

Organizational Analysis and Recommendations

Presented to: The Port of Benton

Provided by: Eileen Griffin-Ray, MBA, Ph.D.

Date: March 2026

Introduction

The Port of Benton is in desperate need of structure, order, and leadership. The absence of these critical organizational components was apparent at the initial introduction to the Port and that observation was reinforced throughout the weeks of research and analysis.

Critical to organizational structure is the allocation of work and the division of work activities. Everyone must know the role he or she plays within the organization. All players must know the roles of others. There must be formal rules, written documents, policies, and procedures all which guide the individual contributors towards the collective effort.

Basic policies and procedures don't exist, or they exist in an insufficient manner, or they exist but they are not followed, or no one has any idea whether they exist or not. Questions to employees regarding the location of policies, checklists, or other organizational tools resulted in confusion. There is a lack of uniformity and absence of consistent communication throughout the ranks of the small team. The lack of coordination and availability of policies, procedures, and processes was a strong indicator of the severe dysfunction within the organization. Overall, the organization is immersed in chaos, confusion, and leadership neglect.

Structure

The Port could be characterized as a complex organization due to the various projects and activities the Port engages in. Staff are spread across disciplines from facilities and airport management to finance and government relations. In most of these areas of responsibility, one individual person comprises the operation. Most of the staff are individual contributors, referred to as a director or manager. They are not, however, organized in such a manner that they can become leaders or even managers as they work in silos with little to no strategic connection and most have no direct reports. There is some teamwork among the siloed staff, but it is incidental and personality-based, not strategic and intentional, for the most part.

Based on information from the staff and evidenced by the salaries and functions, two senior leaders exist at the Port. The most senior leader is the executive director. The director of finance/auditor appears to be second in command, if not hierarchically, then culturally. The director of finance/auditor is in charge when the executive director is not available. Beyond those two individuals there is minimal hierarchy and the organizational chart is essentially flat. Other than within the operations/facilities team, there is no depth to the structure as each "unit" is self-contained.

With this level of centralized leadership, the leader is expected to have oversight and awareness of each area of the organization. Given the level of neglect in all but one area of the Port, it appears that a centralized leadership structure is ineffective.

According to several staff members and based on observation, there does not seem to be a strategic staffing plan that would build units to be more highly sustainable and future oriented. As most of the staff are individual contributors, there is little back-up when someone is out sick. Several employees expressed frustration with the expectation that they work even when they are on vacation or sick. One employee said, "If I am out, no one does the work." One employee said when she asked for some help with her workload, she was told that if she wasn't getting her work done, she should work Saturdays. She was told that extending her work week to include Saturdays would "reduce stress." The employee said her high stress level is due to feeling individually responsible for many things with no guidance, no encouragement, no support, and without recognition or appreciation when she completes projects.

Several employees explained that if they were out of the office their work simply didn't get done. The structure does not currently support back-up and contingency plans.

Conscientious members of the team continue to work with this unreasonable expectation to the point of physical and mental consequences. Up until these recent discussions there was no effort to cross-train staff or create plans for back-up based on staff meetings and employee information.

With the elevated level of turnover, the lack of organizational structure and depth has become a critical weakness for the Port. As one individual leaves, there is no plan for backfill or coverage until another person is hired who then enters a job without the benefit of anyone with previous experience in the role, or in relationship to the role. Upper management also does not step in to help new employees or function as "working managers" leaving new employees to flounder and fail. One consistent complaint was that the two senior leaders functioned as high level executives rather than hands-on managers. Given the relatively small number of employees and the responsibilities of a small Port, a working manager would be far more useful than a high-level executive.

Most of the staff work independently like entrepreneurs responsible for their own business unit without a strong universal culture or unified purpose. One employee said he had not had any support from the rest of the staff in many years. They no longer function as one team, or as one employee described it "as a family." Some long-term employees clearly noticed the lack of continuity and teamwork within the organization. Rather than one unified culture, employees have developed subcultures. In order to function on a day-to-day basis, several staff members have had no choice but to normalize the dysfunction they

are expected to live with. Interestingly, while the business units are entirely separate, some tasks are spread into several areas in what appears to be an entirely random fashion. Some may simply be historical remnants, i.e. a task someone previously did in a role years ago, or it may be a staff member taking initiative to make sure something gets done, lacking confidence that anyone else will do it otherwise. This division also complicates any effort to try to follow a process or ensure completion of a task or project and hold one person accountable if something is not done.

The physical structure of the organization adds to the separation and siloed nature of the group. An open office setting tends to encourage interaction and communication. With the exception of the facilities team, everyone at the Port has his or her own private office as opposed to working in an open office. The offices are furnished and decorated differently, reflecting the personality of the individual, not the culture of the Port. An effective layout would consider the interaction between team members and the accessibility of staff to their manager (Hatch, 2013). Layout should involve matching the task requirements of the job and the interaction of the staff. Inefficiencies and inconveniences occur when the layout has not been thoughtfully arranged for the optimal operation of the organization. “Whenever workers perform sequential or reciprocally interdependent tasks, their ability to coordinate their activities will be affected by the layout of the workspaces they occupy and the proximity of equipment and co-workers” (Hatch, 2013, p. 204). With each individual in a private office, chains of natural collaboration are broken. There are many inefficiencies, redundancies, and unnecessary confusion due to the separation. It is also easier for a manager to monitor staff performance if they are not inside a closed office. The interaction between a manager and employee can be significantly improved when a manager can “walk the floor” and casually interact and inquire about staff progress, concerns, challenges, and successes.

The building is designed almost entirely of individual offices, so it is unlikely that any change can be made at this time. Additionally, it would negatively affect morale to move people out of private offices who are used to having private offices. Moving forward, and through attrition, I would recommend building teams in a structure that is more likely to support interaction and also make it easier for managers to monitor staff. If the Port is physically able to spread out as growth demands, a more typical arrangement is the manager in an office and staff in cubicles close to the management location. As staffing changes, some attention can be given to physical structure.

Several employees have found creative ways to work without the support, structure, and a foundation of a universal organizational culture and leadership. After being ignored when a policy or directive was requested, they created their own. With no formal process for many

things, they defined their own process for their own needs. While this initiative is commendable, this further exacerbates the problem of varied policies and processes detrimental to the functioning of the overall organization, and it becomes impossible to replicate when one person leaves, and a new person is hired without any established road map to follow.

