

# 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

March 17, 2006

9-noon, DCBS, Meeting Room 260, Salem

---

### Members Present:

Jas Adams, DOJ  
Pat Allen, Office of Regulatory Streamlining (RSL)  
Kim Grigsby, Water Resources  
Kirk Jarvie, DSL  
Laura Leshar, Project Manager, Office of Regulatory Streamlining (RSL)  
Gary Lynch, DOGAMI  
Louise Solliday, DSL  
Patty Snow, ODFW  
Christine Svetkovich, DEQ

### Members Absent:

Ken Franklin, ODOT

### Intermittent Members Not Present:

Dale Blanton, DLCD  
Tony Stein, OPRD  
Susan White, SHPO

### Consultant:

Jenny Carmichael, Carmichael Consulting

---

## AGENDA

<u>TIME</u>	<u>AGENDA ITEM</u>	<u>LED BY</u>
9:00	<b>Approve Feb 27 and Mar 6 Meeting Records, Reminder Assignments, Updates</b>	Jenny
9:15	<b>Meeting Schedule Check-In</b>	Jenny
9:20	<b>Dry Run – Advisory Committee Presentation</b>	Pat
10:00	<b>Audit Committee Presentation – March 30</b>	Jenny
10:05	<b>Water Related Permit Automation POP (Governor’s Budget)</b>	Pat
10:15	<b>1200-C Stormwater &amp; 401 Cert Update</b>	Christine/Kirk
10:30	<b>BREAK</b>	
10:40	<b>Team Review – Potential Statutory, Rule, MOA Changes</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- which statutory changes are really needed, desired</li><li>- potential legislative concepts for April 3<sup>rd</sup> deadline</li><li>- draft MOA outline</li><li>- updated ROADMAP</li></ul>	Jenny
11:45	<b>Consultants Update – User Guide &amp; ?</b>	Kirk
11:55	<b>Meeting Wrap – Up</b>	Jenny
	<u>Next Meetings:</u> March 22, 9:00 – 10:30 – Advisory Committee Meeting, Conference Room B L&I Building, Basement March 24, 9 – noon, L&I, Directors Conference Room	

---

## MEETING RECORD

The agenda sequence was modified as noted below.

1. **Meeting Record Approval.** The Meeting Records from February 27 and March 6 were approved.
2. **Reminder Assignments.** Please see ATTACHMENT 1 for reminder assignments. The following items were discussed:
  - a. Legislative Contacts. Gary Lynch will be meeting with Rich Angstrom and Susan Morgan this week.
  - b. Measurement Plan. The team had no further changes to the measurement plan (ATTACHMENT 2). Jenny Carmichael and Laura Lesher will coordinate to obtain removal-fill permit data for both the measurement plan and for MOA mid- redesigning.
  - c. Mediation Training Dates. June 5, 6, and 7 have been set for the mediation training. Two sessions will occur, each running 1.5 days. It appears that the per attendee cost will be somewhat higher than \$80 and Laura is confirming whether the Luke Center will be doing direct registration. More information to come.

### 3. Updates.

Pat Allen reported that DCBS staff will be giving a follow-up presentation to the Governor's natural resources cabinet in April regarding modules that are being developed for natural resource agencies to assess and train for improved customer service. DCBS has devoted \_time of their organizational development manager's position to developing and offering the modules. The modules are being developed so they can also be used by DAS for agencies besides natural resource agencies.

4. **Meeting Schedule Check-In.** The team confirmed that the current meeting schedule will work as it relates to the new meetings of the Measure 37 group.
5. **Coordination with DEQ authorizations.** WRPPIT's current process redesign provides that the Removal-Fill permit will identify requirements that will be a part of the separate 401 certification, assuming the project does not change. WRPPIT had also briefly discussed the possibility of not issuing a Removal-Fill permit until the 401 certification process had been concluded. WRPPIT had also discussed whether DEQ should review all removal-fill permits for state water quality requirements or whether DEQ's review should be limited to the removal-fill permits that also require a 401 certification. WRPPIT had also discussed coordination of 1200-C requirements with the Removal-Fill permit but had put this topic on hold pending further discussion between DSL and DEQ.

