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Systematic, well-designed research provides the most effective approach to the solution of many problems facing highway administrators and engineers. Often, highway problems are of local interest and can best be studied by highway departments individually or in cooperation with their state universities and others. However, the accelerating growth of highway transportation develops increasingly complex problems of wide interest to highway authorities. These problems are best studied through a coordinated program of cooperative research.

In recognition of these needs, the highway administrators of the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials initiated in 1962 an objective national highway research program employing modern scientific techniques. This program is supported on a continuing basis by funds from participating member states of the Association and it receives the full cooperation and support of the Federal Highway Administration, United States Department of Transportation.

The Transportation Research Board of the National Research Council was requested by the Association to administer the research program because of the Board's recognized objectivity and understanding of modern research practices. The Board is uniquely suited for this purpose as it maintains an extensive committee structure from which authorities on any highway transportation subject may be drawn; it possesses avenues of communications and cooperation with federal, state and local governmental agencies, universities, and industry; its relationship to the National Research Council is an insurance of objectivity; it maintains a full-time research correlation staff of specialists in highway transportation matters to bring the findings of research directly to those who are in a position to use them.

The program is developed on the basis of research needs identified by chief administrators of the highway and transportation departments and by committees of AASHTO. Each year, specific areas of research needs to be included in the program are proposed to the National Research Council and the Board by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials. Research projects to fulfill these needs are defined by the Board, and qualified research agencies are selected from those that have submitted proposals. Administration and surveillance of research contracts are the responsibilities of the National Research Council and the Transportation Research Board.

The needs for highway research are many, and the National Cooperative Highway Research Program can make significant contributions to the solution of highway transportation problems of mutual concern to many responsible groups. The program, however, is intended to complement rather than to substitute for or duplicate other highway research programs.

Note: The Transportation Research Board, the National Research Council, the Federal Highway Administration, the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, and the individual states participating in the National Cooperative Highway Research Program do not endorse products or manufacturers. Trade or manufacturers' names appear herein solely because they are considered essential to the object of this report.
FOREWORD

By Staff
Transportation Research Board

This report contains the results of research into successful planning and development of multimodal transportation projects that will provide transportation organizations and planning professionals with practical tools and guidance for establishing and sustaining partnerships. Presented as guidelines, the report provides an overview of multimodal transportation partnerships, their definition, how they are formed, why they are needed, and the types of projects that benefit from such arrangements. It also focuses on how they are organized and sustained. Finally, methods are identified for tracking, monitoring, evaluating, and dealing with various issues in maintaining partnerships. An appendix presents short abstracts of each of the 12 case studies that were prepared during the research. The guidelines report should be especially valuable to state departments of transportation (DOTs), metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs), and local transportation planners as well as other practitioners concerned with planning, programming, and implementing multimodal transportation projects. The report will also be useful as an educational resource into the concepts, tools, and procedures currently employed to establish and maintain partnerships in multimodal transportation planning and project development.

During the 1990s, federal transportation policy, as embodied in the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA) and the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21), placed a high priority on integrating and coordinating transportation decision making through improved partnerships that include and engage a broad base of stakeholders and a variety of interests. This new emphasis represents a shift away from project-specific modal solutions toward a much broader integration of multimodal solutions within the context of overall societal goals. As such, this emphasis is intended to result in transportation plans, programs, decisions, and commitments that are driven by the needs of the specific area as opposed to the modal restrictions of the funding source or program. Given this emphasis, transportation planning and development must be based on partnerships that reflect the multimodal and intermodal aspects of transportation. Such partnerships may involve public agencies, private organizations, or community organizations or groups. As public sector transportation agencies face the next century, their effectiveness will hinge on developing and maintaining partnerships that will enhance the multimodal transportation planning process and result in improved efficiency and market competitiveness, responsiveness to customer requirements, service quality and attractiveness, and transportation planning and financial decision making for more than one mode, especially within metropolitan areas.

There has been a growing expectation that transportation system service and improvements should contribute to the achievement of broad local, regional, and statewide plans and objectives. As a result, transportation decisions taken at both the statewide and MPO levels need to consider the inputs and needs of a much broader
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION TO PARTNERSHIPS: ROCKS TO REMOVE, BRIDGES TO BUILD

The National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) initiated a series of research projects on multimodal transportation planning in response to the intent and specifications of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA). This project focuses on the dynamics of partnerships formed to plan, design, implement, and/or operate multimodal and intermodal projects. Two other reports resulted from this project: NCHRP Web Document 21, “Case Studies of Multimodal Transportation Partnerships,” and NCHRP Web Document 22, “Research Report: Developing and Maintaining Partnerships for Multimodal Transportation Planning” (which summarizes the work and presents recommendations for further research). These are available online at http://www4.nas.edu/trb/crp.nsf/

This introductory section of the guidelines summarizes the project findings, explains who would benefit from these guidelines, and describes how to use them. This section also explains why partnerships are important in managing multimodal transportation projects.

These guidelines are written with an understanding that some transportation organizations are equipped to effectively plan multimodal projects, while others are developing this capability. The guidelines reflect the idea that there are usually elements of partnership that can be improved upon.

This section of the guidelines opens with a brief overview of the project approach and findings. The introduction is followed by a description of who would benefit from using the guidelines and how to use them. Next are a series of questions and answers that lay the groundwork for understanding what is meant by such words as partnership, project, and multimodal. Chapter 1 concludes with some discussion of the importance of identifying the role of local governments and the private sector in multimodal transportation partnerships.

1.1 SUMMARY OF PROJECT APPROACH AND FINDINGS

Partnerships and team-building among stakeholders in transportation planning are necessities in order for a seamless transportation system to become a reality. The overall goal of this research project was to develop a set of strategies and tools for developing and maintaining partnerships in multimodal planning. Specific objectives of the project were as follows:

- To conduct a thorough, systematic study of successful multimodal transportation projects and services;
- To develop and document the factors involved in successful partnerships and the factors that form barriers to success;
- To develop and document a typology of partnership and team-building opportunities in the public and private sectors, by relating partnership characteristics to common multimodal transportation planning activities; and
- To prepare guidelines on how to develop and maintain successful partnerships.

To accomplish these objectives, specific tasks were completed. First, the research team conducted an industry scan to develop a multimodal project database. The team identified approximately 60 projects involving partnerships nationwide. The database provides a good cross section of current and recently completed multimodal projects. From this database, the following 12 partnerships were selected as case studies:

- Outer Banks Transportation Study—North Carolina;
- Summit Stage—Summit County, Colorado;
- South Anchorage Transit Center—Alaska;
- Tower City Center—Cleveland, Ohio;
- NY-Ontario International Border Crossing—Buffalo;
- Norfolk Southern Intermodal Terminal—Kentucky;
- Inner Sound High-Speed Ferry System—North Carolina;
- TransGuide ITS Project—San Antonio, Texas;
- Atlanta Committee for the Olympic Games (ACOG)—Georgia;
- Atlanta Community Empowerment Corporation (ACEC)—Georgia;
- Virginia Railway Express—Northern Virginia; and
- Dulles Greenway—Northern Virginia.

(An Executive Summary of each case study is provided in Appendix A).

From these case studies, partnership issues (e.g., technical, legal, and institutional), barriers, keys to success, and lessons learned were identified and analyzed. The team then created a step-by-step guide on successful development and mainte-
nance of partnerships for multimodal transportation projects. These guidelines are the result of that analysis.

On the basis of a careful analysis of the 12 case study databases, a similar number of common, underlying themes were recognized:

- Lack of initial consideration of legal issues,
- Lack of timely local government involvement,
- Importance of private sector involvement,
- Need for flexible procurement procedures,
- Lack of a regional perspective,
- Use of partnering as a management tool,
- Need for a neutral facilitator,
- Need for planned communications and trust-building,
- Need for authority at the lowest possible level,
- Need to accommodate each partner’s organizational culture,
- Increased quality resulting from effective partnerships, and
- A paradox: the need for necessary inclusiveness while restricting the partnership to only those partners necessary.

1.2 POTENTIAL USERS OF THESE GUIDELINES

These guidelines are intended primarily for the use of state and local public sector transportation agencies. Additional benefits would be gained by the private sector transportation system construction industry, design and planning professionals, providers of transportation services (e.g., transit providers, the trucking industry, rail transportation, and air and marine transport terminals), and quasi-public and private transportation system organizations (e.g., toll authorities, parking authorities, and airport authorities). This report will be of particular interest to top management, major department heads (e.g., planning, design, environmental, construction, and operations), and project managers. The guidelines would also apply to any individual, agency, or organization developing a multimodal transportation partnership or improving the effectiveness of an existing partnership.

1.3 HOW TO USE THE GUIDELINES

The remaining parts of these guidelines are as follows:

- Chapter 2 deals with developing partnerships,
- Chapter 3 covers keeping partnerships going, and
- The appendices contain one-page summaries of each of the case studies.

The guidelines apply to both public-public and public-private partnerships, and any differences in processes for the two types are explained within the text. At the end of each chapter, helpful hints, checklists, and useful references are provided. The checklists are designed to serve as hands-on planning and evaluation tools by managers of partnership activities. The references are of specific examples of management principles and documentation on partnerships.

The resource people identified for each case study partnership (Appendix A) have agreed to serve as a dynamic, ongoing resource that will extend the utility and value of this report. In some cases, the principal contact is the public affairs office of a project, company, or agency. In other cases it is the chief administrative officer. Readers are encouraged to obtain additional information from the valuable resources of other agencies and companies that have formed and maintained partnerships for multimodal transportation planning.