Many of the staff lack clear understanding of their own roles and authority levels due to the erratic job changes, random task and project assignments, and general disorganization. They are not clear on what roles other people play within the organization. One employee said, “No one knows who is on first and there is no communication.” Staff would like to have clear understanding of their role, the roles of others, and how to best interact as a team. Many of them desire a more organized work environment. In general, the lack of structure, planning, and order results in confusion, frustration, inefficiencies, and unnecessary expenses. This results in a system where a culture of ambiguity and non-decision easily evolves (Griffin-Ray, 20022). In this type of environment everyone is in charge, thus no one is in charge. People can avoid responsibility, hide from accountability, and blame others. This ambiguity and constant chaos may be why to date significant mistakes have been made and tasks not completed yet nothing has changed and no one has been held accountable.

In Process: An administrative role has been added, and an individual has been hired. A reorganization of tasks has started with assignments with an improved logic flow.

Recommendation: The Port should be restructured. Exhibit A is a proposed organizational chart. The proposed structure allows for a focused leadership team and growth and development in layers below. Staffing decisions need to be managed so the organization does not add employees or functions without thorough assessment of the need and how it benefits the overall organization. Reducing turnover will also go a long way towards establishing a stable structure and maintaining the structure, thus reducing much of the confusion and disorder. Retention efforts should be considered.

Roles and Responsibilities

A job description provides the employee with an understanding of what is expected of them. It contains the criteria for hiring new staff and it is the baseline for assessing performance throughout the employment life cycle. Employees need the clarity of a job description for success. Job descriptions must be accurate, applicable, and consistent. What was discovered at the Port was that most job descriptions were none of those things. Some people were not sure if they had a job description and, if there was one, where it might be. Some employees had multiple job descriptions and were not sure which job they

were currently expected to perform. In December several job changes were made, promotions given, and pay increases issued to certain employees. These adjustments appeared reactionary and not well planned or implemented. Some employees had been assigned a new job with no guidance as to what to do with the tasks contained in the old job. For the most part, there was not any plan for backfill and reassignment of the “old” role while supposedly moving onto the “new” role. This left some employees highly stressed and confused, wanting to succeed, but without clear understanding of what that would look like. There was only one employee who had been given a new role along with a plan to accommodate the new promotion. Others either had no idea what the plan was or had just accepted that there would be no plan and they were stuck just responding to whatever happened each day.

Staff expressed confusion and concerns about gaps between new roles, old roles, and missing components in both. There was concern expressed by a few employees that some of these role changes were not in the best interest of the team or the overall functioning of the organization. There was a feeling of unfairness and one employee suggested that the promotions and raises could potentially be just to placate staff as they became more vocal about their dissatisfaction with the organization.

Job description titles often did not match with the job title on the organizational chart, the website, or other places where titles might be listed. The organizational chart contained minimal information, had incorrect titles, people who had left the organization, and the role of Government Relations was completely missing from the chart, with no explanation. Fortunately, most of the employees did not seem to find much value in the organizational chart so at least this was something that did not add to the stress, chaos and confusion. It took a day or two to even find an organizational chart as it was not readily available where all employees could easily access the document.

As I began reviewing the jobs in the finance area, it was pointed out that there was a job opening currently posted for an Accountant. That job description included a pay range higher than the job description for the current Senior Accountant/Accounting Supervisor. This is clearly confusing to the current accounting team. Beyond confusion, these oversights, errors, and/or poor decisions are likely be damaging to morale and could potentially create resentment towards a new employee.

The senior accountant job description included many tasks that I would have expected to see in the director role, assuming it is a working manager position. The job description of senior accountant was very extensive, supporting the employee’s expression of frustration with the amount and level of work for the role and the lack of involvement of the finance director as that person seemed removed from much of the work.

The workload does not seem overwhelming for the director of finance role, based on the job description and the fact that the Port contracts with an external accounting firm to handle part of the work. After re-balancing and re-allocation of the work within the finance team, the staff of three, including a working manager, should be able to handle most of the workload. One additional person to fill a support role will further allow the team to focus on the critical work of the department.

Finance also includes human resources. This is under review. In recent years there has not been anyone on the finance team with experience in human resources, yet they are expected to manage the important responsibilities under that discipline. Many human resource functions do not exist now and likely never existed at the Port. Even with some outsourcing, there is a huge gap in this area and leadership should have corrected this many years ago as this is a critical function area. Either a robust training plan needs to be implemented for the finance team or an additional person with a human resources background is needed.

One employee said that there were several things that are not part of her job description, but she is expected to do anyway. Through discussions with the employee and review of the list, I would categorize some items as basic tasks, but others are significant and time-consuming responsibilities. She said everyday things are randomly added that she is expected to do regardless of the job description and the job title she currently holds. She has a heavy and undefined workload with no direction and support from leadership. Correcting this will take a few steps. Some tasks are in the process of being re-allocated. A new support person will take on some of the more basic responsibilities. The role will need more definition going forward.

One individual has three very different job descriptions. A completely new job description was given to the employee in December. This job description changed the role and the reporting authority from what was listed elsewhere. Originally hired to support all the staff, this employee was then assigned to one staff member, and others were told that this employee would no longer be available to support their functions. The details of this change did not seem to be clearly communicated to all team members. Some had been given cursory notice and others seemed unaware of what was going on with the employee and the role. With this support staff reassignment, senior staff members were then assigned some of the clerical tasks such as answering phones. The reassignment of this individual may have been appropriate given the skill set, however, some plan for a replacement support staff member should have been included. Other than the frustrated employees, the Port is also paying a premium to have highly compensated staff performing tasks that can easily be handled by an entry level individual. This is one of many examples

where structural issues result in wasteful spending. This role will need more definition going forward.

The only division with accurate job titles, correct positioning on the organizational chart, and understanding of their roles is the operations/facilities team. The operations and facilities team is mostly managed independent of the rest of the organization. Reasons given for that were a preference to remain outside of the chaos and disorder of the other parts of the business and avoidance of leadership. Some employees within that team said they made it a point to avoid being inside the building if possible.

It is difficult to define the organizational culture at the Port of Benton. The Port's missing cohesiveness and disorganization has impacted the culture dramatically. To have an effective culture, an organization needs to have structural stability (Schein, 2017). Due to the excessive turnover, along with the disorganization, the Port has been highly unstable for the past several years. As members leave the group, a strong culture would allow the retention of the group identity. A strong culture helps new members of the group assimilate into the organization, thus allowing work to continue efficiently. A stable culture ensures that new employees can contribute more quickly and become engaged more easily. All organizations experience change, but the Port has experienced excessive change and is not prepared to handle the change. The structure does not support transition. Roles are confused and illogical. The lack of culture makes it difficult for new people to integrate. The Port is simply not prepared to handle change through planning, preparation, integration and cultural consistency.

