

**Long-Term Management Strategy for
Dredged Material in the Delta (Delta LTMS)**

Value Stream Analysis

Thursday, August 16 2007
9:00 am -3:00 pm

Meeting Minutes

Attendees

Dr. Aaron Allen	Kathy Dadey	Darryl Foreman
John Headlee	Bill Marshall	Tom Scheeler
Jim Sung	Fari Tabatabai	Jeff Wingfield
Calvin Fong	Robert Yeadon	Jessica Burton Evans
Brian Ross	Sheryl Alvernaz	Joshua Burnam
Jill Mally		

Introductions

Dr. Aaron Allen, North Coast Branch Chief from the Los Angeles District Regulatory Division briefly introduced himself, the goals for the meeting, and reviewed Value Stream Analysis basics with the group.

Major Issues and Reasons for Change –

The first portion of the meeting included a discussion of reasons why participants felt change is needed in the Delta permitting process. Participants had been asked to consider this notion and come prepared to discuss. These reasons for change formed the basis of why the group was assembled and what issues were to be addressed. The list below represents the collated list of answers:

- Permitting needs to get done faster – Faster Decisions and Increased Efficiency
- Disconnected agency process – Application flow / information unclear
- Role of Science – proving the negative is problematic
- Overall Process Complexity
- Testing Process Cost/ Complexity/ drives all other processes – a ripple effect from agency to agency as changes/decisions are made
- Timely information / notification of testing requirements
- Predictability of requirements and process to help smooth the process –
- Up-front triage – business needs advanced knowledge of issues (upfront coordination)

- Concerns about water quality if the governor takes the lead – Respond to critical Delta needs-move projects forward (consequences of not having this work done through the permitting process)
- Agencies need to look at no action alternative – Alternative Analysis – Recognize consequences of no project & Consider project public interest factors
- Streamline repeatable processes (general orders & RGPs)
- Clear guidelines when starting the process
- Standard for complete applications are unknown – Reduce “pre” application process

Analysis of Submitted Process Maps

During the next phase, Dr. Allen led a discussion based on the Value Stream maps submitted prior to the meeting. Dr. Allen primarily focused on the Port of Stockton, the Central Valley Water Board, the Corps O&M process, and the Corps Regulatory process. Based on the maps and his analysis, Dr. Allen drew a number of conclusions, such as the fact that several pre-application meetings could be consolidated into one single meeting with all the agencies (reduces steps in several of the process maps), and project modifications must be eliminated to reduce large number of repeated steps including project information being resubmitted to USFWS and NOAA (issues resolved at initial meeting or carry alternatives through the application review process).

The Future State

At this point, Dr. Allen asked the participants to discuss their desires for the “Future State,” which people were asked to consider before the meeting. The Future State represents that state which would alleviate the perceived issues noted in the process maps and opening discussions. General answers included:

- No testing every year – Tier I screen
- Fewer meetings
- Basin Plan amendments
- More general orders, more programmatic permits
- Up-front agency coordination
- Relaxed ground water standards – recognition of environmental baseline conditions, science based
- The Central Valley Board suggested three classes of General Orders: 1. Maintenance, 2. Small projects, 3. Evaluate sediment together and use placement
- Independent Science Groups

Specially, the defined Future State was agreed upon as a “DMMO” type-entity which would mirror the functions of the San Francisco DMMO, but in a less formalized fashion, at least initially. There was a general recognition that the Delta workload and issues set

differs from San Francisco, but a DMMO-type process was needed. That process was outlined as follows:

The Future State (DMMO) –

- Initial Written guidelines for basic permitting/testing requirements from all pertinent agencies
- Mutli-Agency Meeting with project proponent– Agency parameters/requirements and Conceptual Design Presentations
 - Volunteer point of contact to call the meeting (The Corps or CVRWQCB)
- Project proponent develops Draft SAP/project refinements
- Submit SAP to the “DMMO” office for approval
- Project proponent samples according to approved SAP. Submits Results/Report to “DMMO”
- “DMMO” meeting w/ applicant to discuss testing results - Determine placement option boundaries (404(b)(1) alternatives) [Standard Placement Site Criteria-policy development will be a task/product of the Protocols TWG]
- Project Proponent finalizes design & completes, joint application [Joint application to be developed by Permitting TWG]
- Joint application goes to all agencies (CEQA process underway/done)
- Federal lead agency initiates Section 7, Fish and Wildlife consultations (including Essential Fish Habitat) and, Section 106. Agency will issue Public Notices as required.
- Optional multi-agency meeting(s) to resolve issues/stoppages (in-person or teleconference)
- Consultations Completed
- Permits Issued
- Post permit Conditions/Compliance

In order to achieve the Future State, the following Action Plan with task assignments was developed:

- Develop Initial Development plan/DMMO organizational skeleton and Management Committee recommendation – Kathy Dadey (initial prep) w/ Permitting TWG at Aug 28th meeting.
- Produce Agency guidelines for applicants outlining the DMMO process – relevant agencies
- Develop a Joint Permit Application– (Permitting Group)
- Begin consideration of RGPs/General Orders (Permitting Group)
- Begin consideration of new testing guidelines and placement site criteria (Protocols Group)

Begin consideration of Programmatic Biological Opinions (Long-term – Biological TWG – TBD)