Kirk Jarvie (DSL) and Christine Svetkovich (DEQ) reported on a meeting held March 15 that included Kirk, Christine, Lauri Aunan (DEQ), and Louise Solliday (DSL) to discuss the above topics.

The group's primary approach was to identify just how much information Removal-Fill permit applicants can be provided about requirements related to the 401 water quality certification and 1200-C requirements as part of the Oregon Removal-Fill permit. The group did agree that DEQ review in the redesign should be limited to removal-fill permits that involve a federal nexus. Kirk and Christine conveyed the questions the group formulated and its answers:

- ◆ QUESTION: Is there some form of official statement regarding 401 water quality certification than can be incorporated into the new Oregon Removal-Fill permit?

ANSWER: Explore this further as WRPPIT develops the Memorandum of Agreement and the mid-level redesign. Christine and Kirk will meet with their department's legal counsel to assess how this can happen. Legal counsel will also be asked to determine if the public notice process related to the Removal-Fill permit could be coordinated with the public notice process of the 401 certification which cannot occur until a 404 application has been filed.

- ◆ QUESTION: Can 1200-C requirements be incorporated into the new Oregon Removal-Fill permit? (1200-C is the NPDES requirement for storm-water erosion control on construction on sites larger than one acre)

ANSWER: The group recommended that Don Yon from DEQ provide a presentation regarding DEQ's 1200-C program. The presentation would cover how the process works, issues the program is experiencing right now, and who is doing the work. One of the issues is that DEQ has entered into a settlement regarding 1200-C's that requires them to do work they do currently have the resources to perform. This presentation will be scheduled for late April. After hearing the presentation, WRPPIT will apply its knowledge of the redesign process to assess steps that could be taken to inform applicants of 1200-C requirements as part of the Oregon Removal-Fill permit. DEQ's issues regarding funding for the 1200-C program will be addressed separately from WRPPIT.

## 5. Advisory Committee Presentation – March 22

Slides 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14 and 15 need to be corrected to remove the word “optional” in several boxes.

The team developed one additional slide to add to the Advisory Committee presentation:

### **Key Redesign Changes**

- (1) Providing applicants enhanced access to a coordinated state agency team at the pre-application phase.
- (2) Improved coordination of state agencies' review of applications.
- (3) Delivering a final permit that better coordinates state requirements.
- (4) Improved transparency of process and requirements.
- (5) Concurrent review which should lead to faster overall timing.
- (6) Provides responsibility for a unified state process under Department of State Lands.

This information will be included as a new slide 16.

In addition, the visual display of the redesigned process will be the bottom half of the “comparison” handout Pat in his presentation to the Committee, will define “all requirements” as it applies to the redesign (i.e. – only includes notice of 401, CZM, and water right requirements.)

## 6. Team Review –Potential Statutory, Rule, MOA Changes

which statutory changes are really needed, desired  
potential legislative concepts for April 3<sup>rd</sup> deadline  
draft MOA outline  
updated ROADMAP

Jenny explained that the agenda included this topic at this time for two reasons:

- 1) to begin to identify the content of any proposed 2007 legislation. The team noted that actual language is due from DAS to Legislative Counsel on June 30. In order to meet that deadline the team will need to have its work to identify content by the end of May.
- 2) to determine how much of the redesign can be implemented with an MOA. If most or all of it can, implementation does not need to wait until after the 2007 legislative session.

The team reviewed the preliminary analysis prepared by team members (see ATTACHMENT 3).

- a. Statutory Changes. The team explored whether it would be beneficial to codify the following items in statute:
  - ◆ The overall concept of the consolidated permit, with DSL as lead (probably in DSL statutes)
  - ◆ Changing the DSL review period from 90 days to 120 days (which would now include all other reviews where previously it did not). Request for extension language is in ORS 196.825.7 (b). The rule related to the extension is OAR 146.085.0028 (1).
  - ◆ The role of agencies as participants in the permit process vs. commenting agencies. (Note – MOA could define what comments are.)
  - ◆ Requiring that the permit not be conditioned to include other authorizations – that the participating authorizations need to be part of the permit.

JAS noted that ORS 196.795.1 directs DSL to streamline. ORS 196.805 directs DSL to centralize the removal-fill permitting process.