In Process: Job descriptions have been created or revised for most of the employees at this point. Job descriptions are now reflective of the work each employee is doing and there are now connections between job families. There is a logic flow to the jobs and requirements have been added to provide standards and expectations for future hires. There is a plan for an all-staff workshop to review all the job descriptions and provide each member of the team an understanding of their role within the organization and how each role interacts with the other. There is some effort towards cross-training, and more will be implemented as staffing can accommodate.

Recommendation: The Port needs a better structure that more appropriately covers the various responsibilities of the organization. Rather than one senior leader, the Port would benefit from having multiple people in leadership. Three operational areas could support three senior leaders with each holding up their own "pillar" providing more support to the staff, the Commissioners, and the public. Additional staff members are needed to allow for back-up and cross training. Staff hired at a lower level will provide for organizational development and succession planning. At the higher level, leadership skills are needed

along with a strategic human resources capability. Each Executive Director must be highly experienced in their respective occupational area, but also much have leadership background and skills. More emphasis must be placed on building a strong culture. As the organization evolves, a preferred physical arrangement should be considered. A conscientious effort must be made throughout the organization to understand roles, maintain clarity, define interrelationships between roles, incorporate cross-training and contingency planning.

Leadership

Organizations are reflective of leadership. A transformational or adaptive leader will drive results and blaze the trail future forward. Poor leadership will filter through the entire organization spreading like a poison. Leadership skills are rooted in traits or characteristics and the ability to encourage change and growth in a group (Northouse, 2016).

The Port suffers from a lack of leadership. Staff described their leadership as largely unresponsive to the needs of the employees and the organization. The ED travels extensively, and based on comments from employees and the public, is quite successful at economic development. Unfortunately, that is not the job the ED is hired for and paid to perform. Economic development is a piece of the role, but there are responsibilities more critical to the functioning of the Port. An Executive Director over the entire Port is responsible for, and the final authority over, all areas of the business. As previously mentioned, a separation of responsibilities is likely to result in more effective leadership throughout the organization. It will be particularly helpful to have a division that separates the internal and the external needs of the organization.

In terms of the secondary leader, three people have held the role in the past several years so the role will be described as the finance function since the most recent person only held the role a few months and the previous person, just a few years. The functional, systemic problems addressed certainly pre-date the last finance director, however, some unique issues arose due to actions taken by that specific individual.

Several employees said they were hopeful things would get better with the transition to the new finance director. Instead, things got worse. One employee described how she “broke” processes because she didn’t take the time to understand them before dictating new processes. One employee described how uncomfortable the manager made her when she questioned her about personal matters. She seemed to want to know about people’s personal lives and other things unrelated to work. “She was constantly coming to my office, asking me to open up about issues. She wore a path in the carpet,” The employee said this

manager was a problem for everyone. Almost every person in the organization was relieved when she left.

Typically, organizational decision-making tends to be somewhere in between autocratic to delegative in most organizations (Schein, 2017). At the Port, both ends of the spectrum seem to be applied, while the moderate middle ground is ignored. Port leadership has been described as autocratic; oppressive and coercive, but also as absent and neglectful. This creates a Volatile, Uncertain, Complex and Ambiguous (VUCA) environment where chaos and anarchy reign.

Leaders are expected to improve the culture and environment for the employees, clients, customers, and other stakeholders. Leaders should mitigate chaos and bring clarity to ambiguity. It is not unusual for organizations to experience some level of chaos or volatility, but the Port is mired in a VUCA environment (Volatile, Uncertain, Complex, and Ambiguous). Living in a VUCA environment makes it extremely difficult to make good decisions, maintain employee morale, and ensure that stakeholder needs are met.

Leading within this chaotic environment requires a steady hand and a strong presence. Competent leaders can lead through VUCA if they have vision, remain committed to values and principles, and involve other team members in problem solving (Spence, 2024). The leader needs to resist the urge to react, but rather take the time to think through the issues, research information, consider options, seek additional expert input, and effectively communicate to others (Spence, 2024). At the Port, there seems to be no effort to change the environment, and leadership is not navigating through it effectively.

Leaders need to admit mistakes, search for solutions, learn from the errors, and accept responsibility and ownership. At the Port, through the many errors, missteps, and omissions, leadership does not seem to take ownership or even acknowledge the problems. Many of the issues had been previously reported by staff, yet nothing was done. Employees stated that they often complained but were ignored. Many of the problems at the Port are now systemic and will be very difficult to correct because they have continued unabated for years, if not decades. Problems or issues will always occur; they need to be addressed and corrected so the deterioration does not continue. Rather than problem solving, today the Port is mired in disorder and dysfunction.

The Port would benefit from considering leadership skills when promoting a person rather than their success in a different role. A leadership role requires a specific set of skills. Organizations often promote an individual who has had some level of success in their current role because they expect that success to transfer into leadership. Success in other areas does not translate into success in leadership. What appears as success can often

have little or nothing to do with the skills and abilities of the individual, particularly in determining the propensity for success in leadership (March, 1994). Additionally, when one person appears to have met with success, it may be due to team effort, a collaboration with internal or external partners, or even just pure luck. According to March (1994) perception of success can influence the individual building false confidence while obscuring the realities of the individual capabilities. Leaders are often selected for the wrong reasons.

Leaders need to have vision, and they need to be able to plan and successfully execute a plan. One employee said that their leader is not capable of developing a plan and not capable of executing a plan. Some expressed frustration with the communication style coming from the senior leader at the Port. Several employees commented on the lack of two-way communication and information. One employee said, “She is a poor communicator. She is condescending and she is weak on staff communication.” Another employee said, “There is no leadership and there is no support.”

When an individual transitions from an individual contributor role to a leadership role, the focus changes from self to others. Leaders must be more immersed in the organization and focused on the broad goals and perspectives (Spence, 2024). Based on information provided by the staff as well as observations and other evidence, both senior leaders at the Port continued to focus on themselves as opposed to focusing on the overall needs of the organization and the needs of the staff. Employees stated that they received limited feedback other than a continual assignment of tasks and projects. There was only one person who confidently said she felt supported or encouraged by the leadership.

Employees described an environment where the top two leaders allowed one or two to join the “clique” while other members of the staff were bullied and threatened into an unrealistic workload. One employee complained about the workload and she was told that if she could not get her work done during the week, she needed to start working Saturdays. According to some staff, there is systemic favoritism. Some employees were recently given promotions and raises without an explanation. Others were handed off pieces of their work with no discussion or opportunity for input. One employee reported that she was expected to work even while she was sick. Leadership showed disregard for the health and wellbeing of an employee in service to their own needs.