Names, addresses, and phone numbers for these contacts are in the executive summaries of each of the partnerships (Appendix A). More detailed descriptions of these 12, as well as summary information on 58 partnerships are in NCHRP Web Document 21. In a similar way, the authors of the guidelines have additional information on partnerships building on these case studies along with the other 50 partnerships contained in the interactive database developed for this project (also contained in NCHRP Web Document 21).

1.4 WHAT IS A PARTNERSHIP?

In these guidelines, a partnership is defined as any joint or shared use of resources (e.g., personnel, equipment, facilities, and financing) established in order to complete a specific multimodal transportation project or a particular phase of that project. This is a very broad description of a partnership. It does not matter what specific form of binding agreement is anticipated or in place—What is important is the common purpose of combining resources, either formally or informally, to accomplish a specific purpose.

Various types of multimodal partnerships are described in the executive summaries of 12 case studies in Appendix A. These partnerships have been formed to develop or maintain multimodal facilities in high-density urban areas and in remote rural areas. Partnerships are formed among public agencies or as public-private partnerships.

Almost all partnerships incorporate some type of public involvement plan in their work. Some incorporate organizations such as community groups or quasi-public entities formally. Others include such interests and stakeholders informally. A partnership is considered “multimodal” if there is more than one mode included in the project or if it involves a transfer point for people or goods.

Generally, the only type of organizational arrangement that is not considered a partnership in the context of these guidelines would be a strict owner-contractor agreement, with a single owner and a builder or consultant working for that owner under the terms and conditions of a contract. A true partnership in this context is one where each partner contributes resources in some manner. For insight into the various arrangements that are considered partnerships, refer to Appendix A.
1.5 WHICH MULTIMODAL PROJECTS NEED PARTNERSHIPS?

Partnerships should be developed in cases where there exists an overarching vision, one widely recognized as needing to be achieved. Partnerships are seldom useful where single issues dominate or in win-lose scenarios. For partnerships to work, attitudes of flexibility and compromise must exist from the beginning.

Partners also need to be aware of and understand the perspectives of the other partners. In some cases, diverging missions of potential partners create a climate in which developing a partnership is difficult or perhaps impossible. When parties involved cannot go beyond their own perspectives, there is less likelihood that a successful partnership can be developed.

1.6 WHY ARE PARTNERSHIPS FORMED?

Perhaps the most important issue for those who have not previously been involved in a partnership is to understand why partnerships may be useful for multimodal projects. Partnerships have proven useful in multimodal projects because they encourage a wide range of perspectives and involvement in the planning stage. Successful partnership formation ensures proper input from the start and allows organizational stakeholders to play the roles that they know and do best.

Multimodal transportation partnerships can serve various purposes, including the following:

- To use the strengths of different organizations;
- To improve the efficiency of processes;
- To solve complex problems;
- To finance projects and share funding;
- To share benefits and increase the return on investments;
- To share risk;
- To broaden perspectives and increase awareness;
- To increase communications and understanding of issues among stakeholders;
- To improve quality and user satisfaction with projects; and
- To complete the planning, design, implementation, and/or continued operation of a project or facility.

Partnerships may be formed with one or many of the above reasons as a motivating factor.

1.7 HOW ARE PARTNERSHIPS FORMED?

Partnerships are formed in so many ways that it would be impractical to begin to list them. Sufficient guidance here would be to point out that stakeholders in a project in almost all cases would simply identify a need to partner on a particular project. However, one management tool that has been proven extremely useful in developing a partnership is the Partnering Process. The Partnering Process has many applications in planning for multimodal transportation projects. The key to applying the partnering methods summarized in these guidelines is knowing when to use the methods. Partnering is used as a management tool to avoid costly, time-consuming legal actions resulting from disputes.

Partnering had its genesis in large public works projects under the ownership of the Army Corps of Engineers. It was reportedly first institutionalized in the Portland, Oregon, District of the Corps in the late 1980s and quickly spread throughout the Corps’ Civil Works Programs. The process involves a structured set of workshops among all or selected participants in a project, including the owner, planning agency (if different), design consultant, contractor, subcontractors, key suppliers, local officials, environmental groups, and other stakeholders in a particular project. Periodic workshops are held throughout a project’s planning, design, and construction stages.

As the Partnering Process has matured in this country, many state DOTs embraced this management approach during the early 1990s, until at a recent accounting (1995) at least 45 state DOTs were using the process in their highway construction programs. Many states and numerous local governments (e.g., Nashville, Tennessee) are also using the approach extensively in the preconstruction phase of complex projects. An excellent guidebook on how to get started with the Partnering Process has been prepared by the American Consulting Engineers Council and the American Institute of Architects (1993) and is listed as a reference at the end of this chapter. The National Highway Institute also has a course (No. 13444) that introduces the principles of the Partnering Process.

When partnering is part of a project management system, it provides an initial and less costly approach to resolving disputes that often arise in complex multimodal transportation projects. Disputes commonly arise in such projects because of diverging missions among the various stakeholders in the project.

Example from the Case Studies

In planning for a sensitive environmental corridor involving a coastal highway, bridges, and ferry service, the North Carolina Department of Transportation formed a partnership with the principal state and federal environmental review agencies. The objective was to provide an improved environmental review process and a more environmentally sensitive solution for improvement of a multimodal transportation corridor. This partnership, the Outer Banks Task Force, is summarized in Appendix A and described in more detail in NCHRP Web Document 21 (as are all the case studies).
Example from the Case Studies

The San Antonio District of the Texas Department of Transportation formed a public-private partnership with its prime contractor for an advanced traffic management system in the metropolitan area. By bringing into the partnership the prime contractor, all subcontractors, and municipal agencies with responsibilities for incident management, TXDOT was able to take better advantage of the respective strengths of each stakeholder in the TransGuide ITS project.

Although the Partnering Process has been more commonly used in managing construction projects than in preconstruction activities, it is proving to be a valuable tool in planning and design. As described in Section 2.5 of these guidelines, Partnering is also an effective mechanism for avoiding litigation. The costs associated with partnering have proven to be far less than the cost of litigation. Partnering would be the initial step in planning for dispute resolution, as depicted in Figure 1.

In this model, one moves to the next stage only if the previous stage is unsuccessful. If the Partnering Process is successful, for example, alternative dispute resolution techniques (ADR) and legal processes are minimized or even eliminated. Some discussion of ADR is contained in Sections 2.5 and 3.3 of these Guidelines.

1.8 LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE-SECTOR INVOLVEMENT

Although there is widespread recognition that it is important to involve all necessary stakeholders in the planning of a multimodal project from the beginning, adequate, timely involvement is seldom accomplished. In the case of a state agency project, local governments need to be included in the planning process from the beginning. This will usually be true regardless of local funding contributions to the project. Early involvement of local governments has a high likelihood of decreasing the overall implementation time for projects, although the front-end or start-up time and costs may increase.

Similarly, state and local agencies need to involve the private sector early in the planning of multimodal projects. Public agencies must be sensitive to the constraints and limitations necessary to maintain a competitive environment within the private sector. Partnerships require practical markets to attract private-sector investment with the assurance of future return. Several appropriate techniques for early private-sector involvement are available to take advantage of windows of opportunity in the planning process.

Although these guidelines generally apply to partnerships developed among a group of government agencies, they also apply to public-private partnerships. Public-private partnerships are encouraged in some states by virtue of state legislation. Several states will be considering such legislation on the basis of what happens in Virginia and other states in the coming years.

Helpful hints, checklists, and references to aid the reader in obtaining further information on the "preformation" phase of partnership development follow.

1.9 HELPFUL HINTS

Tables 1 and 2 summarize findings from the 12 case studies and other data from a total of 58 multimodal projects included in the database. (These findings are more completely described in NCHRP Web Document 21.)

Although various barriers were encountered in the case studies (see Table 1), some degree of partnership continuity and operations often continued even in the face of adversity. In other words, although most barriers were overcome to a degree, they still interfered with the successful conclusion of the project or system being planned. Other major issues encountered in the case studies, not necessarily barriers to partnership formation or maintenance, are summarized in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1</th>
<th>Barriers to partnership development or maintenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More often Overcome</td>
<td>More often NOT Overcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mistrust</td>
<td>Incomplete communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early local government involvement</td>
<td>Effective private-sector involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan for communications</td>
<td>Regional perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodating each partner's organizational culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal impediments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Planning for dispute resolution.
TABLE 2  Major issues encountered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Institutional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orientation to work assigned</td>
<td>Stewardship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of service provided</td>
<td>Response mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Control systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business orientation</td>
<td>Management functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Operating procedures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.10 CHECKLISTS—HOW TO USE THEM

Refer to Guidelines Section

Stage A: Prior to Developing a Partnership
1. Reasons for forming a partnership 1.5, 1.6
2. Activities prior to deciding to partner 1.7, 1.8
3. Activities to activate a partnership 2.1
4. Identifying stakeholders 2.2

Stage B: Developing a Partnership
1. Activities included in kick-off workshop 2.3
2. Partnership components 2.4
3. Legislation and other legal issues 2.5
4. Institutional issues 2.6
5. Community involvement issues 2.7

Stage C: Maintaining a Partnership
1. Internal communication components 3.1
2. Tracking progress 3.2
3. Legal issues 3.3
4. Institutional issues 3.4
5. Community involvement activities 3.5

* NOTE: Checklists identified with a Section 2.X designation are at the end of Section 2, and 3.X checklists are at the end of Section 3.

Reasons for Forming a Partnership (Ref. Sections 1.5 & 1.6)

Does our project need a partnership for any of the following reasons?

