Project Charter

Project Name: Ch. NR 726 Closure Completeness Reviews- RR Program
Date Chartered: February 2012 **Expected Completion Date:** July 2012
Team Leader: Darsi Foss

Team Goal/Mission:
What is the purpose of the team?
Analyze and streamline the steps taken by RR staff to determine if a complete closure packet is submitted.

The team will implement improvements that accomplish the following:

1. Reduce DNR staff time required to review and notify customers of incomplete closure submittals.
2. Reduce the amount of time it takes for the customer to receive a closure package completeness determination.
3. Conduct completeness reviews within a certain timeframe
4. Clear and consistently applied reasons why package was incomplete or denied.
5. Improve customer satisfaction and save customer's money.
6. Ensure that the first incomplete notice contains all deficiencies.
7. Ensure that all safety requirements are incorporated into the new process.

Measure(s) to be used to determine success:
How will we quantify our progress?

1. Improve quality of submittals so that the number of "incomplete" closure submittals drops by 75%.
2. DNR staff time is reduced by 50% with respect to closure completeness review process.
3. Customer receives initial closure completeness review from DNR, as part of the acknowledgement letter, in 10 business days or less
4. Closure decisions for "complete" submittals in 60 days or less, 100% of the time.
5. Example: customer survey prior to and then a period of time after implementation of recommendations to evaluate changes.
6. Federal, State, and program safety requirements were addressed and incorporated into the new process, if applicable.

Team Members:
RR PMs: Pam Mylotta, Dave Rozeboom, Keld Lauridsen
Team Supervisor: Linda Hanefeld
Others: Mark Giesfeldt. Shelley Fox, Darsi Foss, Mark Gordon, and Bruce Urben

Ad hoc: 2 consultants, 1 state agency, as needed

Issues to be addressed:
What Problems or opportunities will the team solve?

1. Reduce significantly the percentage of closure packages sent to RR project managers that are "incomplete."
2. Eliminate inconsistencies with completeness reviews, with respect to how soon in the process it occurs and by whom.
3. Reduce # of incomplete notices/follow up requests at the same site.
4. Reduce by 95% the notices of closure "denial" that should have been sent earlier in the process as a "pause."

Expected Results:
What will be in place when we are done?
Streamlined process that decreases DNR PM staff time reviewing incomplete submittals, and increases customer satisfaction associated with completeness reviews of closure packages.

Support/Resource People:
Who will we need assistance from besides the team members?
BRRTS File Manager, BRRTS Programmer, A&W Mgr for RR, Bureau Director, Outreach Staff

Responsibilities and Boundaries:
What areas will the team look at and what areas will the team NOT look at?

Will look at: Solutions that can improve closure completeness reviews, and that can be evaluated and implemented within the timeframe of this project.

Will not look at: Entire ch. NR 726 closure process.

DNR Lean Project – RR Closure Completeness Reviews
Final Report

Project Name: Remediation and Redevelopment Program's Process of Reviewing Closure Requests for Administrative Completeness

Project Team Leaders: Darsi Foss and Shelley Fox

Project Purpose: To modify the current case closure request process to ensure that an application is administratively complete (i.e., all the information has been provided as requested) prior to the project manager conducting a technical review.

Project Team Members: See attached list below

Summary of Improvements:
- Created an administrative "completeness" check point at beginning of process.
- Created one statewide process to be used by all 5 DNR regional offices.
- Ensured that closure information will be sent to right DNR staff on Day 1.
- Provided that the customer will receive administrative "completeness" notice by Day 10.
- Allowed for the review of technical info to commence 20 days earlier.
- Proposed an e-submittal and e-payment system in place within a year.
- Re-imaged the closure application form to remove redundant/outdated information.
- Consolidated 2 forms into one single, fillable form.

Project Results:

Goal	Baseline	Target	After Improvements	Goal Met?
Reduce DNR staff workload.	1 hour	30 mins* 0 minutes#	30 mins	Yes
Reduce Lead (delivery time).	30 days (external) 15 days (internal)	10 days* (external) 1 day* (internal) 1 day#	10 days 1 day	Yes
Improve Customer Satisfaction.	Survey: internal & external	Increase in customer satisfaction by 25%	25% increase	Yes
Simplify the Process.	Two processes	One process	One process	Yes
Ensure Staff and Customer Safety.				Yes

* Interim Paper System til July 2013 #Electronic submittal system from July 2013 on

Project Cost:

	Hours	Dollars
Project Team Leader	365 (co-leaders)	
Project Team Members	1062	
Meeting Costs		$ 3,879.43
Improvement Costs		NA
Total	1427	$3,879.43

Recommendations for Future Code/Statute Changes: See attached Opportunity Chart
No changes recommended

Lessons Learned:

1. Let the process work….don't let the team jump to the decisions without gathering the data….you may only solve half of the problem.

2. Continue to remind the team of the task to be resolved. Too often we try to solve too much….keep to the task at hand.

3. Don't make the issue too large to handle (see above)

4. Face to face meetings are invaluable, use calls sparingly

5. A good facilitator will make or break the project!

6. Be sure your team has the time to provide for the process.

7. Get a single, statewide message out on the project early in the process.

8. Data collection is important, but capturing the essential data is sometimes a difficult task.

9. Team makeup and good facilitator are important to the success of this type of project.

10. Give staff time to do this, along with their other work. Team facilitator and one other person ended up doing a lot of work (and in this case quite well) to meet deadlines. Some of that work should under better circumstances be spread among team members.

11. Keeping all options "on the table" was an important concept to use as a guiding principle for meetings and for evaluation of ideas, as a way to help think outside the box.

12. It is hard to keep a project within scope, and requires continuous reminder and allowing possible "tasks for later" to be identified and set aside.

RR Program's Closure Completeness Lean Team

Front row:
Mark Giesfeldt, CO
Linda Hanefeld, SCR
Darsi Foss, CO
Bruce Urben, NER

Back row:
Dave Rozeboom, WCR
Pam Mylotta, SER
Mark Gordon, CO
Keld Lauridsen, NER
Shelley Fox, CO
Jane Lemcke, CO (not pictured)

Ad Hoc:
Danielle Wincentsen, NOR
John Robinson, NOR
Roxanne Chronert, NER