The team concluded that the best approach at this time is to continue the placeholders in all agencies. By the end of May, when actual language is due to DAS the number of agencies that forward bills could narrow. Finally, while proceeding with the preparation of one or more bills, they may or may not need to be introduced. It will be important for the team to continuously evaluate whether

- b. Draft MOA . Jenny reviewed a draft outline for an MOA (see ATTACHMENT 4). The team indicated that the words “agency coordination” and “conflict resolution” should be added. The team also explored the possibility of an Executive Order directing that the MOA be prepared.

Kirk will send team members copies of existing MOA’s between DSL and WRPPIT agencies.

The team will approach development of the MOA by brainstorming points to include in the various sections. Jenny will draft the written language for the team’s review. Jas will be asked for input as to format and to review what the team develops.

- c. Updated Redesign Road Map. Jenny distributed an updated roadmap to reflect the progress of the team to date (see ATTACHMENT 5). The team indicated a preference for a phased implementation.

## **7. Water Related Permit Automation POP (Governor’s Budget)**

Pat Allen reported on an offer from Gail Achterman, Director of the Institute for Natural Resources (INR) at Oregon State University, to develop a program option package (POP) for the Governor's budget to automate water related permitting. Gail would access free software from other states that have developed similar decision support tools and combine them with the databases and systems the Institute already has to build the tools needed by WRPPIT. The Institute may also be able to obtain outside resources for the automation project. A package that is more complete than Washington’s can be expected. The team was highly supportive of this and is interested in meeting with someone from INR to coordinate package requirements and

functionality. Pat Allen will communicate support to Gail from WRPPIT and ask for a time that someone from INR can meet with WRPPIT. Louise Solliday indicated that DSL will consider sponsoring the POP.

8. **Audit Committee Presentation – March 30**

The powerpoint presentation prepared for the Audit Committee will be saved for the actual meeting. The content of the presentation will be included in narrative format in the Audit Committee pre-mailing. Slide 3 of the draft powerpoint presentation will be deleted. A few other edits were also identified.

Changes identified in the above agenda item for the Advisory Committee presentation will also be incorporated into the Audit Committee presentation.

An update on the 32 recommendations from RFPIT will be discussed at the March 24 team meeting.

9. **Consultants Update – Users Guide & ?**

The sub-group working on the Users Guide will solicit feedback from consultants via e-mail rather than through a face-to-face meeting at this time. Once more of the details of the redesign are known, a face-to-face meeting will be more appropriate. In addition to soliciting comments about the draft Users Guide, the e-mail will include summary information about the redesign.

10. **Next Meetings:**

March 22, 9:00 – 10:30 – Advisory Committee Meeting, L&I Building, Basement

March 24, 9 – noon, L&I, Directors Conference Room

March 30, about 10:30 – Joint Legislative Audits Committee Meeting, Legislative Building

WRPPIT  
**Reminder Assignments**  
 As of March 8, 2006

Deliverable	Who?	Assignment
A – Project Management	All	Regular Project Communications
B – Stakeholder Involvement	Pat	Legislator and legislative staff briefings
	Pat, Laura, Jenny and Kirk	Prep for Advisory Committee Meeting
	Pat, Laura, Jenny	Prep for Audit Committee Meeting
C- Measure Project Impact	Laura, Jenny	Meet with DSL data folks for measurement plan
D – Customer Service Training		DONE
E – Pamphlet		DONE
F – SPGP Implementation Plan		DONE – IMPLEMENTATION IS UNDERWAY
G – Inter-Agency Training	Laura	Confirm Mediation Training Dates
H – Process Redesign	Christine/Kirk	Develop recommendation regarding 1200-C, 401 cert and DEQ
	All Jas	review of all removal-fill applications before March 22 April 3 <sup>rd</sup> Deadline for Legislative Concepts Begin to assess statutory and rule changes needed
I – MOU		
J – User’s Guide	Kirk/Patty/ Christine/Lori	Plan Consultant Meeting in April
K – Super Application	?	Review SPGP Application

# *DRAFT WRPPIT Project Impact Measurement Plan*

3-9-06

## **Overview**

The measurement topics focus the customer experience and concerns raised and identified in the May 2005 Water-Related Process Improvement Recommendations Report and those concerns identified in customer stakeholder groups that the Water-Related Permitting Process Improvement Team (WRPPIT) met with during the fall of 2005. The overall goals of the WRPPIT efforts are centered in continuous process improvement and to improve the customer's experience while; maintaining the levels of natural resources protections.