- To use the strengths of different organizations
- To improve the efficiency of processes
- To solve a complex problem
- To finance the project or share funding
- To take advantage of state enabling legislation and tax incentives
- To share benefits and increase the return on investments
- To share the risk
- To broaden perspectives and increase awareness
- To increase communications and understanding

- To improve quality and user satisfaction with the project

Activities Prior to Deciding to Partner (Ref. Sections 1.7 and 1.8)

Have the following steps been taken? Is complete information available to allow an informed decision on whether a partnership is necessary for our project?

- Develop a project description (concept and scope)
- Clearly define the goals of the project
- Determine general resources needed to complete the project
- Search for available information on other partnerships
- Examine legal concerns:
  —Statutory interpretations:
    ISTEA and CAAA
  —Flexibility of state laws
  —Flexibility of procurement practices
  —Jurisdictional issues
- Identify possible funding sources
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CHAPTER 2
A GUIDE TO DEVELOPING PARTNERSHIPS: BUILDING A PARTNERSHIP MENTALITY

This chapter describes activities recommended to help prevent those problems and barriers that commonly occur during partnership development. Included are suggestions for the following:

- Agencies and organizations to consider in forming a partnership,
- Appropriate steps to get the partnership started,
- Organizational models for partnerships, and
- How to explore the various issues involved in partnership development (issues are categorized as legal, institutional, and community involvement).

Chapter 2 of the guidelines provides a logical time-sequenced approach to forming a partnership. First there is guidance on identifying stakeholders in a multimodal project, then information on conducting a project kick-off workshop, and then a discussion of the various organizational models that have been used in public-private and in public-public partnerships. Chapter 2 concludes with a discussion of those legal, institutional, and community involvement issues typically encountered in the formation of multimodal transportation partnerships.

2.1 GETTING STARTED

In these guidelines, it is assumed that top management within an organization has identified an individual or group within the organization to explore the need for establishing multimodal partnerships. This role might be assumed by a member of the top-management team or delegated to others in the organization. Therefore, a clear understanding of who will take on the start-up responsibilities must be established.

To reiterate a point made in the introduction to these guidelines, it is recognized that some transportation organizations are equipped to effectively plan multimodal projects, while others are still establishing this capability. As implied in the subtitle to this section of the guidelines, it is assumed that development of a multimodal mentality is a desirable objective in the post-ISTEA era.

It is anticipated that the guidelines will be equally applicable to any state or local transportation organization that needs a multimodal transportation partnership. For guidance on developing the multimodal planning process, the reader is referred to the following NCHRP studies:

- Innovative Practices for Multimodal Transportation Planning, 8-32(1) (later published as NCHRP Report 404);
- Development of a Performance-Based Planning Process, 8-32(2);
- Integration of Land Use Planning with Multimodal Transportation Planning, 8-32(3) (later published as NCHRP Report 423A); and
- Developing Improved Data Collection Methods for Multimodal Transportation Planning, 8-32(5) (later published as NCHRP Report 401).

A suggested model for developing a partnership would include several important start-up tasks. Early consideration of the actual need for a partnership, according to project specifics, will increase the probability of success. The following tasks should be accomplished before deciding to create a partnership:

- Develop a project description (including overall concept and scope);
- Clearly define the goals of the project;
- Determine the resources and capabilities needed to complete the project;
- Review information on other partnerships (see references for this section and case study summaries in Appendix A);
- Identify funding sources (e.g., federal, state, local, and private sector); and
- Examine legal concerns and the status of legislation on partnerships
  - Restrictive state laws,
  - Restrictive procurement practices,
  - Jurisdictional issues, and
  - Statutory interpretations such as ISTEA, Clean Air Act Amendments (CAA), and the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA).

If the above steps are followed, an organization should be in a good position to decide if a partnership would benefit the project. Assuming the decision is to go forward with a partnership, the following start-up activities are recommended:
• Investigate the time frames/availability for funding sources;
• Determine the political base of support;
• Identify and analyze potential opposition to the project; and
• Determine the partnership approach
  —Informal agreements (initially),
  —Partnership Process (including a partnering agreement),
  —Interagency Agreement,
  —Employees/equipment on loan from one agency to another,
  —Memorandum of Understanding (MOU),
  —Memorandum of Agreement (MOA),
  —Request for Information (RFI), and
  —Sole-source contract (where permitted and appropriate).

As with any activity, establishing a partnership requires careful planning to ensure a strong foundation.

Examples from the Case Studies

The Commonwealth of Virginia has been one of the innovators in recent years in developing specific legislative initiatives to encourage public-private partnerships for transportation projects. The Virginia Railway Express, a commuter railroad connecting suburban Northern Virginia to the District of Columbia, was founded based on legislation that created a special regional transportation commission authorized to use sales taxes for commuter rail.

Another project, initiated during the 1980s, was the Dulles Greenway, founded on the Virginia Highway Corporation Act, which encouraged private toll road construction in the state. In 1995, the Virginia legislature passed the Public-Private Partnership Act, which was specifically designed to encourage multimodal partnerships.

Example from the Case Studies

The Summit Stage, a rural transportation service in central Colorado, formed a public-private partnership consisting of Summit County, ski resorts, small towns in the county, and private transportation providers. This partnership was formed to plan, design, and build a multimodal transfer facility near Interstate 70 in the Town of Frisco. Although the partnership nominally involves all the “right” players, not all members of the partnership recognize the partnership as anything other than a town- contractor relationship.

Example from the Case Studies

An International Border Crossing Coalition on the Buffalo-Niagara Frontier area of New York and Ontario formed a partnership called the ITS Committee to deploy an advanced traffic management system to the various bridge crossings across the Niagara River. Included in this partnership are approximately a dozen public and private agencies with responsibilities for infrastructure construction, operation, and maintenance. Even with the relatively large number of stakeholders formally involved in this partnership, participants indicated that there were important stakeholders missing, including the municipalities in the region.

- Chambers of Commerce,
- City and county government,
- Metropolitan Planning Organization,
- Professional and trade organizations,
- International interests and organizations, and
- Contractors/consultants (to provide planning, design, implementation, and operations).

To minimize prolonging the planning, design, and implementation time for projects, all necessary organizations should be involved in the planning process from the beginning, even if they are minor partners in funding the project or do not participate in funding at all. Partners, in many cases, are not necessarily “cash contributors” to the partnership. In-kind services, for example, are often as critical to success as funding. In some cases, providing in-kind services helps a stakeholder buy into a project. Keep in mind, however, that as the number of partners increases, difficulty in communicating and coordinating activities increases.

The following two examples from the case studies illustrate some of the intricacies involved in selecting the right organizations and the right people to participate in partnership formation and in meeting the partners as they initiate a project or system plan.
2.3 KICK-OFF WORKSHOP

An early “kick-off” workshop is recommended as an initial step in establishing a partnership. This could be an organizational meeting for the project itself or the partnership. It may be determined that an initial, information-sharing meeting is appropriate before making the final decision on which agencies or organizations should be officially included in the partnership. Such a meeting would be an open forum for potential partners, with no commitments at this point in the partnership development process.

Partner selection criteria should be refined, based on the project’s goals and requirements. Requirements could include such elements as management and/or technological experience and financial stability. Following a clear decision concerning partnership participants, a kick-off workshop including all partners should be held at the beginning of the planning, design, or construction phase of a project. A workshop format rather than a meeting format will help all parties to get acquainted with the project and with each partner’s role in the project. This workshop should also be approached as a working session to develop an action plan, rather than simply a meeting where issues are discussed but no plan is developed for follow-up and continuation of partnership development or work tasks.

Using the Partnering Process as the model for decision-making throughout the life of a project, the sequential activities that will ideally take place are shown in Figure 2.

Experienced project managers understand that some type of interactive management process must be in place to ensure the successful completion of complex multimodal projects. In many cases, in the absence of an effective decision-making process, however, project managers find the sequence of events shown in Figure 3 taking place.

Partnering is designed to prevent the pattern shown in Figure 3 from occurring. Partnering workshops can be planned and facilitated either internally or by bringing in a consultant. Partnerships that have used the expertise of an outside facilitator generally find that a quicker start can be achieved on a project or activity. Another benefit of having a facilitator who is not a stakeholder in the partnership is that partners usually have their own preconceived agendas, corporate/agency procedures and philosophies, and ideas of how a partnership should work and an outside facilitator often helps participants to focus on issues and resolve potential problems.

In some cases, an individual who has had training in workshop facilitation may be part of one of the participating organizations. In larger organizations, personnel-training offices could have such expertise available. Whoever serves as a facilitator for the partnership must be “neutral” and able to understand and incorporate the perspectives of each partner. The partnership members must assess the current situation in a logical, systematic way to decide on the most appropriate workshop facilitator. For example, if the partnership has previously worked on similar projects, then there may be an inside facilitator available. All major stakeholders must agree on who should facilitate the partnership workshops and meetings.

Activities that are commonly included in kick-off workshops are as follows:

- Review of project description, purpose, status, and plans;
- Discussion of different perceptions of the project;
- Team building—sometimes called paradigm shifting (this is an exercise where there is a “walk through” or simulation of the entire project or task, with an identification of issues and potential problems and responsibilities to resolve them);
- Identification of the interests and needs of all partners;
- Issue identification at each stage of the project;
- Clear definition of each partner’s role and benefit from a successful project (“give and take”);
• Development of an action plan to achieve a successful project
  — Vision statement for the project,
  — Values important to a successful project,
  — Address/phone/FAX list,
  — Issue resolution process chart, and
  — Charter or mission statement for the partnership consisting of common goals and objectives and signatures of all participants;
• Development of a partnership evaluation process to be conducted periodically throughout the project; and
• Evaluation of the partnering workshop.