While most leaders transition to leading the team, working through others, and taking responsibility for all functions of the organization, this did not happen with leadership at the Port. Multiple sources praised the work Port leadership in terms of economic development. The fact that so many people commented on the economic development work of the ED reinforces that the ED was not functioning as the leader over all areas of the

Port, as the current job requires. Evidence suggests that resources and attention were focused on economic development whereas a leadership role would require attention and support in all areas.

Leaders control their employees through use of power tactics. They have authority over salary and the opportunity for promotion and growth. As they assert this control, they can pressure employees and cause unnecessary stress. Power does have strategic uses for organizations for those who are skilled at using it, but for those unskilled, power tactics can negatively harm employees (Griffin-Ray, 2022). Some staff commented about the use of intimidation. One employee said, “there is a culture of retaliation.” Others said their opinions were clearly not wanted and usually disregarded by top leadership. One employee said her manager is “in her face” every day micromanaging her work. She is told to record everything she does and report it to her manager. This communication style can be intimidating and appear threatening. One employee said employees were not treated equally or fairly.

Two bases of power in use at the Port are reward power and coercive power (French & Raven, 1959). Port leadership alternatively uses coercive tactics such as intimidation or threats then comforts the employee with a reward such as a trip, more flexibility and freedom, or a promotion or raise. Use of the two power bases can allow an incompetent leader to stay in the role longer than they might without use of coercion and reward power. Inexperienced leaders tend to rely on reward power which is expensive for the organization. When one employee hit the maximum on the pay band for that position, the answer from leadership was to just change the pay band to give the reward (raise). The increase may or may not have been warranted, but pay ranges are implemented to control costs. The Employee Handbook states that some people may hit the maximum and be frozen at that wage other than cost-of-living adjustments, yet this was ignored and the raise was given.

One employee had concerns about catching leadership in lies. Once she voiced those concerns the relationship with leadership changed. She said, “once you are on the bad list, you don’t come back.”

Port leadership is expected to keep the Commissioners apprised of the functions of the Port. Instead, the Port of Benton has a solid wall between the Commissioners and the top leadership. Employees were told they are not allowed to speak directly to Commissioners. There was an effort to demonize the commissioners. Employees were told that the offices would be filled to make sure that the Commissioners could not have space at the corporate office.

According to the Washington Public Ports Association, management is expected to take directions from the Commissioners. They are supposed to work together, not in conflict.

“The management element is the operating arm of today’s port. Management is responsible for executing the direction of the Board of Commissioners when they act as a body of the whole. The executive director is accountable to the commission for making policy, financial, and technical recommendations; executing policy and operational direction; overseeing staff and operations; and providing professional feedback on the port’s progress, opportunities, and challenges” (WPPA, retrieved 3/2026).

According to the WPPA, there is a critical reporting relationship between the Commissioners and the Port manager. Reporting to the Commissioners is an obligation as they have the “ultimate responsibility and authority.” At the Port of Benton, Commissioners were not given access or provided with necessary information to give guidance and correct failures in leadership. It is unclear what efforts have been made on either side, but it is well known that there has been a significant conflict between the Commissioners and Port leadership.

“For any port to function at peak efficiency, there must be trust and a teamwork-driven relationship between the commission and the executive director, as well as among the commissioners themselves. This aspect of management is critical to a port’s daily functions and its overall success” (WPPA, retrieved 3/2026).

Rather than help build trust, it appears that top leadership fostered division. One employee said they were all told that if one specific commissioner running for office was elected that they could all lose their jobs. He said employees were told, “If he gets elected, it’s all over.” Some of the staff were afraid they would lose their jobs. Another employee said most of the staff had a negative impression of some of the commissioners because of things said by leadership.

Employees talked about the elitism of the two in upper management. They described leaders who put themselves first, not their employees. One employee talked about something as simple as scanning a document. “She made me scan it instead of doing it herself.” Upper management sits a few yards from the printer/scanner. In order to get another employee to scan the document they had to walk several additional yards, past the machine, to ask an employee to handle the task.

Employees described the extent of support the senior managers required. One employee said she was expected to set up the Zoom calls in the conference room for the Executive Director. When asked why training was not provided to the individual, the employee said,

“she didn’t want to learn” leaving the staff member to continue to handle this basic function.

Staff explained the amount of work required to support the executive director’s travel. One person managed most of the travel plans for her including registering for the conference, making hotel reservations, and booking flights. According to the employees, and confirmed by accounting, this amounted to 1-2 trips per month. One employee said that having someone else handle this was very inefficient. When the registration asked for preferences for the attendee, she would have to go get each question answered in order for her to complete the registration on behalf of the executive director. This level of support is highly unusual in the current business environment and for an organization this size.

Both senior leaders used employees to send emails on their behalf. They used staff for scheduling and other basic functions that could be handled much more efficiently by the senior leaders themselves. One employee explained that she was told to send an email on the manager’s behalf. She would get the information about what was to be included in the email. She would type the email. She would go back to report that she had sent the email. Then she would be asked if the email had been responded to. Then she would be told to send a follow up email and on and on. Employees at the Port are often used as administrative support rather than being developed into the career fields they aspire to. Leaders seek to develop their employees, not treat them as personal assistants.

Several employees noted that senior staff travelled frequently while also claiming that the Port cannot afford to hire even a part-time receptionist/administrative assistant. This seemed disingenuous to them and signaled an attitude of elitism. One of the employees said that he never believed that excuse because so much money was spent on things like travel for the ED. He felt that they should have prioritized the needs of the organization over their own.

Those in positions of power must respect the organization and recognize that they are in leadership to responsibly, ethically, and effectively steward staff and resources. If a leader cannot do that, he or she needs to relinquish the role. Self-centered people have no business in leadership.

Comments from the facilities/operations teams revolved around the way they have been separated out from the rest of the staff and ignored by leadership. One employee said they have been left out of everything.

A skilled leader with a solid support structure, can leave the office for extended periods of time, however, a leader with high turnover, weak structure, few policies and procedures, and minimum staffing levels is not afforded that luxury. In the Port’s current situation, it is

important that leadership be physically present, in the office, managing the operation closely. The Port has only 22-24 employees, is taxpayer funded, and cannot support elitist, non-working managers.

In Process: Job descriptions are in process to further detail out the expectations of leadership roles. The Interim ED has established a protocol for interaction between himself and the Commissioners to improve the relationship between the executive directors and the Commission, as suggested by the WPPA.

