

# Water Related Permits Process Improvement Team (WRPPIT)

Making clear whether and how a project gets to YES & transitioning to a consolidated state permit system.

## MEETING RECORD

FINAL

November 18, 2005

9:00 – 4 pm, DCBS, Director's Conference Room, Salem

---

### Members Present:

Pat Allen, RSL  
Debbie Colbert, Water Resources  
Kim Grigsby, Water Resources  
Laura Leshar, Project Manager, RSL  
John Lilly, DSL  
Gary Lynch, DOGAMI  
Patty Snow, ODFW  
Christine Svetkovich, DEQ  
Jenny Carmichael, Carmichael Consulting

### Members Absent:

Kirk Jarvie, DSL

### Guests:

Donna Wimer, RSL

---

**1. Approval of Prior Meeting Record.** The record of the November 2 meeting was approved.

**2. Project Impact Measurement Plan.**

The team discussed a variety of options agreeing ultimately that both a means of measuring the short term and long term impact of WRPPIT would be needed. The team agreed that the changes implemented by WRPPIT could measure the short term impact. A group consisting of Pat, Christine, Debbie, Jenny, and Gary will convene to develop a recommendation for the full team's consideration.

**3. Review Redesign Plan and Materials**

Jenny reviewed with the team a "Redesign Notebook" consisting of the following materials:

- a. Redesign Roadmap
- b. Redesign Charge
- c. Redesign Assumptions
- d. Principles of Effective Task Flow
- e. Permit Quantity Information
- f. Product and Process Expectations
  - "What customers say today"
  - "What we want them to say"
- g. Redesign the Product
- h. Optimum Task Flow
- i. Redesign the Production Line
- j. Attachments

The team made alterations to items a, b, c, and d.

The team agreed to bring correct information for item e to the November 22 meeting.

#### 4. Stakeholder/Public/Applicant/Consultant/Staff Expectations

A significant amount of the meeting on the section of the notebook titled “Product and Process Expectations”. The team individually wrote draft statements of “what we want customer to say”. The team then selected their preferred statement from among all offered. The statement that received the most votes from the team was then fine tuned. Please see separate attachment titled “Product and Process Expectations” for the results of the team’s discussion.

#### 5. Redesign the Product.

The last task of the team at this redesign meeting was to offer potential products that could supplant today’s existing product. The following list was built:

	What Exists Today	Some Possibilities for What Could Exist
End Product	<p><u>One, several, or all of the following:</u></p> <p>Multiple Permits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Removal-Fill Permits with Conditions (DSL)</li> <li>- Stormwater Permit (DEQ)</li> <li>- In Water Blasting Permit (ODFW)</li> <li>- Oregon Shore Permit (OPRD)</li> <li>- Scenic Waterways Permit (DSL, OPRD)</li> <li>- Mineland Reclamation Permit (DOGAMI)</li> </ul> <p>Multiple Authorizations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Water Quality Certification (DEQ)</li> <li>- State Lands Proprietary Authorization (DSL)</li> <li>- Water Use Authorization (WRD)</li> <li>- Coastal Zone Management Certification (DLCD)</li> </ul> <p>Multiple Reviews</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In-Water Work Period (ODFW)</li> <li>- Habitat Mitigation Review (ODFW)</li> <li>- Fish Passage Review (ODFW)</li> <li>- Archeological Review (OPRD)</li> </ul> <p><u>Note: this does not include local and federal requirements.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Single Permit</li> <li>- Give authority to ODFW to have binding comments</li> <li>- Clear zones with no projects or only certain projects</li> <li>- Safe harbor language (defined thing in a defined way)</li> </ul> <p>Example packages:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. make the right thing to do the easiest thing to do.</li> <li>b. Notice based permit: applicant follows standards, state role is compliance.</li> <li>c. General standards for common projects, e.g. – stormwater plan</li> </ol> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Self-certifying developers</li> <li>- Reduce/combine permits</li> <li>- Eliminate redundant state review of the same issue (multiple comment opportunities for locals)</li> <li>- Final project decision that meets all state requirements</li> <li>- Rapid wetland determination (sub-product)</li> <li>- Local delegation</li> </ul>
Process Start Point	Multiply entry and random points.	
Process End Point	The last state agency approval arrives – potentially requiring changes after a project has been fully approved by other agencies and designed and is perhaps underway.	

The following ideas were also offered for the redesign:

- Consolidated comments
- Integrated websites
- Integrated data bases
- Website like Washington
- Permit team sets up projects
- Publicly financed mitigation
- Published standards (user guide)
- Education about good/bad projects, public information campaign

Additional ideas:

- incentives for good projects
- authorization for projects that have an environmental benefit

## **6. Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the team will be an all day meeting on November 22.