The following measurement approach includes reporting on the completion of project products referred to as the Report Changes, Project Impact Reports which is the analysis of permitting processes using content analysis of quantifiable data and lastly through feedback from customer focus groups over time. Each method of measurement will be reported individually and the summary of the identified changes, data, and feedback will be incorporated into an overall report produced annually that addresses the changes and improvements, trend lines, indicators for project impacts, outcomes and continuous improvement, and any unintended consequences of the efforts related to Oregon's Removal Fill permitting process. WRPPIT has developed this measurement plan in order to adequately assess the changes to the current permitting process with minimal resource requirements and minimal impact to customers, which is why it was decided to not use multiple customer surveys. These three measurement approaches need to demonstrate to what degree the WRPPIT work has accomplished the overall purpose of water-related permitting process improvement project.

## **WRPPIT Measurement Tracks**

Three measurement tracks:

Report Changes: These reports will track actual changes implemented to address 2005 key customer concerns identified in 2005 while maintaining the same level of natural resource protections. The deliverables will be documented for comparison against the 2005 permitting system and will be issued in late 2006, at the end of 2007, and at the end of 2008 (See Appendix A for report format).

Project Impact Reports: These reports will assess the impact of changes implemented to the removal/fill permit process regarding the 2005 key customer concerns while maintaining the same level of natural resource protections. This will be accomplished by conducting content analysis research on permit applications meeting specific criteria, determining trends and identifying opportunities for further improvements. Some changes from this project that do not require statutory modification will begin to be implemented as early as late 2006. At this point, it is uncertain which changes will be implemented or when it will begin. Changes that do require statutory modifications will be decided by the legislature during 2007 Legislative Session, with implementation proposed to begin in 2008. The first impact report will be completed by December 15, 2006, the second December 15, 2007, the third by December 15, 2008, and the fourth and final Project Impact Report by December 15, 2009.

Focus Group Feedback: A customer focus group will be used to gather feedback on the status on Oregon's Removal Fill permitting system. The focus group will consist of those applicants who do a significant amount of permitting work in Oregon and are reflective of the cluster groups of consultant,

development, environmental, local government, and forestry/farm/agriculture interests that the project team gathered feedback from during 2005.

### **Measurement Tracks Detail**

A baseline has been established of customer concerns and is captured in Appendix A. The summary of concerns in each category was obtained from consultants, development, environmental, local government, and forestry/farm/agriculture interests, as well as agencies' staff and management. The approach used to capture this baseline of information can be considered a focus group type approach where groups are asked to identify concerns regarding the existing system. The WRPPIT Advisory Committee validated this information on December 14, 2005 as an accurate reflection of customer concerns.

### **Report Changes**

Using the protocol and reporting format defined in Appendix A, the WRPPIT Staff Team will document the project deliverables and timeline for each deliverable and categorize the deliverables by intended outcomes. This report will also identify other changes or circumstances that may impact or support the project goals.

### **Project Impact Reports**

A neutral third party will perform content analysis of randomly selected, criteria specific applications to establish and track baseline measures over time. A baseline of key customer concerns regarding the state of Oregon's approval requirements to work in waterways and wetlands was established in 2005. Key customer concerns are listed below in priority order are defined in greater detail in Attachment A.

- Clear Info at the Beginning
- Clear Authorities and Non-Conflicting Decisions
- Outcome/Compliance Focus
- Unified State Process
- Faster and Known Timelines
- Permitting Cost Estimate Provided
- One Stop and Specialized Assistance
- Single Application

This work will answer if the redesigned permitting process has achieved concurrent, multiple permit decisions while maintaining the same level of natural resources protections.

Cycle time will be collected and reported beginning with 2006 permit applications, and assessing actual state processing cycle time for randomly selected, criteria specific removal-fill applications, and related state authorizations. Database entries will also be used to report state processing timelines for specific permit milestones for all permit applications. This will include all agencies participating in the WRPPIT project. The state processing cycle time is defined as the actual time a state agency is in control of an application, not the time the application is being worked on by a customer. Changes in the amount of time, individually and cumulatively, for all removal-fill permits and related state authorizations will be reported annually. Other factors that may have influenced cycle time should also be reported.