Recommendation: A new organizational structure would allow for three clearly defined leadership roles. (See Exhibit A). Three key areas can be separated out to allow focus from each leader in their respective areas. Each leader will be equal to eliminate the centralized power in one individual. The facilities and operations team should report to one executive director, currently the person who has been the director of facilities and operations. The finance director should become an executive director. This person will have oversight of all financial matters and directly report to the Commissioners. The third executive director will focus externally. The third role will lead all efforts towards economic development, government relations, and be the public representative of the Port. Each individual selected for leadership must exhibit clear leadership skills and a track record of success. I recommend a robust recruitment and hiring process to be sure that all entering leadership are capable. Requirements will be more stringent as leadership skills become a must for anyone in a leadership role. Once leaders are established, they must be held accountable and the entity tasked with that is the Board of Commissions. The Commissioners should be included in more strategic discussions about staffing and leadership. Communication must be improved with regular meetings and ongoing interaction between the Commissioners and the senior leaders.

Policies

Many policies typically found in organizations are missing at the Port. If policies do exist, they are either not followed or not known. There needs to be a solid set of policies, and they need to be communicated and universally enforced. Policies and procedures should not be arbitrarily changed.

The Port needs several policies, forms, checklists, and other relevant data for the effective functioning of the organization. Some examples include the following:

Job descriptions need to accurately describe the role each employee performs.

They need to be consistently revised for accuracy, consistency, and logic to prevent the confusion and chaos that currently exist in the organization. Several staff

members are unsure of their responsibilities, and they are not aware of the roles of others. Many tasks fall between the cracks because there is so much uncertainty about who “owns” what thus eliminating accountability.

The organizational chart is a road map to the organization. The organizational chart must be regularly updated, maintained and the data must be accurate. Every employee in the organization should know exactly what the chart looks like and where to find it. No employee should look at the chart and notice that they don't exist.

The Port currently has no standard hiring process. The need for consistent hiring practices is critical. Once implemented, the hiring policies and processes need to be enforced across the entire organization.

Employee files are not managed properly. One file contains all information relevant to each employee including benefits, tax, medical, and personnel items. Every document related to an employee is held in one file and it looks like that is the way it has always been done. A policy for the creation and maintenance of employee files is necessary. Existing files will need to be separated, and a system needs to be created for each section of employee records resulting in a set of files for each employee.

Currently education policy resides within the Employee Handbook, however, it needs to be its own policy, and the policy with more details and structure. The planning, budgeting, and approval processes must be included and managed ongoing. There should be a robust review process to ensure that any financial investment the Port makes benefits the Port, not just the individual.

There is some frustration with the current On Call policy. Given the work of the Port and the potential for ongoing needs after business hours, a review of this policy is necessary.

There is currently no consistent onboarding policy or process. One needs to be created and implemented consistently throughout the organization.

There is a need for a policy for employee reviews and salary adjustments. It needs to be consistent and documented. A new annual review form or forms should be created.

Employees have requested a dress code with some guidelines for things such as fragrance. Currently, the Port has no dress code.

There is a policy included in the Employee Handbook defining a “drug -free workplace program” yet the Port does not currently do drug screening prior to hire.

The current compensation system is not clear. There are pay bands but they do not connect to a particular job. When a person hits the cap, apparently there is a no concern about simply changing the pay band, thus eliminating the purpose of pay bands. A consistent process for either utilizing pay bands or a different system needs to be implemented. A compensation policy and procedures will ensure uniformity and fairness.

Progressive discipline is not implemented at the Port. It is important to create a fair, reasonable, structured disciplinary action process so that employees are not surprised and confused when they are corrected.

Training is needed for basic organizational functions and there is a need for systems training and organizational training as a part of new employee onboarding.

Manager’s training is needed. The Port does not require any previous management experience for most jobs labelled “manager” or “director.” Particularly since most of the employees at the Port are given the title “manager” or “director” there should be a requirement for manager’s training. Untrained managers cause problems, cost money, and present liabilities to any organization.

A strategic staffing plan and ongoing adherence to the plan will help maintain structure and avoid having so many things fall between the cracks. A retention goal, with outcomes in terms of evaluation and pay increases for leadership, would help those in positions of leadership to focus on staffing and future planning. This would also include a succession plan for those close to retirement.

There should be an employee relations program or process. Employees need a reporting process or avenue for discussing employee issues. This would require the addition of a human resources function.

Some policies that do exist often are not followed. For example, the Employee Handbook includes a policy and process for requesting training or educational financial support. The Handbook requires employees requesting funding for training or education to receive the approval of the Executive Director and the Executive Director is expected to ensure that the requested training is reasonable and directly relevant to the employee’s responsibilities. The policy is missing some safeguards, but it does reference a consistent approval process for all employees. Unfortunately, it is not followed. When employees were questioned

about the process for requesting to attend a training, conference, or any other event one employee said, “I asked and I was told to do whatever I wanted.” One employee said, “I just emailed my manager (not the ED) and he emailed me back and told me to go.” Neither employee described any plan or discussion with either their manager or the ED about the training, the purpose, or the necessity for the Port’s financial support of the request. One employee said she was surprised it was so loose because they were very strict where she used to work. She described the process as “definitely willy nilly.”

In addition to the education and training policies, employees seemed confused about the rules for working at home. It had been allowed for all employees until recently. Employees said new rules were implemented but only for some people. One employee said it was clearly “unequal treatment” and only some people were targeted. While some people could work from home, others were told that if they could not come to the office, they would need to take PTO. “There was willy nilly changing of rules and processes,” one employee said.

In Process: Some processes have been implemented and checklists created. I have created a new hire process and workflow. There is an exit checklist. There is now a current employee inventory. Work has started on a new compensation system and pay structure. Work has started on a new On Call policy.

Recommendation: Each of the policies identified need to be created or revised. Staff training should take place to give each employee the opportunity to know and understand the policies. Leadership must enforce all policies consistently and fairly. The Port spends a great deal of money on education and training for staff. Most of the expenses are due to training in other locations requiring travel and lodging. Given the investment of taxpayer resources, a strict policy should be implemented so funds are not wasted. There must be management oversight with a senior level person consistently reviewing requests for training. There must be accountability for the purpose of the training and the benefit to the Port for the expense.

Employment Process: Hiring, Managing, Promoting, Exiting

Onboarding and offboarding are particularly difficult for the Port. Both activities lack necessary processes to position employees for success while also protecting the interests of the Port. There is a great deal of inconsistency and disorganization in these areas. There is tremendous liability for any organization that does not have sound practices in hiring, promoting and terminating.