Example from the Case Studies

In the San Antonio TransGuide project, a consultant was hired to facilitate the Partnering Process. This outside facilitator designed an Issue Resolution Process Chart, which is being used on a monthly basis to track the progress of the partnership during the construction of a traffic management system. This example of an ongoing evaluation process is shown in TCRP Web Document 21.

In summary, the recommended approach to initiating a formal partnership must include all members of the partnership working together to clearly establish the partnership framework. The partnering approach to this kick-off workshop has proven beneficial in transportation projects.

2.4 ORGANIZATIONAL MODELS FOR PARTNERSHIPS

Four general organizational models, or strategies, have been developed based on the case studies conducted as a part of this NCHRP project. Every partnership included in this study is different, and the variations of each of these four basic models are shown in more specific detail in the Executive Summaries in Appendix A. The four generalized models shown in Table 3 are examples of partnership organization in terms of: partnership function (purpose of partnership), partners (who is involved), roles of partners, and the type of binding agreement used. Important factors to consider in the understanding and application of these generalized models follow.

Private-sector involvement. In each of these models, the public sector must take advantage of every opportunity to involve the private sector as early in the project as possible. Benefits of this approach include the possibility of cost-sharing in the planning and design phases, greater interest from the private sector in the project outcome (return on investment), and shared risk-taking. Private-sector partnership status does not exist when only a traditional owner-contractor relationship is maintained. However, partnership status is achieved if both the public and private sector enter into a mutual involvement in developing and carrying out the project with a common interest or vision.

Local government involvement. Similar to the early involvement of the private sector, it is equally important to involve MPOs and other local government agencies early in the development of the partnership, regardless of funding level.

Formation of an executive committee and working group. Case studies show that the appointment of an executive committee, or policy-making group, is essential where numerous partner representatives are involved. The working, or technical group, would in all likelihood meet more frequently to complete most of the work necessary for the partnership to function. The executive committee should be called on to resolve issues that cannot be resolved at the working group level, as well as to endorse decisions that need to be elevated to a higher level. The executive committee typically should include only one representative from each participating organization. However, the working group can function with a larger number representing each partner in order to cover all necessary technical and administrative requirements.

Need for a neutral partnership facilitator. An unbiased person should be appointed to facilitate partnership meetings and maintain the partnership with some degree of continuity. There is a need for a strong, but unbiased champion to stress the process of partnership development and maintenance without influencing the actual outcome of the partnership. The outcome needs to be equitably distributed throughout the partnership. This lead person is frequently from the lead agency involved, but employment of an outside facilitator is often necessary to ensure neutrality in complex scenarios. The idea of an unbiased facilitator is discussed in detail in the kick-off workshop section above (Section 2.3).

2.5 LEGISLATION AND OTHER LEGAL ISSUES

In partnership formation, specific attention needs to be given to potential legal issues that are often not anticipated in the initial phases of a multimodal project. Early identification of potential legal concerns is not only beneficial from a cost-benefit perspective, but is imperative given the funding mandates prescribed by ISTEA. These mandates encourage participation by non-traditional stakeholders. Legal issues must be addressed at each stage of partnership formation and throughout the life of the project. Legal issues must be identified as early as possible in order to reduce or avoid escalated transaction costs resulting from disputes and/or litigation (see Chapter 1).

Legal obstacles and issues vary depending on the composition of the partnership. Partnerships involving public-
TABLE 3 Models for the development and maintenance of partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Three general models for public-private partnerships</td>
<td>State DOT, MPO/local govt.*, Private firms, Environmental agencies, Federal agencies</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Informal Agreement, MOU/ MOA, Partnering Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal agencies, State DOT*</td>
<td>Technological assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developer, Metro/regional transit*</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private firms</td>
<td>Planning guidelines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State DOT (central), Local agencies*</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Design-Build Contract, Partnering Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State DOT (regional)*</td>
<td>Design, constr. mgmt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private firms</td>
<td>Land lease, facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transit improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Oversight, policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>O&amp;M Contract, Partnering Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance, operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management, maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. A sample model for public-public partnerships**

| Planning, Design, Implementation/ Construction, Operations | FHWA, State DOT, State Ferry Div, State, Federal permitting agencies, University | Funding | Interagency Agreement, Shared Resources, Partnering Process |
| | | Planning, design, matching funds, construction mgmt. | |
| | | Planning, operations | |
| | | Joint development, planning | |
| | | Research, database development | |

* Indicates usual lead roles, depending on the project.
** This example would have many variations, depending on the project; for details of this particular partnership model, see the case study on the Outer Banks Transportation Study.

Private entities frequently necessitate policy shifts and legislative initiatives that require political commitment for the partnership to succeed. The use of public funds to lease private lands or buildings or underwrite private entrepreneurial ventures is subject to strict accountability. On the other hand, the criteria for the formation and function of a public-public partnership may involve legal issues that are particularly unique because of varied federal, state, and local regulatory and procedural issues.

---

Example from the Case Studies

A rather complicated set of local, state, and federal statutes had to be reviewed, understood, and subjected to compliance in developing Cleveland’s Tower City Center project. Conflict of law and guidelines was evident as the private developer and Cleveland Transit sought to meet the requirements of the ADA, historic preservation guidelines, and FTA regulations in developing a mixed-use, urban multimodal terminal.

Whatever the composition of a partnership, the importance of early identification of potential legal issues cannot be overstated. The following list, although not exhaustive or necessarily applicable to every multimodal project, exemplifies the multifaceted and diverse legal issues that should be addressed:

- Statutory interpretations (ISTEA, CAAA, NAFTA, etc.);
- Jurisdictional disputes;
- Conflict of law;
- Labor compliance;
- Land acquisition and capital expenditures;
- Federal preemption issues;
- Intellectual property rights;
- Liability concerns;
- Access issues (ADA);
- Civil Rights Act;
- Bonding;
- Risk allocation; and
- First Amendment issues.

These issues must be continuously addressed throughout the life of the project, but require particular attention during partnership development.

Lastly, it is recommended that an expert in the field of dispute resolution be involved in early stages of partnership development to discuss the options available and whether ADR should be formalized.
2.6 INSTITUTIONAL ISSUES

The concept of “partnership” is to bring diverse groups together to solve a common problem. This diversity introduces institutional issues that can develop into barriers to the project itself. All partners should be aware of institutional issues that commonly exist in partnership development:

- Diverging organizational missions (along with different clients, procedures, and technologies);
- Adherence to individual corporate cultures (resistance to change);
- Different languages used by public sector and private sector;
- Timely and/or incomplete communications on issues;
- Mistrust of other partnership members;
- Partnerships that can weaken control of the project’s final outcome;
- Frustration between public and private sector partners in accommodating different approaches to project development (e.g., public sector emphasis on process, private sector focus on outcome);
- Lack of full support and involvement by all organizations needed for a complete partnership; and
- Unwillingness of the partners to work out an acceptable arrangement for project accountability.

Example from the Case Studies

The public-private partnership formed to plan a High-Speed Passenger Ferry Service for North Carolina’s Inner Sounds developed an innovative tourist transportation system, but failed to keep the various political constituents onboard and supportive of the project. Consequently, not all the institutions needed for a complete partnership were in place, with the result that the plans for the ferry service are being extended over a longer period.

Of particular interest in public-private partnerships are the differences in character between the public and private sectors. Table 4 shows a comparison of these attributes.

2.7 COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT ISSUES

Every partnership should consider how the project will affect various communities, groups, and the general public. It is not only important to make certain the public stays informed, but to actively solicit input into political and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Private Sector</th>
<th>Public Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stewardship</td>
<td>Private investors</td>
<td>Public trust, safety and welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response mechanism</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>Response to constituents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work/assignment orientation</td>
<td>Outcome-oriented</td>
<td>Process-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>Budgets, taxes, fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usual type of service provided</td>
<td>Specialized; Short-term, high-</td>
<td>Normal engineering and design;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>technology applications</td>
<td>emergency and incident management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control systems</td>
<td>Centralized</td>
<td>Moving toward more decentralized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major management functions</td>
<td>Innovates, Designs, Moving toward</td>
<td>Directs, plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>operation and maintenance</td>
<td>Operates, maintains, Regulates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modus operandi</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Standardized, Regulated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Driven by competition</td>
<td>No competition, except within agencies and between agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business orientation</td>
<td>Profit-seeking Quality</td>
<td>No profits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production orientation</td>
<td>improvement-oriented</td>
<td>Public service-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sets own pace, Progress-oriented,</td>
<td>Consensus decision-making process;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tends to be exclusive</td>
<td>Slower procurement; Inclusive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

decision-making processes. A public involvement plan is a necessary part of any transportation project. Public involvement is required by the “3-C” (Coordinated, Comprehensive, Continuing) planning process. ISTEA gave this process additional emphasis. Community involvement issues that are important for a partnership to consider in developing a multimodal transportation project include the following:

- Community redevelopment and renewal;
- Improved overall mobility;
- Access to job opportunities and community services;
- Equitable distribution of transportation services;
- Participation in community decision-making and political processes;
- Openness to new ideas, ideologies, and community goals;
- Openness to different ways of solving problems;
- Protection of community environments; and
- Provision of alternative modes in urban areas (e.g., pedestrian walkways, bicycle paths, and connectors to transit routes).

Community involvement can help ensure that all affected stakeholders in a project have an opportunity to provide their input. This is particularly important for those groups not directly involved in the partnership. The challenge for partnerships is to take an already complex process of communication and coordination among partners and reach out to the public. However, this challenge is necessary because it produces greater user satisfaction and is preventive maintenance for potential public opposition in later stages of the project.