### **Criteria For Permit Review/Content Analysis**

Applications will be assessed at regular intervals using a content analysis approach to quantify the changes in concurrent state permits/authorizations, state processing cycle time, application/project design re-submittals, and progress on other prioritized customer concerns of the WRPPIT efforts (as listed above and detailed in Appendix A).



Randomly selected Oregon Removal Fill Permits with the Individual Removal Fill Permit characteristics filed for non-government entities. The recommended percentage of these permits should be 30 percent with possibly examining additional permit applications that involve multiple state agency approvals if more data on concurrent state permit decisions is desired. Reports of all the state authorizations required by the project and the ratio that were decided in the Oregon Removal Fill Permit will be an important measurement. This subset of all the Individual Permits is expected to include sophisticated, moderately skilled and first time permit application filers.

The state processing time for specific milestones of state processing durations, ratio of required to actual state decisions, agency concurrence/coordination will be evaluated and trend lines will be established and compared year to year for the project improvement criteria.

The Office of Regulatory Streamlining will be engaging an external group to conduct annual focus group sessions for a three-year period beginning in the third quarter after implementation of the redesigned process and continuing annually through the end of 2009. The focus groups will be reflective of the individuals and groups interviewed to establish the 2005 customer baseline (see above) and will assess whether the desired customer expectations outlined have been realized. This report will present trend lines. In addition, other factors that may have influenced cycle time should also be reported.

### **Focus Group Protocol and Implications**

A representative customer focus group will be used annually to gather feedback on the status of Oregon's Removal Fill permitting system. The focus groups will consist of those applicants who do a significant amount of permitting work in Oregon and are reflective of the cluster groups of consultants, development, environmental, local government, and forestry/farm/agriculture interests that the project team gathered feedback from during 2005. The Office of Regulatory Streamlining or a neutral third party will conduct this research. Each of the nine involved agencies will propose up to 15 consultants or applicants that apply for permits regularly. The Office of Regulatory Streamlining will invite 12 to 15 of these proposed applicants that are representative of different types of water-related permitting work to take part in the annual focus group feedback session. The focus group participants will remain anonymous to the agencies and all comments will be documented without attribution. The themes and trends identified by the annual focus group will synthesize the feedback and prepare a feedback report to interested stakeholders and agencies involved in WRPPIT. Agencies should be prepared to respond to issues with additional adjustments or improvement efforts and track progress on the WRPPIT project purpose.

### **Focus Group Questions**

What is your feedback regarding the agencies providing information at the beginning of the application process? (Prompt if needed: What is your feedback about technical requirements and procedural information?)

What is your feedback regarding the efforts to improve the Oregon Removal/Fill permitting decision process? What has changed (if anything) for the worse?

Were you provided one stop and specialized assistance if you requested it? To what degree was this accurate/helpful?

What is your feedback about customer service during the permit application process?

What issues or concerns (if any) do you have about Oregon's Removal Fill Permitting?

## **Means and Methods of Completing Research**

The WRPPIT Staff Team would complete the first aspect of the project measurement during 2006 as products are completed. The first report would be ready to distribute to interested stakeholders prior to the 2007 Legislative Session.

The content analysis aspect of project measurement should be accomplished in two phases. The communications and technical staff of DSL generating the random numbers for the projects selected that meet the established criteria with an outside third party conducting the content analysis research. This could be accomplished by using another agencies expertise such as DAS or DCBS or by contracting with an outside party under the Statewide Regulatory Streamlining Request For Proposals with all the agencies participating in these limited costs. A member of the WRPPIT should take the lead in sharing the above scope of work, coordinating and reviewing draft work, and making agreements with the other agencies (DCBS or DAS) to review and guide the research.

The focus group work can be accomplished by having a neutral third party facilitator from either an agency not involved in water-related permitting or an outside vender conducting the focus group sessions (without agencies staff or management present) document the raw comments (without attribution), followed up with a report of themes and indicators from each focus group session. The agencies that have capacity in this area (at this time) are ODOT, DHS, DAS, and DCBS. The costs should be minimal due to the protocol already being established.