One critical tool in onboarding and offboarding and throughout the employee lifecycle is the Human Resources Information System. There are many options for an HRIS but it is critical that a reliable system be utilized for payroll, benefits, and employee management. When I asked about the HRIS at the Port I was told it was not even worth looking at since it was not very good. When I asked about data that would normally come from the HRIS I was told that the data was not in the system because no one ever put the data in the system. They recognized the need for data management, but it was never done. The staff talks about hoping to have someone who can scan and upload all the employee documents and data eventually. Presumably a great deal of work is done manually at this point. The bottom line is the Port has paid for a system but then did not follow through on the implementation necessary to make it useful.

Several of the staff members commented on the problems they experienced when they were first hired at the Port. They expressed frustration with a lack of planning and training. Employees are expected to learn the job with little or no guidance. Employees are not set up for success. For many years, the Port had little or no turnover, so this missing piece was probably not a concern. The last few years, however, the turnover has been exceptionally high. As one employee said, "We cycle a lot of people through here." Another employee said, "If we could stop having to hire people, things might settle down." The high level of turnover the past few years has impacted the entire organization as the continuum of history and culture is broken and task transference is almost nonexistent.

One employee said when he started, he was left to fend for himself without any introduction or training. He said there were several documents critical to his job which took him months to find them as they were buried several file layers deep within the Port's Sharepoint and no one knew where to find them. There is no map to track the Sharepoint files or folders and each new employee uses their own logic for filing. This lack of a universal, organization-wide, file system causes a waste of time and great frustration.

One employee said when he started working at the Port the job was nothing like what he had interviewed for. He said there was no discussion about the job or the expectations. He said he was just assigned "random stuff" by the executive director. He said he had no guidance, no support, and no one interested in helping him get what he needed to be successful. He said he had no idea what his authority was or what decisions he was able to make. Since there was little or no interaction with the ED, he said he was surprised when he was accused of not being a good communicator. Typically, with a new employee there are regular meetings to discuss progress and to aid with integration. Ownership of that onboarding process belongs to the hiring manager, not the employee. This employee's poor experience could have resulted in quick turnover and the loss of a highly skilled employee.

One employee said when he was hired he had no direction and then he found out he was doing things wrong. He called the process “clunky” with no idea of what was going on. He said he knows other employees who struggle also.

Another employee joined the organization and was thrown immediately into an audit. She started at the Port without any organizational onboarding or department training. She looked for written procedures to help and found none. When she asked for some guidance from her manager, she said he seemed unwilling to help her. He would send her an email rather than coming to work with her and support the needs of the audit. She said she was left to learn on her own, find things as she could, all under the pressure of an audit.

One employee said she, “learned everything from scratch.” As employees described it, their introduction to the Port resulted in a much slower ramp up time causing the employee frustration and costing the Port money.

Several employees talked about the discrepancies in hiring and staffing. Things seem random and not well thought out. In some cases, the contracts administrator is the point of contact for job openings, which does not align with the role at all. She is tasked with sending out job leads, posting them online, collecting resumes and scheduling interviews. Sometimes candidates are not routed through her so there is again more inconsistency. One recent job was filled without notice or a clear process. Employees had little forewarning and no explanation for the decision.

The Port does not conduct background checks, even for employees who work in tenant buildings and have access with keys and badges to tenant buildings. The hiring process does not include a drug test. As far as anyone knows, there is no formal, universal, consistent process for hiring employees.

Several unexplained impromptu promotions occurred in December of 2025. This created a series of problems as many of those promoted were given few details about the new role or plan for how to transition out of the old role. With no documentation or written rationale for the sudden promotions, there is also a question of fairness. Significant raises and promotions given outside the bounds of a performance review should be documented to prevent an accusation of favoritism or unequal treatment of staff.

During the flurry of promotions, the marketing and communications manager role was assigned to a person who already had a full time job without any transition plan, re-assignment of current responsibilities, or back-fill. This leaves the employee carrying out the responsibilities of two full-time jobs with no explanation of how to do both roles or for how long this is expected. There are other responsibilities also handled by this individual, outside of both job descriptions, that make this situation entirely unsustainable.

The employee brought on just before an audit and ended up doing the vast majority of the work pulling files for the auditor without the benefit of knowing where things were. She said she would have been able to work much faster if she knew where things were located within systems and within the organization. A proper onboarding would have provided her with a better understanding of where to find things and helped her respond effectively to an auditor.

Another employee explained how the lack of proper onboarding hurts existing staff as well as the new employee. She said one new employee was working for the Port for 4 months before he became aware of the use of Sharepoint. One employee said, “There is no structure to hiring. There is no onboarding. People keep quitting.”

There does not seem to be training manuals, written procedures, or any consistent way for people to learn about their job or to integrate into the organization. It has been mentioned that some former employees have left “bitter” and with a negative opinion of their work experience. With the amount of turnover, this is not surprising.

One recently hired employee does not even have an employee file within the organization. Several employees expressed confusion about the arrival of a new senior level employee with little warning and without even the minimal process typical of new hires at the Port. This employee never went through any hiring process or screening, as far as anyone knows.

The individual tasked with processing new employee paperwork said the new hire was non-compliant when requested to provide documents. The staff member emailed the new employee multiple times requesting signed paperwork required from all new employees.

When asked to provide documents to complete the I-9, as required by federal law, the employee was non-compliant. All U.S. employers are required by federal law to review documents provided by the employee to provide identity and employment authorization. (US Citizenship and Immigration Services, retrieved 3/2026). The Port follows the legally required process, and all employees are asked to provide documents to work at the Port. After repeated attempts the employee continued to refuse to provide the documentation.

This person then informed the staff member that she would complete the I-9 form on herself. This is an unacceptable practice and violation of the law. “Employees cannot act as authorized representatives for their own Form I-9. Therefore, employees cannot complete, update, or make corrections to Section 2 (or Supplement B) for themselves or attest to the authenticity of the documentation they present” ([U.S. Citizen and Immigration Services](#)). By law, a new employee has 3 days to provide the documentation needed for the employer to complete the form and if they cannot provide the documents they cannot be

retained. This person should have been terminated after the 3 days when the documents were still not produced.

Regardless of this behavior, the new employee then directed that she be given a significant raise in contrast to Port policies and procedures. She was given a 4% raise after being employed approximately two months. The Employee Handbook includes a 6-month probation period and a review due, with a potential for salary increase, at the end of that time. The employee claimed that the raise had been promised by the ED and she insisted that the raise be given immediately, resulting in another occasion where Port staff did not follow their own policy. Others are told that the soonest they are eligible for a raise is after 6 months of employment. When this happens at the highest level, it also sends a message throughout the organization that disregarding policy is acceptable.

