Project Charter

**Project Name:** Wild Game Serving Permit Process Improvement  
**Date Chartered:** 01/12/2012  
**Expected Completion Date:** 06/30/2012  
**Team Leader:** David Holmes

**Team Goal/Mission:**
Analyze the current Wild Game Serving permit process and implement changes that:
1. Identify process steps that can be streamlined or eliminated based on changes in department needs or society values.
2. Evaluate the circumstances in which we currently issue Wild Game Serving Permits and determine if we have to issue permits in all such circumstances to be in compliance with the state law. If the permit process no longer has value, then it should not be required.
3. Improve customer service by reducing the amount of time it takes to process a Wild Game Serving Permit Application.
4. Reduce the amount of staff time spent processing the permits.

**Measure(s) to be used to determine success:**
1. DNR staff workload will be reduced by a minimum of 10%.
2. Customers receive permit in less than 5 business days. Permits need to be consistently issued in less than 5 business days with no permit issuance being more than 5 days statewide.
3. Permit applicants and LE staff identify increased satisfaction with the new process compared to the old process on web surveys.
4. The process is simplified by clearly identifying when a permit review is required by DNR.

**Team Members:** David Holmes, Tom VanHaren, George Protogere, James Kaplanek, James Mack, Bill Buckley, Joe Jerich

**Issues to be addressed:**
1. Identify the potential to reduce the number of permits needed/issued.
2. Identify delays in the process and create efficiencies to deal with existing delays.
3. Determine customer and DNR staff satisfaction with the new process.

**Expected Results:**
1. DNR only reviews permits that are legally required and add value to resource protection.
2. A standard operating procedure for the process.
3. Training for staff on the new process.
4. A list of future policy and law changes that would also improve the process.
5. An electronic, searchable database of permit holders.
6. A webpage that educates the public on permit and routing requirements, provides web links and application.
7. Ensure food safety within the confines of Health Regulations.

**Support/Resource People:**  
Form, IT, and Web Publishing Staff

**Responsibilities and Boundaries:**
The team will not:
1. Rely on Statutory Changes to make improvements
2. Increase staff time devoted to this.
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Project Name: Wild Game Serving Permit Process Improvement

Project Team Leader: David Holmes

Project Purpose: To simplify and create a permit application process that is more customer friendly for submittal and reduces staff time processing the permits.

Project Team Members: David Holmes, Tom Van Haren, George Protogere, Kevin Huggins, James Mack, James Kaplanek, Corey Robinson, Tammy Lalor, William Schleichert, William Buckley.

Summary of Improvements: See attached Project Implementation Plan

Project Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>After Improvements</th>
<th>Goal Met?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce DNR staff workload.</td>
<td>10 – 20 minutes</td>
<td>10 minutes or less, new bureau</td>
<td>10 minutes or less, new bureau</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce Lead (delivery time).</td>
<td>7.2 Days</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Customer Satisfaction.</td>
<td>Mixed Satisfaction</td>
<td>Satisfied Customers</td>
<td>Satisfied Customers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simplify the Process.</td>
<td>2 agency bureaucracy</td>
<td>1 agency review</td>
<td>1 agency review</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure Staff and Customer Safety.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Team Leader</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Team Members</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Costs</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>$201.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>204.5</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations for Future Code/Statute Changes: See attached Opportunity Chart

Lessons Learned:

- The only way to get clear communication on an issue is through direct communication. Going off of past practices or knowledge transfer may not get you the correct answers.
• Customers were generally satisfied or indifferent to the old process, expectations for the government to process things in a timely manner are low.
• The Department has created processes that are not backed by administrative code nor with legislative intent.
• Through cooperation and communication with other state agencies concessions can be made and still achieve the results that are needed to satisfy the public and the needs of the agencies.
• Mentally be prepared for last minute road blocks. Attempt to predict responses and be ready to respond.
• Achieving the results expected can be very satisfying.
• Customer Service and Licensing is an excellent bureau with a clear goal in mind to serve us and our customers!