## **Appendix A WRPPIT Report Changes**

The following documentation and reporting of changes implemented to address the issues within the permitting system identified by customers as areas of concern and articulated in the WRPPIT Recommendations Report completed in May 2005.

### **Concern Category In Advisory Committee Priority Order**

A baseline has been established of customer concerns and is captured below. The summary of concerns in each category below was obtained from consultants, development, environmental, local government, and forestry/farm/agriculture interests, as well as agencies' staff and management. The WRPPIT Advisory Committee validated this information on December 14, 2005 as an accurate reflection of customer concerns.

### **Concern Category In Advisory Committee Priority Order (1 through 8)**

#### **1. Clear Info at the Beginning**

##### **What customers were saying in 2005**

It is unclear what types of state permits, authorizations and certifications are required prior to conducting work in a waterway in Oregon. There is not a straightforward "permit process" as there are various state agencies that are responsible for certain elements of the required reviews, approvals and technical assistance. Additionally, there is no defined pathway to get through the "permit process" nor clarity on what requirements each agency has for proposed projects. It would be much easier and cheaper to design a project if it was clear what the "permit process" was and the expectations from each agency and the applicant were clear before designing a proposal.

##### **What customers would like to be able to say**

It was clear at the beginning of the process what information and design features I needed to include in my application to:

- 1) Have it processed in a timely manner.
- 2) Receive a favorable permit decision.

3) Learn early on that my project is not legally feasible.

**Changes Implemented to Address Customer Concerns**

To Date	Yet To Be Implemented In 2006	Proposed For 07/08
Multi agency pamphlet	Users Guide	

2. Clear Authorities and Non-Conflicting Decisions

**What customers were saying in 2005**

The roles, responsibilities, and jurisdictions of each agency in the permit process are unclear. The timelines, information regarding requirements, and authorities of each agency is not communicated to applicants. The state agencies are not coordinated when providing responses to applicants nor in conditions that are included in permits to ensure the proper natural resource protections are in place.

**What customers would like to be able to say**

The state requirements were clear and definitive. The requirements did not conflict with each other and represent consistent application of statues, rules, and policies. High levels of internal consistency exists within each individual agency. There is a balance of consistency with flexibility. Substitute federal or local permit if it requires the same thing as a state permit.

**Changes Implemented to Address Customer Concerns**

To Date	Yet to be implemented in 2006	Proposed for 07/08

3. Outcome/Compliance Focus

**What customers were saying in 2005**

It is difficult to design a project proposal when the desired/required outcomes are not defined ahead of time. Conditions that are too prescriptive are often constraining during implementation. More flexibility is needed to ensure that the best action is taken to reduce any potential natural resource impacts that are unanticipated.

**What customers would like to be able to say**

The state focused on outcomes and I clearly understand what the outcomes are designed to achieve. I know what I will be held accountable for. Requirements are proportional to project impact.

**Changes Implemented to Address Customer Concerns**

To Date	Yet to be implemented in 2006	Proposed for 07/08
Inter-agency Customer Service Training		

4. Unified State Process

**What customers were saying in 2005**

There is not one state “permit process” in Oregon. All of the agencies involved have different timelines, processes and fees. The multiple processes with various associated timelines results in unnecessary costs, duplication and frustration.

**What customers would like to be able to say**

All of the state agencies involved in permitting my project worked in a unified manner to deliver a timely and responsive decision

**Changes Implemented to Address Customer Concerns**

To Date	Yet to be implemented in 2006	Proposed for 07/08
Multi-agency Water-Related Pamphlet	Users Guide Multi-agency professional and technical training	

5. Faster and Known Timeline

**What customers were saying in 2005**

The timeline for obtaining all of the required state permits, authorizations, and certifications is often long and unknown when proposed projects are designed and applied for.

**What customers would like to be able to say**

It was great to know how long it was going to take to get through the state process. I was able to plan accordingly and begin on time. The process today is a lot faster than it used to be.

Wetland delineation was approved early enough so I could avoid wetlands.

**Changes Implemented to Address Customer Concerns**

To Date	Yet to be implemented in 2006	Proposed for 07/08
	Users Guide Multi-agency technical training	

6. Permitting Cost Estimate Provided

**What customers were saying in 2005**

The permitting costs are unknown for applicants at the beginning of the permit process. The costs, including fees and timeframes, should be predictable. Permitting costs and requirements should be commiserate with project impacts.

