

MEETING RECORD

September 21, 2005

9 - noon, DCBS, Salem, Conference Room A - basement

Members Present:

Pat Allen, RSL
Kim Grigsby, Water Resources
(for Debbie Colbert)
Kirk Jarvie, DSL
Laura Leshar, Project Manager, RSL
John Lilly, DSL
Patty Snow, ODFW
Christine Svetkovich, DEQ
Jenny Carmichael, Carmichael Consulting

Members Absent:

Jas Adams, Attorney General's Office

Intermittent Members Present:

None

Guests:

None

Intermittent Members**Not Present:**

Dale Blanton, DLCD
Jon Germond, ODFW
Jim Johnson, ODA
Gary Lynch, DOGAMI
Vicki McConnell,
DOGAMI
Mike Morales, DSL
Bill Ryan, ODOT

1. **Approval of Prior Meeting Record.** The record of the September 14th meeting was approved.

2. **Updates.**

SPGP. Laura and Wayne worked with DSL staff for a couple of hours this past Monday to develop a more detailed SPGP Implementation Plan. Jones and Stokes will start work on October 21.

General Authorizations Update. Many general authorizations expire at the end of 2005. Laura will facilitate a brief work session of all WRPPIT agencies to identify issues from other agencies that DSL will want to consider incorporating into the reauthorizations, for example, DEQ has updated water quality standards.

3. **Check-in: Assignments for Today's Meeting**

Assignments were reviewed for completion.

4. **Deliverable B - Stakeholder Meetings.**

Pat will introduce the stakeholder meetings with a description of the reason for the WRPPIT project. Christine and John will present the slide show. Kirk will e-mail the slide show to all.

The Monday, September 26 meetings will have sufficient attendees. Laura will arrange for someone to check on actual attendance at the Friday, September 30 Agriculture and Public Partners meetings. If only a couple of people are coming Pat will provide a 1-1 briefing at the arranged times. If so, all Team members will not need to attend. Laura will send an e-mail confirmation.

Laura will arrange for a sign in sheet and write-in name tags.

WRPPIT attendees should arrive about 9:00 on Monday morning at the Wilsonville library.

5. Deliverable D – Customer Service Training.

The first customer service training in October 1st. Christine has sufficient case studies.

The WRPPIT 10 minute item on the agenda will consist of a brief presentation by Pat or Laura regarding the reason for the WRPPIT project, how it links to the customer service training, and what kind of products/changes staff can anticipate.

6. Deliverable C – Measure Project Impact

John Lilly shared a listing of 2004-2005 individual removal-fill permits issued by DSL. The list was drawn so that the team could evaluate which customers should receive the DAS customer survey and other related questions.

Questions from the team about the list clarified the following:

- WRPPIT participating agency data bases don't talk to each other. A master record number or name does not exist.
- DSL's data base does not track a Corps number or whether a Corps permit is issued.
- ODFW does not have a data base.
- 30-40% of the applications on the list are from public entities.
- Road and Bridge projects are not the concern. The projects experiencing a lot of customer dissatisfaction are private industrial, residential, and commercial developments. Examples: Lowe's in Lebanon; Hyundai in Eugene. Note: if all customers are not surveyed, the report should be clear about who the information is and is not coming from. If changes are made to the process based on the feedback of a sub-set of the permittees, the process could still be improved for all permittees.
- The total list is about 300 permits.

The team defined the following parameters for the customer survey:

- Survey owners of private projects (not public) who have been issued a removal-fill permit. (This is not the same as the applicants on John's query with "removal-fill" in column two.)
- Surveys should be sent to the applicant/permit holder (i.e., the person who is responsible to comply with the conditions of the permit).
- Survey permittees for Jul – Dec 04, Jan – Jun 05, and at the end of every subsequent six month period. Compile a trend line that shows results every six months.
- Distinguish respondents by size. Possible survey questions: acres of the development; number of employees of applicant. This will serve as a proxy to identify the sophistication of the applicant. It will be important, when reviewing survey results, to know whether applicants are first time or frequent filers.
- Use one instrument for all respondents, not separate instruments for each WRPPIT agency. In at least the initial survey, ask respondents to identify which type of permits they needed to obtain. Ask for feedback on each permit.

Consider using an off-the-shelf survey instrument.

Potential additional survey questions:

- Have you started construction? If no, why not?
- Did you have to obtain any local government permits?

Consultant survey:

- construct something different from the customer survey that assesses how well the state is meeting consultant needs.
- ask Monte to present what DSL is doing now to survey consultants (phone survey 2 times a year, etc.)

7. Deliverable H – Legislative Package (Process Redesign)

Permits identified as possible cases to run through any WRPPIT proposed changes:

31647 Les Schwab Tire Center, Reedsport
25818 Oregon Pride Nurseries Earthen Dam
Port of Tillamook Bay

8. Deliverable G - Inter-Agency Training for Consultants.

Kirk will send out the invitation from DSL.

Laura, Jenny, John, and Kirk will facilitate the small groups.

9. Deliverable F – SPGP Implementation Plan

John and Kirk circulated a process map that defines how to get a permit under SPGP.

Jones and Stokes is responsible for the SPGP education program. Internal training begins in September. External training will begin in January.

DSL will share the SPGP implementation plan that is expected to be ready in a week or two.

The work involved in this deliverable is being done by DSL with the assistance of the Office of Regulatory Streamlining.

10. Deliverable J - User's Guide

Primary Users (customers/audiences):

- applicants
- people who prepare the application (e.g. – engineering tech in a county road department)
- agency staff
- new staff (for training)

WRPPIT will need to decide: if the guide will be predominantly for the first time user or for the frequent filer, or both. Is a remedial section needed? Consider nested levels of information.

The team may want to begin with the essential basics and enhance the document over time. Consider the 80/20 rule – get the most issues covered with a moderate investment. The team mentioned that it may want to provide more complete information on permits or authorizations that are likely to cause applicants difficulties.

The team supports asking Wayne to investigate what would be involved in having the guide be searchable on the web. A couple of approaches may be possible.

11. Deliverable A - Project Management

a. DOGAMI.

Pat Allen is meeting with Vicki O'Connell on September 21. Rich Angstrom is attending a stakeholder meeting. In a previous conversation with Pat Allen Rich indicated support for 1) moving to a consolidated system and 2) providing better information at the beginning about what it takes to get to yes. Rich also concurred that policy issues regarding aggregate should be left to the consensus building group connected to PSU. DOGAMI and ODA are sending staff to the customer service trainings.

Patty asked whether the scope of DOGAMI's involvement is related to in-water permits or upland permits. This is one of the questions that needs to be answered. Jenny also suggested that DOGAMI should be asked whether they want to participate in WRPPIT meetings when the redesign work begins or whether they want to assess what might be applicable to their separate processes when the redesign is complete. Laura will pass these questions on to Pat.

b. Draft Directors Update.

Laura circulated a first version of an update to the Directors that will need to be sent mid October. Team members should submit suggested edits to Laura by the end of the day Wednesday, September 28.

c. 32 Original Recommendations.

See Attachment for a Summary of the Team's Discussion.

12. Meeting Wrap Up

Next Meeting: October 5, 9 – noon, DEQ, Portland, Conference Room 6A, 811 SW Sixth Avenue, Portland. A key agenda item will be to review the DOGAMI process and how it is linked to the removal-fill process map developed in May, 2005.

Assignments for the next meeting will be circulated by e-mail.