- Agree to focus on the completed project, not the processes needed to get there (the end, not the means to the end).
- Come in with an attitude of compromise and cooperation.
- Avoid creating organizational charts for the partnership.
- Accept responsibility for mistakes and shortcomings; find ways to overcome them within the partnership or bring in new participants.
- Make sure that the public-sector participants understand the concept of financial risk in public-private partnerships.
- Appoint a project management team that is experienced, flexible, and willing to work closely with representatives from other organizations.
- Be aware that multiple layers in public and private sectors alike complicate communication and increase decision-making costs.
- Include all necessary stakeholders; as the number of partners increases, difficulty in communicating and coordinating activities increases.
- Keep careful records of business conducted and partnership processes.

Table 5 summarizes the “Keys to Successful Partnerships,” abstracted from the material in NCHRP Web Document 21 and NCHRP Web Document 22.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keys to Success</th>
<th>Explanation/Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic incentive</td>
<td>Ability of private sector to make a profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk-taking</td>
<td>Ability to move outside the “comfort zone” of each partner’s corporate/organizational culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open communications</td>
<td>Frequent informal contacts—a much better approach than formal reporting and makes required reports easier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to compromise</td>
<td>Alternate models for partnerships must be explored and the “best practices” from each model used to fit the situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity</td>
<td>Disjointed stops and starts in the partnership result if the same key people do not stay involved in a project at least through the planning phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making</td>
<td>Existence of an active “policy group” with sufficient authority to bind an organizational commitment to decisions as they are made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal relationships</td>
<td>Informal relationships are more often the guiding force in partnerships, both with public agencies and private firms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example from the Case Studies

In considering all stakeholders in the metropolitan area that should be involved in urban redevelopment and the transportation planning process, the Atlanta Community Empowerment Corporation involved more than 40 organizations in their Policy Board.

Helpful hints, checklists, and references dealing with the formation and establishment of multimodal partnerships for planning transportation projects follow.

2.8 HELPFUL HINTS

- Understand the business “culture” or procedures of all partners, and obtain a top management commitment from the beginning.
### 2.9 CHECKLISTS

#### Activities to Activate a Partnership (Ref. Section 2.1)
If a firm decision has been made to partner, have the following steps been taken as we begin developing our partnership?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Investigate the time frames for which all sources of funding would be available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Determine the political base of support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify and analyze potential opposition to the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Determine the partnership approach:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Informal agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Partnering Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Interagency agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Employees/equipment on loan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Memorandum of Understanding, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Request for Information, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Sole-source contract</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Identifying Stakeholders (Ref. Section 2.2)
Have the following entities been considered as potential partners?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Transportation facility owners/operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Private-sector involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public-sector funding sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local government involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public-sector policy makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Formation of an executive committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Political structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Formation of partnership working group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local and community groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Designation of a partnership facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Permitting agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community involvement plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Contractors and consultants (for planning, design, implementation, or operations and maintenance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Legislation and Other Legal Issues (Ref. Section 2.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a plan in place to continuously examine these legal issues throughout the life of our project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chambers of commerce and business groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Federal statutory interpretations - ISTEA, CAAA, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• City and county governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• State statutory interpretations - Public-Private Partnership Act, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Metropolitan Planning Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Jurisdictional disputes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Professional and trade organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conflict of law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• International interests and organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Labor compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access issues - Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Legislative and Other Legal Issues (Ref. Section 2.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a plan in place to continuously examine these legal issues throughout the life of our project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Activities to Include in Kick-Off Workshop (Ref. Section 2.3)
Have these activities been planned for the kick-off session?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Review of project description, purpose, status, and plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Federal statutory interpretations - ISTEA, CAAA, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Discussion of different perceptions of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• State statutory interpretations - Public-Private Partnership Act, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Team-building presentation/exercises (if needed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Jurisdictional disputes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access issues - Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Civil Rights Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bonding authorization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Risk allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• First Amendment issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional Issues (Ref. Section 2.6)

Have the following institutional issues been addressed in partnership development?

- Diverging organizational missions
- Adherence to individual corporate cultures (i.e., resistance to change)
- Different “languages” in communications
- Timely and/or incomplete communications on issues
- Mistrust of other partnership members
- Accommodating differing approaches to project development
- Full support and involvement by all needed organizations
- Acceptable arrangement for project accountability
- Control/acceptance of project outcomes

Community Involvement Issues (Ref. Section 2.7)

Have the following issues been incorporated into our plan for developing the partnership?

- Participation by underrepresented groups in community decision-making and political processes
- Openness to new and divergent ideas, ideologies, and community goals
- Protection of community environments
- Openness to different ways of solving problems

2.10 REFERENCES

1995

1994

Vorster, M.C. “Dispute Review Board as an ADR Tool in Construction,” NAVFAC Presentation (March).

1993

1991
Rudy, John A. Legal Aspects of Partnering. Nixon Hargrave, Devans, & Doyle.

1990

1989
Martin, Steve A. Guidelines for Partnering Workshops. Winston-Salem, NC.
“Master Agreement for Provision of Commuter Rail Services in Northern Virginia—Establishment of the Virginia Railway Express” (October).

1988

1986

1984
CHAPTER 3

A GUIDE TO MAINTAINING PARTNERSHIPS: KEEPING A GOOD THING GOING

This chapter describes activities to help prevent common problems and barriers associated with maintaining a partnership. The chapter starts with guidelines concerning communication within partnerships and then covers how partnerships can track their progress during the continuing activities of carrying out the work. This chapter concludes with coverage of legal and institutional issues and those activities to be carried out as part of a community involvement program.

3.1 COMMUNICATIONS WITHIN PARTNERSHIPS

A partnership’s continued success depends greatly on both the quantity and quality of communications among partners. The following elements of an internal partnership communications plan should be considered:

- **Media.** Communications media depend on the physical proximity of partners with each other. Some project requirements may indicate a need for jointly locating project offices; others involve participants in remote locations, where telephone, e-mail, and fax networks need to be established.

- **Content.** There should be a commitment from each partner to carefully plan communications with top management when resources and/or decisions are needed. Thought should be given to relevance and timeliness of information.

- **Frequency.** Frequent coordination and correspondence are essential to maintaining a successful partnership. The frequency of communications needed within a partnership depends on the types of activities underway. For example, during the construction of a project, daily communications are probably necessary. Every partnership is unique, and each calls for unique communications requirements. Nevertheless, all partners should feel comfortable with the frequency of communications.

- **Shared Databases and Information.** A plan for sharing project technical details and financial information should be developed so that all members of the partnership have access on a “need-to-know” basis. Local area networks (LANs) or wide area networks (WANs) are common links of shared databases and information systems that should be incorporated into most project offices.

---

Example from the Case Studies

In planning for long-range transportation improvements on North Carolina’s Outer Banks, the working group of the Outer Banks Task Force met monthly for several years. The working group met with the Executive Committee on a biannual basis to chart progress and new directions, as well as secure policy decisions. Information provided to the Executive Committee was just enough to allow for an informed decision and to establish a confidence level so that the plans could be moved into the implementation stage.

---

3.2 TRACKING PROGRESS

Part of the database management system for any partnership is used for providing information to evaluate the success of the project, as well as provide some indication of how well the partnership itself is managing the project. Other elements of tracking progress are described in the following paragraphs.

**Partnership Meetings.** Open and continuous communications within a partnership reduce the need for frequent meetings. However, periodic meetings, whether weekly, monthly, or quarterly, provide a forum to discuss successes and failures, current status, and plans. They also provide the opportunity to discuss issues and resolve problems. In a partnership with a two-level management structure, meetings of an executive committee would generally be much less frequent than working group meetings. With modern communications technology, telephone conference calls or video conferences are alternatives to face-to-face communications.

---

Example from the Case Studies

As the policy-making body of an operating commuter railway, the Operating Board of the Virginia Railway Express meets monthly, much like a state or local transportation commission. In order to handle claims and disputes, a formal ADR process was specified in the contract.
Continuous Partnership Evaluation and Improvements. This element includes such items as development, review, and comment of periodic progress reports (typically monthly) and financial status reports. A distinction needs to be made here so that partners understand the difference between evaluating the project and evaluating the partnership itself. Project evaluations should include the following:

- Schedule,
- Budget,
- Quality,
- Safety,
- Equity,
- Consumer satisfaction,
- Efficiency, and
- Economic growth.

Although the above elements are project-specific, the relationship between project successes and shortcomings and partnership performance should be considered. The following are elements of partnership performance:

- Level of participation,
- Internal communications,
- Community involvement,
- Political support,
- Consensus building,
- Decision making,
- Accountability,
- Issue/conflict resolution,
- Joint planning activities,
- Shared capabilities,
- Cost-sharing, and
- Risk/benefit sharing.

The ultimate purpose of evaluating the partnership itself is to make commensurate improvements in the project. A suggested partnership evaluation form is shown in Table 6. This evaluation process is considered appropriate at certain milestones or on some regular basis throughout the life of a partnership or project. For most projects, perhaps quarterly or every six months would be an appropriate interval between check-ups. In periods of intense activity, perhaps monthly would be appropriate.

3.3 LEGAL ISSUES

Due to the need for inclusiveness in multimodal transportation projects, the likelihood of legal issues arising out of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 6 Partnership evaluation form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ratings:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0- not applicable; 1- unsatisfactory; 2- needs improvement; 3- satisfactory; 4- good; and 5- excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Factors</th>
<th>Rating (0—5)</th>
<th>Comments/explanation</th>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Membership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. All Stakeholders Represented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Appropriate Level of Representation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Internal Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Shared Databases/Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Community Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Political Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Consensus Building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Decision Making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Issue/Conflict Resolution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Partnering Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. ADR Techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Joint Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Shared Capabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Cost Sharing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Benefit Sharing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL _________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE _________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
differing agendas or opposing views requires stakeholders to expeditiously resolve legal claims while affording all parties due process. Therefore, adoption of ADR techniques must be considered and incorporated by the partnership at the conception of the project.