**What customers would like to be able to say**

I knew ahead of time approximately how much the permits and permitting process were going to cost so I could plan appropriately.

**Changes Implemented to Address Customer Concerns**

To Date	Yet to be implemented in 2006	Proposed for 07/08

7. One Stop and Specialized Assistance

**What customers were saying in 2005**

The state needs to provide a single point of contact to answer questions and coordinate the permit process for applicants.

**What customers would like to be able to say**

All of the state agencies involved in permitting my project worked in a unified manner to deliver a timely and responsive decision.

**Changes Implemented to Address Customer Concerns**

To Date	Yet to be implemented in 2006	Proposed for 07/08

8. Single Application

**What customers were saying in 2005**

One state application with one designated ID number for all of the state processes is needed. Technical assistance tools, similar to Washington's questionnaire and Web site, would be beneficial.

**What customers would like to be able to say**

The state application process was straightforward. I submitted all my info at once and provided additional detail without having to start over. I had one project number and was able to track it through the process.

**Changes Implemented to Address Customer Concerns**

<b>To Date</b>	<b>Yet to be implemented in 2006</b>	<b>Proposed for 07/08</b>

## WRPPIT Statutory/Rule/MOA Analysis 3-16-06

Purpose: To give WRPPIT a heads up of obvious items requiring statutory or rule changes or an MOA. This will help us frame legislative concepts due April 3<sup>rd</sup>. In addition it will help us determine what the team can move forward on without legislative action.

**DSL**

**DEQ**

**ODFW**

**Water Resources**

**DOGAMI**

**No changes needed.**

<b>Key Agency Changes Required by the Redesign Cornerstones</b> (Source: 3/6/06 power point presentation)	<b>Statutes</b> that may need to be modified. Please jot a few words to identify likely modification needed.	<b>Administrative rules</b> that may need to be modified. Please jot a few words to identify likely modification needed.	Address in <b>Memorandum of Agreement</b> . Please jot a few words to identify what MOA should address.
1. Provide conditions and authorizations in one state permit (with notice of 401/CZM and water use requirements.)	<b>Don't know – need to discuss further</b>		DSL will notify applicant that a water right authorization may be required.
2. DEQ review for all removal-fill permits applications for projects that will require a 401 WOC for water quality conditions within removal-fill permit timeframe. (potential funding implications)			Timeframes, coordination, final decisions, communication processes, language for conditions, process to deal with “complex” projects.
3. ODFW: make permit decisions under removal-fill umbrella and timeframe			
4. All agencies commit to one consolidated state process.			X I'm unsure what this means for DEQ . . . if it is coordination we need language regarding jurisdictions and coordination.
5. All agencies maintain multi-agency guide to provide clear information at the start.			X Funding, workload, update process.
6. Make a state designated regulatory expert available to identify multi-agency requirements to applicants at the start of projects. (potential funding implications)			
7. All agencies participate in multi-agency pre-application meetings as needed. (potential funding implications)		? (141-085-0024)	X      Need to know how that would work, who would coordinate and what the responsibilities would be for each agency. We need to clarify if WRD will participate in

			these pre-app. meetings if a water right is required.
8. All agencies commit to a single application and data coordination <b>Maybe better to say: “commit to a coordinated application and its completeness review”</b>		X (141-085-0027)	X Not sure how that would work – would have funding issues as how would we make that happen and who would be responsible for making that happen?
9. All agencies commit to a single public review process.	? (196.825)	X (141-085-0028)	X Kirk and I will be working on a question for Jas . . . it is still uncertain if this is possible for the 401 process.
10. All agencies participate in multi-agency application reviews.	? (196.825)	X (141-085-0028)	X Process, coordination, responsibilities need to outlined.
11. All agencies examine the appropriate timeframe for a single Oregon Removal-Fill permit that would allow reviews by all agencies.	? (196.825)	X (141-085-0028)	X
12. All agencies commit to review intervals and timeframes that will make the entire process work.			X (Though to extent timeframes are put in rule or statute, that act becomes the commitment) Need language about “complex” projects and who makes the call when timelines need to be extended.
13. DSL becomes product and process owner of multi-agency Oregon Removal-Fill permit. As such manages total applicant, stakeholder & participating agency satisfaction with Oregon Removal-Fill Permit. Manages multi-agency coordination, applications, data, User Guide, etc. <b>(potential funding implications)</b>			X
14. All agencies become partners with DSL in delivering a quality state product and process, rather than respondents to another agency’s process and focused on one’s own requirements.			X

