project's Egnyte collaboration site and Confluence project management site. ✓ We encourage the project manager to continue to keep the Egnyte and Confluence sites updated, as these are excellent resources for project information.
Project Management Methodologies and Practices	**No Risk Identified**	✓ The project is using "best practices" for project management (e.g., schedule management, risk management, issue management, and others).	✓ For a project of this size, the planning being utilized is more than adequate.

Assessment Area	Risk Level	Status	*bluecrane's* Findings & Recommendations
Project Management and Sponsorship (continued)			
Commitment of Project Resources	**No Risk Identified**	✓ Internal CRGC resources and contracted staff from ESA Sitka have been committed to the project. ✓ The project plans to hire a public records clerk for a limited-duration position if its 2023-2025 budget request is funded.	✓ CRGC is likely to encounter the difficulties of recruiting and hiring in the current job market that other state projects in the Pacific Northwest are confronting. However, at this early juncture, the risk is not noteworthy.
Communication Strategy	**No Risk Identified**	✓ The project's strategy for communications is documented in Section 2.5 of the ADR Project Management Plan.	✓ The project's strategy for communications is consistent with common project management practices.
Acquisition Planning	**No Risk Identified**	✓ The project has already acquired the services of ESA Sitka for developing a feasibility study and providing assistance with project initiation and planning. ✓ It is anticipated that the project will conduct a procurement for Commercial-Off-the-Shelf (COTS) software as the primary element of the new solution. ✓ The COTS software procurement is planned for Phase 2 of the project, assuming the project's 2023-2025 budget request is funded.	✓ The project's acquisition planning is consistent with industry best practices. ✓ To the extent practicable, we encourage the project to utilize existing contracts and/or master service agreements in Washington or Oregon, where appropriate, to acquire vendor partners.

Assessment Area	Risk Level	Status	*bluecrane's* Findings & Recommendations
Project Management and Sponsorship (continued)			
Vendor Management Planning	**No Risk Identified**	✓ The project is utilizing standard practices in managing ESA Sitka's contract.	✓ The current plans for vendor management are consistent with industry best practices.
People			
Adequate Project Staff Resources	**No Risk Identified**	✓ CRGC is utilizing existing internal staff and contracted resources from ESA Sitka for project management activities. ✓ The project plans to hire a public records clerk for a limited-duration position if its 2023-2025 budget request is funded.	✓ CRGC's ADR Project has mitigated the risk of recruiting and hiring key project staff by contracting with ESA Sitka for key project management and technical assistance. ✓ For the public records clerk position, risks related to this recruitment will need to be evaluated as the time to recruit and hire approaches.
OCM	**No Risk Identified**	✓ The "user community" of the ADR solution is a relatively limited one consisting of CRGC staff and potentially county staff in the three Washington counties of Klickitat County, Clark, and Skamania and the three Oregon counties of Wasco, Hood, and Multnomah.	✓ From our initial interviews of management and staff at CRGC, there is wide-spread enthusiasm for the new solution. ADR's Project Management Plan includes sections on roles and responsibilities, communications, and meetings. ✓ As the project progresses, we encourage the project to develop a specific plan for engaging the user community to create awareness of, interest in, support for, and knowledge about the new solution.

Assessment Area	Risk Level	Status	*bluecrane's* Findings & Recommendations
People (continued)			
Agency Awareness	**No Risk Identified**	✓ The ADR Project Management Plan includes a section on Communications.	✓ The current state of CRGC awareness is adequate for the project's current activities and stage in its lifecycle. ✓ As noted above, from our initial interviews of management and staff at CRGC, there is wide-spread enthusiasm for the new solution.
Stakeholder Engagement	**No Risk Identified**	✓ The project is keeping executive management well-engaged and is sharing information with stakeholders.	✓ To-date, the project's stakeholder engagement activities have been consistent with common project management practices and appear to be adequate for its current activities. ✓ We encourage the Project to develop a "Stakeholder Register" to: o Identify stakeholders o Assess influence, impact, and other characteristics o Progressively elaborate throughout the project's lifecycle ✓ A Stakeholder Register can serve as a basis for planning, monitoring, and adjusting stakeholder engagement and can serve as a foundation element of OCM.

Assessment Area	Risk Level	Status	*bluecrane's* Findings & Recommendations
Solution			
Solution Selection that Meets Business Needs	**No Risk Identified**	✓ CRGC intends to procure a software solution in Phase 2 of the project.	✓ The feasibility study outlines solution alternatives and identifies a preferred alternative that is highly likely to meet CRGC's business needs.
Requirements Development	**No Risk Identified**	✓ The feasibility study developed by ESA Sitka in collaboration with CRGC documents business, functional, and technical requirements for the new solution.	✓ The requirements development and elaboration approach being utilized by the project are appropriate for a project of this size and scope.
Data			
Data Strategy	**No Risk Identified**	✓ The same data sources that are utilized by the legacy system will be used for the new solution. ✓ CRGC anticipates conversion of 35 years of legacy data from paper files and historical information from the existing Access system.	✓ Conversions of paper-based data and migrations of electronic information that needs extensive "clean-up" have inherent risks which the ADR Project will need to assess, monitor, and mitigate. ✓ However, in terms of "readiness" at this early stage, the ADR Project is doing a good job of planning for these efforts.
Infrastructure			
Infrastructure Implementation	**No Risk Identified**	✓ The preferred solution identified in the feasibility study is a "cloud-based" one.	✓ Requirements for infrastructure at CRGC are minimal.