The dispute resolution model adopted may vary from project to project, involve only certain stakeholders within the project, or require modification during the life of the project. Selection of the ADR model during partnership development (see Section 2.5) will likely provide stakeholders an early opportunity to function as a partnership.

The following are optional resolution procedures, any or all of which may be applicable during the continuation stage of a partnership:

- Negotiation procedures,
- Change orders,
- Claims procedures,
- Mediation,
- Dispute Resolution Board, and
- Arbitration (binding or non-binding).

If these ADR techniques are not successful, the next step is the resolution of disputes in the courts.

3.4 INSTITUTIONAL ISSUES

All partners should be aware of institutional issues that may become barriers to successfully maintaining a partnership. In addition to those which commonly exist in partnership development, the following institutional issues may arise in later stages of the project:

- Adherence to individual corporate cultures (resistance to change);
- Diverging missions (along with different clients, procedures, technologies);
- Public-sector processes take longer than private-sector processes;
- Political influence;
- Uncommon “languages” of public and private sectors;
- Timely and/or incomplete communications on issues;
- Mistrust of other partnership members, particularly if partners have been competitors in other projects;
- Frustration between public- and private-sector partners in accommodating differing approaches to project development (public-sector emphasis on process, private-sector focus on outcome);
- Lack of full support and involvement by all organizations needed for a complete partnership; and
- Frequent turnover of partnership representatives (complete membership continuity is ideal).

3.5 COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM

The overall goal of a community involvement program is to inform the public and to allow the citizens the opportunity to be a part of the planning process. This can be accomplished through an interactive public information and press coverage campaign and through a series of focus groups and community meetings. Table 7 illustrates a model community involvement program.

Example from the Case Studies

One of the most extensive public involvement programs encountered in the case studies was developed by the Dulles TRIP II partnership. The same approach of environmental sensitivity and community involvement was followed when the same partners formed a second partnership called Rebuild, Inc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 7 Model community involvement program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elements</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This chapter on how to maintain partnerships concludes with helpful hints, checklists, and references in an effort to provide additional information on lessons learned from the Case Studies. In reality, the best information comes from the review of the Case Study material itself, and personal contact with those or other individuals who have been involved in developing or maintaining multimodal transportation partnerships.

3.6 HELPFUL HINTS

- Opportunities for “no agenda” meetings among key partnership participants are helpful in establishing and maintaining mutual feelings of trust, respect, and united effort.
- Despite modern communications media, a jointly located project or operations office for a partnership provides a helpful level of personal interaction that is not possible otherwise.
- There is no such thing as too frequent communications; during the operations and maintenance of any multimodal project, partners must establish a comfort level that allows an appropriate level of personal interaction.
- Use the schedule as a project management tool.
- If at all possible, continuity in membership and participation in partnership meetings should be maintained.
- To overcome the barriers identified in the case studies that most often are not resolved or that create the most problems for maintaining the continuity of a multimodal transportation partnership, the reader is referred to Table 8, with further review of selected references in the text of these guidelines as indicated in the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 8 Changes most often needed in multimodal partnerships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference sections from Volume I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Initial consideration of legal issues 2.5.E, 3.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Initial involvement of local government (if the project or plan is a state responsibility) 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adoption of a broader, “regional,” or long-range perspective 1.5, 2.6 &amp; 2.7, 3.4 &amp; 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More complete, continuous communications 3.1 &amp; 3.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7 CHECKLISTS

Internal communications components (Ref. Section 3.1)
Have the following components of our partnership communications plan been developed?

- Media
- Content/subject matter
- Frequency
- Shared databases and information

Tracking Progress (Ref. Section 3.2)

Have the following evaluation components been given proper consideration, and have individuals responsible been designated for each component?

- Database management system
- Partnership meetings
- Continuous partnership evaluation and improvements
- Project evaluation process for:
  - Schedule
  - Budget
  - Quality
  - Safety
  - Consumer satisfaction
- Partnership performance evaluation of:
  - Communication
  - Issue/conflict resolution
  - Community involvement
  - Team member reliability

Legal Issues (Ref. Section 3.3)

Is a plan for handling legal issues and alternate dispute resolution in place?

- Negotiation processes
- Change orders
- Claims procedures (administrative review, legal review)
- Mediation
- Dispute Resolution Board
- Arbitration

Institutional Issues (Ref. Section 3.4)

Is a partnership evaluation process designed to include an analysis of the following potential institutional issues?

- Paradigm shifts or handling changes caused by the partnership
- Effect of diverging missions
Community Involvement Activities (Ref. Section 3.5)
Are the following activities being continued as part of an ongoing public involvement plan for our project?

- Public information
- Press relations
- Focus groups
- Community meetings

References to Specific Case Studies (Ref. Appendix A)
If further detail is needed, see NCHRP Web Document 21.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multimodal Project</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outer Banks</td>
<td>Rural corridor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit Stage, Colorado</td>
<td>Rural corridor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Anchorage, Transit</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center, Cleveland</td>
<td>Transfer center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York-Ontario Border</td>
<td>Urban corridor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk Southern Intermodal</td>
<td>Freight transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Sound High Speed Ferry</td>
<td>Tourist travel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransGuide ITS Project, San</td>
<td>Metro project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Atlanta Committee for the Olympic Games | Community involvement |
| Atlanta Community Empowerment Corp. | Community involvement |
| Virginia Railway Express           | Commuter rail        |
| Dulles Greenway                   | Suburban corridor    |

3.8 REFERENCES

1995

1994


1993

1992
“Northern Virginia Commuter Rail Agreement” (June).


1988

The Dulles Toll Road Extension: Comprehensive Agreement Between the Virginia Department of Transportation and the Toll Road Investors Partnership II, L.P., (TRIP 11); an agreement for guiding the design-engineering, construction, operations, maintenance and expansion for the first privately financed toll road facility based upon the Virginia Highway Corporation Act of 1988, as amended.
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CASE STUDY EXECUTIVE SUMMARIES

CASE STUDY SITES

Outer Banks Multimodal Transportation Study
I-70 Rural ITS/Summit Stage Transfer Center—Colorado
South Anchorage Transit Center—Alaska
Tower City Center—Cleveland, Ohio
New York–Ontario International Border Crossing
Norfolk Southern Intermodal Terminal
Inner Sound High-Speed Ferry Service
TransGuide, San Antonio, Texas
Atlanta Committee for the Olympic Games
Atlanta Empowerment Zone
Virginia Railway Express
Dulles Greenway TRIP II

INTRODUCTION

This appendix contains the executive summaries of each case study report. A “trip report” or documentation of each of the 12 on-site case studies is contained in NCHRP Web Document 22. Included in each executive summary in this appendix is a general project description, general partnership overview, keys to success, and major partnership issues/barriers. The partnership type and key contacts (with phone numbers) are identified at the closing of each summary.

Tables A-1 and A-2 are at the end of this appendix. They summarize the case study partnership characteristics. Figure A-1 identifies the project locations geographically. The sample was selected to illustrate the wide variety of multimodal transportation projects that have developed and maintained partnerships over the past several years.

OUTER BANKS MULTIMODAL TRANSPORTATION STUDY

The Outer Banks Task Force is a public sector partnership created among seven state and federal agencies in 1993 to address the long-range transportation corridor improvements needed on North Carolina’s Outer Banks between Whalebone and Ocracoke. This planning project involves highway and ferry service along an 80-mi corridor that serves over 3 million annual visitors to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and the Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge.

The partnership operates under the guidelines of a mutually developed Memorandum of Understanding. The partnership functions through a 15-member working group and an Executive Committee made up of a single representative of each of the seven agencies in the partnership.

Key elements that have contributed to the partnership’s success are as follows:

- The use of a two-level committee structure;
- The inclusion of the right individuals from the right agencies in the working group and the Executive Committee;
- A neutral facilitator for the working group and Executive Committee who helped guide the partnership through its formative stage; and
- The continuity of the members of the Task Force.

Studies that are laying the scientific baseline for the protection of this environmentally sensitive area are underway.

Type of Partnership: Public–Public

Key Contacts: Secretary Garland B. Garrett, Jr., North Carolina DOT (919) 733-2520

I-70 RURAL ITS/SUMMIT STAGE TRANSFER CENTER - COLORADO

A public-private partnership has been formed to carry out the Summit Stage Intermodal Transfer Project, which is in the planning process. The transfer terminal has been recognized as a public need that would allow the regional bus system to better serve the area’s residents and tourists. The project features an ITS component involving an Advanced Traveler Information System and an Advanced Public Transportation System.

The project’s success to this point is closely related to the CDOT’s support and interest gained by the partnership. Another key is the regular meetings of the members of the partnership. A current issue facing the partnership involves the conditional use of property for the transfer facility only and is not directly tied to the functioning of the partnership itself.

Type of Partnership: Public–Private

Key Contacts: Amy Ostrander, Summit Stage
(790) 453-1339
Barbara Schroeder, Parsons Transportation (303) 863-7900
SOUTH ANCHORAGE TRANSIT CENTER—ALASKA

The South Anchorage Transit Center is a good example of a public-private-nonprofit project in a mid-sized North American city. Here, the principles important to successful partnerships, equity, and efficiency have been embodied in the formulation and maintenance of the partnership. There was an initial partnership between the private mall developer and the municipality and excellent cooperation from the state and federal authorities. In addition, volunteerism played an important part in both the construction of the facility and continues to be involved in its operation and maintenance. The results have been beneficial to all concerned, and the project has yielded some unexpected dividends for the community.