Employers are expected to retain the completed I-9 for one year after employment ends. This employee still has not completed the I-9 and it is impossible to correct at this point since she no longer works for the Port. Failure to follow the law regarding I-9 completion and retention could result in fines for the Port. Failure to have, or to follow, an onboarding process has left the Port liable.

As there is no onboarding process, there is currently no exit process either. This was identified as a problem when a tenant notified the Port that a former employee still had a badge allowing access to a building. Facilities staff have access badges, keys, and other Port-issued items but there is no record keeping of who has what items. There is no exit checklist when an employee leaves and there is no formal process for collecting Port-issued items. One employee had a badge for an HMIS Building but no one collected his badge when he left. Since there is no list created at onboarding, there is no way to be sure everything the employee has in his or her possession is returned during the offboarding. One employee left with the Port's gas card and was able to buy gas for his personal vehicle after leaving employment with the Port.

While people are employed, they need to be managed. It appears that there is a lack of day-to-day management. Several projects became up because they were important and yet had been neglected for years or possibly decades. On multiple occasions I was told that this had been assigned to "Jane Doe" or this is something "John Doe" is responsible for. If an employee is assigned a task or project and yet the task or project does not get done, there is a management problem. Where was the follow up? If the employee failed to complete a critical project, why was there no disciplinary action taken? Why is an employee allowed to simply disregard a directive?

There were a few reasons given for this dereliction of duty such as a lack of necessary knowledge or skill, but one unacceptable reason was that the person assigned chose not to do it or passed it off to someone else. Employees should not be shifting job responsibilities on a whim. Some employees are clearly overburdened while others seem to have inexplicable authority to reassign tasks. If there is a lack of skills, that needs to be addressed as well.

With tasks and projects being shifted around, it makes management of those tasks and responsibilities much harder. Based on the fact that so many critical projects have not been completed, it appears that there is little follow up by management. The Port has created an environment that accepts and allows for insubordination and defiance. In most organizations, if an employee fails to complete an assigned task or fulfills the responsibilities of his or her job, it is dealt with through a disciplinary process. Disciplinary action needs to be taken if an employee continues to disregard a directive and, after a thorough process, an incompetent or noncompliant employee should be removed from their position. At the Port, tasks can be ignored and projects can be abandoned with disregard for how it impacts other employees, tenants, the taxpayer, and the public.

In Process: I am instituting consistent practices for hiring and onboarding. The interview process will also be planned, organized, and consistent and onboarding will be deliberate. I have drafted an onboarding checklist, and I am coaching the first effort at implementation. Staff is very receptive and I am confident this will improve. An internal audit of I-9s is planned.

Recommendation: The Port should institute practices for progressive discipline. If employees are not completing critical tasks and projects and not meeting deadlines, the situation needs to be addressed, not ignored. The Port needs a reliable HRIS that is fully implemented and utilized. This investment will reduce the manual labor currently performed by staff.

Financial Oversight and Responsibility

Based on comments from staff and other observations, the senior leader over finance has been uninvolved in much of the day-to-day functioning in the department. As discussed previously, this role needs to be a working manager closely involved in the department.

The leader in the finance area also has an oversight role for the entire organization. Managing the finances, particularly of a public entity, requires serious attention, fortitude, and integrity. The finance leader must be resistant to pressure and should be intent on protecting the assets of the organization.

Both employees in the finance area described several manual processes. They both seemed unclear about the role each other plays and they have not been coordinated by leadership or cross-trained to support each other. One person said processes could definitely be faster. She said the department needs to be modernized with improved workflow. There is no teamwork currently in the department and no leadership looking for process improvements. There are probably several efficiencies to be gained and improvements to be made.

Employees commented that projects are started and studies are requested and then the projects are abandoned and data provided in studies may never be used. This is frustrating to staff as they spend a great deal of time on random projects assigned, yet there is no benefit when projects are inexplicably abandoned just as quickly as they are assigned. The organization suffers as money wasted on these activities could be better utilized to provide high staffing levels or other needs of the organization. There appears to be no coordination between projects and limited cost controls. The cost of vendors, consultants, and products in addition to the expense of staff time does not appear to be a consideration. There is a great deal of outsourcing.

The two staff members are not fully aware of the role of their counterpart. There seems to be uncertainty about what the director of finance does. The last two people holding that position functioned as high level executives rather than working managers, which is what a very small team in a small organization would require. The accounting team was relieved of some duties when administrative tasks were handed off at one point, but then they reverted back when that person became part of the impromptu promotional flurry.

Several concerns were raised about the new director of finance hired in December. (Note: She has since left the organization) Employees talked about the environment this person created. One employee said, "She came in like a wrecking ball. She picked her favorites, goes to bat for them, and everyone else suffers." Many comments were made about her behavior and how she treated employees. One employee called her "toxic" and said she was a dictator. She reportedly made drastic changes in two weeks, moved people around, and then spent her time "snooping" and not working, according to staff.

Employees said that she was not doing her job. She stopped doing the vendor TIN matching creating a backlog of vendor approvals. Eventually another employee from a different department had to step up to get it done. Although she assured the Commissioners that she was approving invoices, it was discovered that 259 outstanding invoices had not been paid. Shortly after the Commission meeting, all 259 were approved in minutes. With so many invoices getting approved in just a few minutes, concerns were raised about the level of scrutiny given as they were supposedly reviewed and approved so quickly.

Some employees expressed concern about her behavior. One employee said, “there is something really off about her.” Another employee said, “It has been pretty rough for us under her regime.” Other employees explained how she managed by intimidation and getting “in your face” rather than asking questions or trying to understand. There was tension when she was there and relief when she left.

Leadership in the finance area has been lacking for quite some time based on audits, operational evidence, and employee comments. One manager in the operations/facilities department explained that he had to create all of his own budget tracking and spreadsheets because they were getting no communication from the finance department and, when they did, it included wrong data. Another employee said, “we have no confidence in the numbers we get from finance.” One employee said that there is no planning, no forecasting and no research done on new projects from a financial perspective. The facilities/construction department has had to create all of their own systems and financial tracking because they could not get any reliable support from finance. He said they were lucky if they got financial reports from finance twice per year but even when they did get reports, the numbers never matched what the department had for their tracking. He said sometimes the finance director would change where he allocated budget items without telling the team. It sounded like a lack of communication from finance was a frustration.

One employee said, “There is no company-wide process for tracking projects and budgets.” Each team or individual must build their own systems without the support of finance. They have no idea if they are over or under budget on a project. They are kept completely in the dark. He indicated a possibility of significant cost savings with better financial management. It looks like antiquated processes in finance and human resources go back many years and have never been improved or updated. One employee said payroll has been “messed up” and he has had to ask several times to correct a mistake on his benefits.