And we didn’t have this in the redesign materials yet, but we will probably need to add:

15. All agencies commit to a single appeals process.	? 196.835	? 141.085.0075	
--	-----------	----------------	--

# Memorandum of Agreement

By and between:

---

<u>Director</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Signature</u>	<u>Date</u>
Michael Carrier	Governor's Office	_____	_____
Katy Coba	Department of Agriculture	_____	_____
Roy Elicker	Department of Fish and Wildlife	_____	_____
Ann Hanus	Department of State Lands	_____	_____
Stephanie Hallock	Department of Environmental Quality	_____	_____
Vicki McConnell	Department of Geology and Mineral Industries	_____	_____
Lane Shetterly	Department of Land Conservation & Development	_____	_____
Phil Ward	Water Resources Department	_____	_____
Tim Wood	Parks and Recreation Department	_____	_____

---

## Background



## Points of Agreement

1. Customer, Stakeholder and Agency Satisfaction
2. Consolidated Permit
3. Consolidated Process
4. Agency Roles
5. Agency Authorities
6. DSL Commitments
7. A Commitment to Continuous Improvement
8. Process and Product Agreements
  - a. User Guide
  - b. Pre-Application Meetings
  - c. Single Application and Data Coordination
  - d. Single Public Review Process
  - e. Multi-Agency Application Reviews
  - f. Oregon Removal-Fill Permit
  - g. Timelines
  - h. Single Appeals Process

## Implementation

1. Statutory Changes
2. Rule Changes
3. Operational Changes

Nov 05	<b>Step 1. Team Charge and Assumptions</b>
	<b>Step 2. New Product and Process Specifications</b>
	<b>Step 3. Redesigned Product Options</b>
	<b>Step 4. Optimum Task Flow <del>and Timing</del></b>
Dec 05	<b>Step 5. Early Stakeholder, Applicant, Staff and Director Input</b>
Jan 06	<b>Step 6. Redesign Cornerstones and Agency Change Principles</b>
Mar 06	<b>Step 7. Director, Applicant and Stakeholder Input</b>
Apr-Jul	<b>Step 8. Legislative Bill Language, Rule Changes, MOA including an implementation plan, Cost Options, Staff Involvement</b>
Aug 06	<b>Step 9. Director, Applicant &amp; Stakeholder Input</b>
Fall 06 and 07	<b>Step 10. Implementation</b>
07 and 08	<b>Step 11. Legislative Bills and Evaluation and Continuous Improvement</b>

# ORIGINAL WRPPIT

## Product and Process Redesign ROAD MAP and Timing

Nov 05	Step 1. Team Charge and Assumptions
	-
	Step 2. New Product and Process Specifications
	-
	Step 3. Redesigned Product Options
	-
	Step 4. Optimum Task Flow and Timing
	-
Dec 05	Step 5. Early Stakeholder, Applicant, Staff and Director Input
	-
Jan 06	Step 6. Refined Proposal(s)
	-
Feb 06	Step 7. Redesign the Production Line Staffing needs for new product and process. Space, equipment and location needs. Supporting resources and technology.
	-
Feb 06	Step 8. Cost/Benefit Analysis
	-
Feb 06	Step 9. Stakeholder, Applicant, Staff and Director Input
	-
Feb 06	Step 10. Working Proposal
	-
Mar 06	Step 11. Stakeholder, Applicant, Staff and Director Input
	-
Summer 06	Step 12. Implementation Plan Actions without statutory/rule changes, statutory/rule/resource proposals, evaluation/continuous im- provement plan, implementation timeline, change management, and other implementation requirements.
	-
Fall 06	Step 13. Stakeholder, Applicant, Staff and Director Input
	-
06 and 07	Step 14. Implementation MOU, etc
	-
07 and 08	Step 15. Evaluation and Continuous Improvement
	-