Type of Partnership: Public-Private
Key Contacts: Tom Brigham, Alaska DOT (907) 465-4070
Michael Barry, Dimond Center (907) 344-2581

TOWER CITY CENTER - CLEVELAND, OHIO

This dynamic public-private partnership is an ongoing relationship between a private development company, Forest City Enterprises, and its home city, Cleveland, Ohio. The project involved the redevelopment and restoration of a badly deteriorated central city multimodal transfer facility. The Terminal Tower, which is in the National Register of Historic Buildings, has been transformed into an exciting mixed-use facility, with three levels of shopping and 42 office levels over an underground heavy and light rail rapid transit station.

This partnership, which successfully completed the restoration of the transit terminal and the Terminal Tower in 1990, is expanding the Greater Cleveland transit system by extending the light rail line between Tower City and the waterfront area. The Tower City multimodal project has been successful in revitalizing investment in downtown Cleveland and in saving a historically significant building. Perhaps the key element in the success of the project has been the high level of risk-taking assumed by the private sector and the general public. The key element in the partnership has been the building of mutual trust between the project managers of the development company and the Regional Transit Authority over a period of years.

Type of Partnership: Public-Private
Key Contacts: Don Yuratovac, Cleveland Transit (614) 566-5085
Doug Lund, Consultant (216) 464-2860
NEW YORK–ONTARIO INTERNATIONAL BORDER CROSSING

This case study report describes a partnership that exists to meet the transportation needs of the Niagara Frontier. One of the immediate needs identified was to plan, design, build, and operate an AVI system to automatically collect tolls and provide automated clearance of commercial and passenger vehicles through immigration and customs at the Niagara River international border crossings. The partnership is an outgrowth of several years of technical interactions on issues of mutual interest and need among state and local transportation organizations in New York and Michigan and Ontario, Canada.

Until recently, this partnership functioned as a single, large committee of 45 to 50 people from 12 organizations. An element that has limited the partnership’s success is the lack of an executive committee. More involvement of local decision-makers, such as a representative of the City of Buffalo, is needed.

One key to this partnership’s success is the understanding among committee members that some continuing dialog is needed to express interests and grasp other members’ perspectives. Another key to success is the cooperation between the two bridge authorities operating the four bridges crossing the Niagara River.

**Type of Partnership:** Public-Public
**Key Contacts:** Rod Sechrest, NYSDOT, Buffalo (716) 847-3268
Steve Mayer, Peace Bridge Authority (716) 884-6744

NORFOLK SOUTHERN INTERMODAL TERMINAL PROJECT

This private-sector partnership was formed by the Norfolk Southern Corporation with VASCOR (Value Added Service FORporation) to develop and operate an intermodal transfer facility for incoming parts and material and for shipping out fully assembled automobiles at the Toyota Motor Corporation plant at Georgetown, Kentucky. Several partnerships have been formed between VASCOR and its parent company and its operating partners at the intermodal facility.

Key strengths of the partnership between VASCOR and Norfolk Southern, which has been operating the facility since mid-1985, are the onsite working relationships between the VASCOR and Norfolk Southern managers and the progressive management style of VASCOR’s top and middle management. Managers in this partnership feel that increased operational efficiency would result from an increased level of communications and joint training programs on topics such as teamwork, quality improvement, and daily process management.

**Type of Partnership:** Private-Private
**Key Contact:** Daniel M. Greenberg, Assistant General Manager, VASCOR, Ltd. (502) 868-3384

INNER SOUND HIGH-SPEED FERRY SERVICE PROJECT

A very interesting public-private partnership between a private land developer and a regional Tourist Development Office in northeastern North Carolina is involved in the planning for a high-speed ferry service that would link the inner sounds harbor towns with the high-use tourist areas on the Outer Banks. This partnership was stimulated by the state as a part of a regional economic development initiative.

The success of the partnership to date has been the result of a vision shared by all the partners, in addition to the local communities. Despite ongoing barriers (which are being resolved) the partners and the project have achieved a very favorable public image. In addition, a high degree of confidence is evident in the key motivators of the project.

**Type of Partnership:** Public-Private-Community
**Key Contact:** William D. Rich, The Rich Company (919) 338-2183

TRANSGUIDE, SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS

TransGuide is the Texas Department of Transportation, San Antonio District Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) partnership, which has been in the development stage since 1988. A milestone in the program genesis was attained in July 1995 with the opening of a state-of-the-art Traffic Operations Center (TOC) in northwestern San Antonio.

Included in the partnership are the City of San Antonio (Emergency Medical Service, Fire and Police Departments); VIA Metropolitan Transit; Allied Signal Technical Services Corporation; and numerous subcontractors who have been involved (until the opening of the TOC).

In the minds of most of those interviewed concerning this project, the partnership for building the TransGuide TOC was only a partnership because the planning, partial design, and construction of the system was facilitated by the active incorporation of a Total Quality Management technique called Partnering. Through this process, the groundwork was laid for a successful partnership and long-term commitment to manage the operations and maintenance (O&M) phase of the program with a more comprehensive view of the mission of the program and individual projects within the program.

A multimodal approach to urban traffic management has also resulted, with plans for future extensions of the countywide transit system poised to use advanced technology that will integrate transit operations with the overall TransGuide traffic management system.

The benefits of the partnering process were identified as follows:

- More hands-on involvement by the owner, which was seen as highly desirable since TXDOT is the system operator;
- Greater adherence to the schedule;
• Increased communications—both horizontally and vertically;
• A standard of communications such that daily communications are the norm;
• Value-added engineering enhancements;
• No unresolved issues and no claims to date;
• Reduced hassles and sharing of risks; and
• Lower transaction costs.

**Type of Partnership:** Public-Private  
**Key Contact:** Patrick Irwin, TX DOT (210) 731-5247  
C. R. (Hap) Carr, Jr., Allied Signal (919) 921-0703

### ATLANTA COMMITTEE FOR THE OLYMPIC GAMES: OLYMPIC TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

The effort to mount the 1996 Olympic Games in Atlanta, Georgia was massive and complex. In late July 1996, the city hosted over 10,000 athletes and over 500,000 spectators per day. The problem of moving the Olympic family, spectators, and media representatives was the responsibility of the Atlanta Committee for the Olympic Games (ACOG).

ACOG devised a plan for the Olympic Transportation System (OTS) to ensure the efficient movement of people, goods, and services during the hectic days of the 1996 Summer Olympic Games. The plan relied on Transportation Demand Management strategies to lower the background traffic in and around the Olympic Circle and maximized use of rail, bus, and pedestrian walkways. The Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA) was under contract to operate the OTS.

ACOG alone could not successfully mount such an effort without the support of a well-established partnership of public and private agencies and organizations. More than 30 organizations were involved in a partnership to plan and coordinate the OTS. Keys to the partnership’s success included a commitment by the partners to recognize concerns of all affected parties and national/international attention gained by the project.

**Type of Partnership:** Public-Private-Community  
**Key Contact:** Joel F. Stone, Jr., ACOG (404) 548-2030

### ATLANTA EMPOWERMENT ZONE: ATLANTA COMMUNITY EMPOWERMENT CORPORATION’S MULTIMODAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING EFFORTS

This case study examines the efforts of the Atlanta partnership that put together a winning Urban Empowerment Zone application. The empowerment zone process requires that a strategic plan be developed and implemented by a Community Empowerment Board. This Board directs the activities of a new public-private agency, the Atlanta Community Empowerment Corporation (ACEC). Participation of the local residents in all phases of planning and in all major policy decisions relating to the Strategic Plan is required by law.

The basic goal of the ACEC is to significantly reduce poverty and revitalize the 30 neighborhoods that make up Atlanta’s Urban Empowerment Zone. The Strategic Plan plays a key role in improving Atlanta’s transportation components, with the recognition of the link between urban inequality and urban mobility. Transportation improvements are essential to the success of the overall plan.

A key to the success of this partnership is the willingness of the participants to keep an open mind to new ideas and new ways of solving old problems. Also, attention has been given to continuous monitoring and evaluation, with a willingness to respond to criticism of shortcomings without defensiveness.

**Type of Partnership:** Public-Private-Community  
**Key Contact:** Tony Mangrum, ACEC (404) 330-6969

### VIRGINIA RAILWAY EXPRESS

Members of the partnership that created the Virginia Railway Express (VRE) between 1986 and 1989 include the Northern Virginia Transportation Commission (NVTC); Potomac and Rappahannock Transportation Commission (PRTC); the counties of Fairfax, Prince William, Stafford, and Arlington; and the independent cities of Manassas and Alexandria. Since its creation, the cities of Manassas Park and Fredericksburg have joined the partnership.

A seven-member Operations Board serves as the policy committee of VRE; the Director of the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation is one of the seven. Each member of the Board has an alternate. Alternates also typically attend the monthly Board meetings. The instrument that created the VRE was an inter-governmental Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) that was signed by the two commissions and the original six cities and counties.

An “extended partnership,” in addition to the three-agency, public-sector partnership identified in the previous two paragraphs, would necessarily include other stakeholders: CSX Transportation, Inc., Norfolk Southern Railway Company, Conrail, and Amtrak. The form of agreement between the two transportation commissions and the three railroads is a formal Operating/Access Agreement. Amtrak has a contract to provide crews and scheduling.

While the extended partnership is the most critical to the overall success or failure of VRE, there was insufficient time during this research project to allow a complete study of the railroad’s participation.

Therefore, primary lessons learned in the case study are applied to the public-public partnership identified above. Lessons learned from the partnership’s association with the railroads are included to amplify and clarify the findings.