Expenses for training/education are significant with little financial explanation given or oversight provided. One employee said it never made sense to her that people from the Port of Benton would attend large national events. She said most information gained from the large Port national meetings would be useless. The small Port meeting hosted by the Washington Public Ports Association was the most valuable for anyone from the Port of Benton to attend. The WPPA hosts a Small Ports meeting in Washington state. This year it will be held in Lake Chelan. To attend this meeting, one would need to travel by car, avoiding the expense of a flight. Attending this event would only require one night or two at the most at Campbell’s Resort on Lake Chelan. Local travel means lower costs and less

time out of the office. There should be stronger controls over the training, conferences, and travel given the significant financial impact of these activities.

One employee said leadership would not allow facilities staff to get training while other people were able to get training whenever they want. “We have people standing in the road waving flags that have not been trained.” There are people running forklifts without training. They requested budget for safety training and were told there was no budget available for safety training. This further pointed towards concerns that leaders prioritizing themselves over the needs of the staff and the organization.

It was discovered at one point that many vendors had not been paid, going back months. It also was discovered that the accounting staff was not charging tenants on pass-through expenses. The Port was expecting reimbursement, but no one in accounting was aware of the charge back. As a result, tenants received a large bill unexpectedly to cover the months that the finance team did not implement the fees.

One employee talked about the frustration of being left out of financial decisions despite having a great deal of responsibility for expenses. Staff in the operations/facilities area said they have been completely left out of the budgeting process for the last two years. One employee said that their manager had been “hogtied” with no decision-making authority. The facilities/operations team was cut out of the budgeting process with no explanation given. The expertise that some members of this team would bring is lost when they are disregarded.

In Process: Reallocation of job duties and the addition of support staff is in process. Once the pressure is off some staff, attention will be shifted to training and gaining of efficiencies. The staff has good ideas and discussions have begun on how to improve this department. Communication must be improved. An all-employee communication channel is in the works and should be launched by the communications manager in the near future. Employees stated that often such an effort starts but, with no individual ownership, it is abandoned as other tasks take priority.

Recommendation: Recognizing the structural and staffing issues of the finance department, a thorough analysis of expenses should be done. Staff in the finance department need to have authority and accountability. As the finance director position is open, this is an opportune time for the Port to hire a highly skilled professional known for ethics, leadership, and strict financial controls who will function as a working manager.

Conclusion

The Port of Benton has an opportunity to significantly improve the functioning of the organization with deliberate and intentional strategic decisions and decisive

implementation. With the commitment made by the Commissioners to honestly assess the issues and invest the resources to improve, the Port can start fresh, with a new focus.

Employees receive messaging from leaders that influence how they function (Schein, 2017). Beliefs, values, and priorities become known as staff respond, even unintentionally, to the leader's signals. If the leader does not pay attention to certain areas of the business, the staff get the message that something is not important. The neglect at the Port starts at the top but has effectively filtered through because everyone can see what the leader pays attention to and what is not attended to. The way employees are treated, paid, and promoted are all reflective of the values of the leader.

Employees have been absorbing the beliefs, values, and assumptions of current leadership for several years. It will take quite some time to chart a new course and change culture, if that is what is desired. The hardworking and committed staff deserves leadership that reflects the importance of each aspect of the Port's responsibilities. When leadership is attentive, interested, and engaged in the full functioning of the organization, employees are more likely to be attentive, interested and engaged.

There are good employees at the Port who have suffered under bad circumstances. Many of the employees talked about the disorganization and chaos that they live with every day. They would like more stability, more structure, and less ambiguity and confusion. While many organizations suffer from some level of chaos, the Port seems to have an unusually high amount of chaos for such a small employee base. Disorder and chaos within an organization result in anxiety and stress. Most of the employees quickly embraced the initial efforts to bring order and structure to their world. More resources must be devoted to creating policies, improving policies, and developing procedures that give employees the guidelines and guardrails to do their jobs effectively. Onboarding and training are both critical to the health and development of the organization. Systems that improve efficiency and replace manual processes are necessary. Once the Port of Benton shifts its priorities, invests in the key areas that need investment, and ensures that the right people are put in the right places, the train will get back on the tracks.

References

Barbuto, J. & Cummins-Brown, L., (2007). Full Range Leadership, Nebraska Guide, University of Nebraska, Lincoln Nebraska.

French, J.R.P. Jr., & Raven, B. (1959). The Bases of Social Power. In D.P. Cartwright, ed., Studies in Social Power (p. 150-167). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research.

Griffin-Ray, E. (2022). Decisions and Non-Decisions, A Pragmatic View of Power, Structure, and Culture in Complex Organizations. Outskirts Press, USA

Hatch, M. (2013). Organization Theory; Modern, Symbolic, and Postmodern Perspective, Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK

March, J. (1994). Organizational Culture, Mapping the Terrain, Foundations for Organizational Science, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA

Schein, E. (2017). Organizational Culture and Leadership. Wiley Publications, Hoboken, NJ

Spence, L. (2025). Leading Through the Next Crisis, In Questad, D., Griffin-Ray, E. and Coffell, E. Holding Steady, Leadership During Volatility, Lulu Press, USA.

U.S. Customs and Immigration Services, retrieved, 3/2026, <https://www.uscis.gov/i-9>

<https://www.uscis.gov/i-9-central/completing-form-i-9/completing-section-2-employer-review-and-attestation>

Washington Public Ports Association, (2022). Port Governance and Management Guide.

Retrieved 3/2026, <https://www.washingtonports.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/MFAPortGovernanceandManagementGuide.pdf>

About the Analyst

Eileen Griffin-Ray, MBA, Ph.D. is a seasoned business executive with over 20 years of leadership experience in human resources, training, wealth management, and marketing, primarily in the financial industry. She has managed teams and led projects. She has implemented policies and procedures and led communication and training efforts to ensure consistent organizational application. She has done research and writing for The Heartland Institute, a national think tank, and has written numerous articles and white papers. She is the author of books including Power, Politics and the Leadership Landscape and Decisions and Non-Decisions; A Pragmatic View of Power, Structure, and Culture in Complex Organizations and she was the editor and contributor to Holding Steady, Leadership During Volatility. She earned her Ph.D. in leadership studies focusing her doctoral research on organizational theory, structure and culture. Her MBA thesis focused on the human factor in the financial industry, and business ethics. She is highly skilled at identifying organizational deficiencies, evaluating human capital, and envisioning a path forward.

EXHIBIT A: PROPOSED ORGANIZATIONAL CHART