Factors that have contributed to the success of this public agency partnership to date have included the following:
• The persistence, vision, and management style of VRE’s top management;
• An orientation and continuing commitment to the customer and marketing of the transportation service;
• The vision of the political leadership in Northern Virginia in setting an agenda to establish a commuter rail service and following up with the necessary actions to make it happen; and
• The existence of a ready-made market for the product—a relatively affluent population group in the service area that is willing to pay for alternate transportation to personally avoid congested highways in their daily commute.

The Commonwealth sees that other potential commuter rail services (e.g., that being discussed in the Tidewater area) can learn from some of the mistakes that have been acknowledged in developing the partnership and in planning the VRE.

**Type of Partnership:** Public-Public

**Key Contact:** Steve Roberts, Virginia Railway Express (703) 642-3808

**DULLES GREENWAY TRIP II**
** (TOLL ROAD INVESTORS PARTNERSHIP II, L.P.)

The Dulles Greenway is a 14-mi toll road that was formalized as a project in 1988 and opened for traffic in 1995. The highway links Dulles International Airport with Leesburg, Virginia. The Greenway is a privately built, four-lane freeway that joins with the publicly built Dulles Toll road, which connects with the Interstate 66 corridor into Tyson’s Corner and Washington, DC. Plans for future addition of HOV lanes and/or rail in the median are part of the design.

The partnership, formed to plan, design, build, operate and maintain this facility, consists of two general partners, the Shenandoah Greenway Corporation and an Italian firm, Autostrade International. Joining these two general partners is the general contractor for the facility, Brown and Root Engineers, a limited partner. The agreement that provided the basic document forming the partnership was signed in late 1988. The toll road opened in September 1995—6 months ahead of schedule.

This partnership was formed under the Virginia Highway Corporation Act, (§56-535 et. seq., Code of the Commonwealth of Virginia), as amended. The project was approved by the Commonwealth Transportation Board as an extension of the original Dulles Toll Road.

The success of the partnership has been attributed to the following factors: (1) the small, tightly managed group of partners; (2) the high degree of competence and special talents of the management team; (3) jointly located field offices of the three partners and VDOT inspectors during construction; (4) the financial package offered to the general contractor as a limited partner; and (5) the assumption of most of the risk by the general partner, Shenandoah Greenway Corporation.

The success of the partnership is also illustrated by the management team for TRIP II. This group of professional engineers and managers has been hired as staff for a second partnership called Rebuild, Incorporated. This partnership has been formed to provide professional services elsewhere in planning, design, and construction of additional toll roads and the operation and maintenance of existing facilities. Nation-wide and international interest has been placed on the results of the Greenway and the partnership formed to build it.

**Type of Partnership:** Public-Private

**Key Contact:** Maj. Gen. Charles E. Williams, USA, Ret. Executive Vice President, Rebuild, Inc. (703) 478-2240

---

**TABLE A-1** Types of partnership agreements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Type of Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Outer Banks</td>
<td>Public-Public</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>MOU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Summit Stage</td>
<td>Public-Private</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Anchorage</td>
<td>Public-Private</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cleveland</td>
<td>Public-Private</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. NY-Ontario</td>
<td>Public-Public</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Mission statement, Vision statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Kentucky</td>
<td>Private-Private</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Inner Sound</td>
<td>Public-Private-Community</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. TransGuide</td>
<td>Public-Private</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Contract, Partnering Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. ACOG (Atlanta)</td>
<td>Public-Private-Community</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. ACEC (Atlanta)</td>
<td>Public-Private-Community</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. VRE</td>
<td>Public-Public</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>MOA, Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Dulles Greenway</td>
<td>Public-Private</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Design-Build-O&amp;M Agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* B - Beginning Stage (usually within first two years)
  I - Intermediate
  C - Continuing (operational)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Partnership Function</th>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>Primary Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Outer Banks, North Carolina</td>
<td>Rural corridor plan</td>
<td>North Carolina DOT, FHWA, NC Dept. of Environment Corps of Engineers, U.S. Fish &amp; Wildlife Svc., Nat'l. Marine Fisheries, Summit County, Summit Stage, Colorado DOT, DeLeuw, Cather, FHWA, Summit County Schools, Dimond Center, Anchorage Transit, FHWA, UMTA (now FTA), Alaska DOT</td>
<td>Partnership formation, Funding, Environmental databases, Planning/technical assist., Facility management, Facility management, Environmental protection, Political support, Operate rural bus service, Funding, ITS technology support, Funding, Land for multimodal fac., Land for facility, Funding design &amp; const'n, Funding, Fed. funding administr'n., Local match for funding, Facility redevelopment, Bridge reconstruction, Urb. Dev. Action Grant, Funding, Conduit for FTA funding, Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Summit Stage, Colorado</td>
<td>Rural corridor ITS plan; multimodal facility plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Anchorage, Alaska</td>
<td>Plan, design, build suburban transfer center</td>
<td>Anchorage Transit, FHWA, UMTA (now FTA), Alaska DOT</td>
<td>Funding design &amp; const'n, Funding, Fed. funding administr'n., Local match for funding, Facility redevelopment, Bridge reconstruction, Urb. Dev. Action Grant, Funding, Conduit for FTA funding, Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Norfolk Southern Intermodal Terminal, Georgetown, KY</td>
<td>Plan, design, build, and operate intermodal freight transfer facility</td>
<td>VASCOR, Toyota, Norfolk Southern, Phoenix Transportation, Other trucking companies</td>
<td>Intermodal terminal mgmt., Vehicle manufacture, Rail service to terminal, Truck service to terminal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. TransGuide, San Antonio</td>
<td>Metropolitan ITS Plan; Design, Build, Operate and Maintain (O&amp;M) a Freeway Mgmt. System</td>
<td>ACOG, MARTA, Atlanta Regional Comm., Community Action Prog., City of Atlanta, Georgia DOT, FTA, HUD, FTA, FHWA, MARTA, City of Atlanta, Atlanta Regional Comm., Corp. for Olympic Devel., Nat'l Assoc'n. of Neighborhoods</td>
<td>Planning, Transit operations, Planning support, TDM strategy implement., Coordination; security, Funding; design &amp; const., Funding, Redevelopment funding, Funding plng. and demos., Design &amp; deploy ITS, Infrastructure improvem't, Planning, Pedestrian improvements, Develop Transit Trav. Ctr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Partnership Function</td>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>Primary Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Common Acronyms used in these organizational models:

FHWA - Federal Highway Administration
FTA - Federal Transit Administration
DOT - Department of Transportation
HUD - U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
MARTA - Metropolitan Atlanta Regional Transit Authority
The Transportation Research Board is a unit of the National Research Council, which serves the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering. The Board’s mission is to promote innovation and progress in transportation by stimulating and conducting research, facilitating the dissemination of information, and encouraging the implementation of research results. The Board’s varied activities annually draw on approximately 4,000 engineers, scientists, and other transportation researchers and practitioners from the public and private sectors and academia, all of whom contribute their expertise in the public interest. The program is supported by state transportation departments, federal agencies including the component administrations of the U.S. Department of Transportation, and other organizations and individuals interested in the development of transportation.

The National Academy of Sciences is a private, nonprofit, self-perpetuating society of distinguished scholars engaged in scientific and engineering research, dedicated to the furtherance of science and technology and to their use for the general welfare. Upon the authority of the charter granted to it by the Congress in 1863, the Academy has a mandate that requires it to advise the federal government on scientific and technical matters. Dr. Bruce M. Alberts is president of the National Academy of Sciences.

The National Academy of Engineering was established in 1964, under the charter of the National Academy of Sciences, as a parallel organization of outstanding engineers. It is autonomous in its administration and in the selection of its members, sharing with the National Academy of Sciences the responsibility for advising the federal government. The National Academy of Engineering also sponsors engineering programs aimed at meeting national needs, encourages education and research, and recognizes the superior achievements of engineers. Dr. William A. Wulf is president of the National Academy of Engineering.

The Institute of Medicine was established in 1970 by the National Academy of Sciences to secure the services of eminent members of appropriate professions in the examination of policy matters pertaining to the health of the public. The Institute acts under the responsibility given to the National Academy of Sciences by its congressional charter to be an adviser to the federal government and, upon its own initiative, to identify issues of medical care, research, and education. Dr. Kenneth I. Shine is president of the Institute of Medicine.

The National Research Council was organized by the National Academy of Sciences in 1916 to associate the broad community of science and technology with the Academy’s purpose of furthering knowledge and advising the federal government. Functioning in accordance with general policies determined by the Academy, the Council has become the principal operating agency of both the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering in providing services to the government, the public, and the scientific and engineering communities. The Council is administered jointly by both the Academies and the Institute of Medicine. Dr. Bruce M. Alberts and Dr. William A. Wulf are chairman and vice chairman, respectively, of the National Research Council.

Abbreviations used without definitions in TRB publications:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AASHO</td>
<td>American Association of State Highway Officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASHTO</td>
<td>American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASCE</td>
<td>American Society of Civil Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASME</td>
<td>American Society of Mechanical Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTM</td>
<td>American Society for Testing and Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAA</td>
<td>Federal Aviation Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>Federal Highway Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>Federal Railroad Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEEE</td>
<td>Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITE</td>
<td>Institute of Transportation Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCHRP</td>
<td>National Cooperative Highway Research Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTRIP</td>
<td>National Cooperative Transit Research and Development Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHTSA</td>
<td>National Highway Traffic Safety Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAE</td>
<td>Society of Automotive Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCRP</td>
<td>Transit Cooperative Research Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRB</td>
<td>Transportation Research Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.DOT</td>
<td>United States Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>