City of
PORTLAND, OREGON

Development Review Advisory Committee

DRAC Process Improvement and Technology Subcommittee
MEETING NOTES
February 20, 2020

Subcommittee Members Present: Sean Green, Suzannah Stanley, Tom Sjostrom, Kate Holmquist, Krista Bailey, Brian Shelden, Holloway Huntley, Josh Lighthipe

City Staff Present: Matt Wickstrom, Ross Caron, Angie Tomlinson, Melissa Linehan

Consultant: Lisa Dennis, Delaris Technical Consulting

Agenda:
1. Eplans updates
2. Review updated charter and discuss next steps
3. Business Process Improvement Project and next steps
4. Review RACI chart
5. Revisit edited suggestion input flowchart
6. Update regarding the Process Improvement and Technology Suggestion form and database

Summary of Topics Discussed:
1. Eplans updates. Angie gave an overview of Eplans updates, noting that the successful roll-out of Amanda 7 allows the POPS team to be well prepared. Next up are pilot projects for the Facilities Permit Program (FPP) and an electrical permit. The Eplans team is preparing for permits for new commercial construction as a part of the BPI project. Angie stated that 25 Eplan review projects were submitted at the end of November/December, so there is work to cover. Focusing Eplan review with the outcomes of the Business Process Improvement Project is anticipated for summer 2020 which means that other smaller projects can be examined in the meantime.
   1.1. Sean asked if enrolling in Eplan review involves submitting an existing conditions plan. The answer was yes, it currently does.
   1.2. Melissa noted that almost 100% of projects that are eligible for Eplan review, are selecting it.
   1.3. Suzannah noted that the feedback she's receiving on process managed Eplan review projects is that it took a week to set up the initial review. Melissa responded that this was due to a short-staffed team at the time.
   1.4. Angie questioned whether it would be possible to have the Eplan permit setup before the project is ready to submit. Currently, the project gets set up as soon as an application is

received by the Process Management Team.

1.5.   Suzannah asked if there is a timeline for process managed projects. Angie noted there is currently a 5-day set up timeline.

1.6.   Melissa stated that there is a difference between the pre-review that plans submitted in the DSC receive and the pre-review of plans submitted for E-plans review and that in the DSC only 3 teams review the plans.

2. Review updated charter and discuss next steps. The subcommittee had no further comments on the charter. Reviewing it with DRAC at an upcoming meeting was discussed as the next step.

3. Business Process Improvement Project and next steps. Ross gave an overview of the Business Process Improvements Project noting that the project team has begun to engage BDS managers and the Interagency managers whose bureaus are also involved in the permit review process as well. The short-term goal is to put together an Employee Steering Committee representing BDS and interagency bureaus. The committee will evaluate the work that has been done so far. They'll also provide guidance about upcoming project initiatives including employee and customer work sessions.

3.1.   Sean explained a workplace seminar about using a lean approach which creates a continuous improvement model that recognizes employees' values as well. Sean noted that value stream mapping was the approach used in the lean approach which was described as: increase collaboration, decrease waste and improve flow. He also noted the lean approach can result in more staff and management excitement about improvements as a result of opinions and suggestions having value.

3.2.   Angie noted that POPS already uses a lean model and a lot of the success of the Amanda 7 roll-out is due to that approach.

3.3.   Lisa mentioned a goal of the lean model is to get employees and customers – those closest to the work enthusiastic about the approach. One of the principles is to have those doing the work assess the work on the front lines.

4. Review RACI chart. Matt presented the RACI chart.

4.1.   R = responsible
A = accountable
C = consulted
I = Informed

4.2.   Kate suggested changing a couple subcommittee items from "informed" to "consulted". Staff made the change on the attached spreadsheet and corrected dates.

4.3.   Lisa explained that the project is in Phase 2 as shown on the RACI project outline, mentioning the inclusion of work and involvement efforts that have already been done. During Phase 3 of the project, the process maps showing the steps of the process and pinch points will be provided to the subcommittee.

4.4.   Ross explained the composition of the Business Process Improvement Project Steering Committee which will include representation from BDS as well as inter-agency partners.

4.5.   Holloway reiterated the purpose of the project as to make commercial new building construction more efficient. Staff agreed, but clarified that creating a process to make one building permit type more efficient should examine other permit types as well. Staff

agrees that communicating this part of the project needs to occur as well, including how it fits within the POPS framework.

4.6.   Holloway clarified if the subcommittee was only working on the BPI project because it is the current project. The response is that at the current time, no future project is expected and the BPI project should help lay a roadmap for future projects.

4.7.   Ross asked for advice on how to best work with customers and gather input from outreach and workshops. Kate asked if outreach to customers is a subcommittee task.

4.8.   Krista stated that the BPI project should create a framework for how other future projects are examined.

4.9.   Krista asked how many permit review representatives are on the Steering Committee. Lisa responded 11 representatives most likely. Krista responded that 11 sounds low. Lisa stated that additional staff representation and input comes from other approaches. Suzannah asked about the Steering Committee overall role. Lisa responded that a steering committee should be the champions of a project.

4.10.   Holloway asked how many months the BPI project has been underway. The response was since September 2019, followed by an explanation of why the project delayed setting up a Steering Committee, due to the need to allow for the Amanda 7 launch. Lisa reviewed the accomplishments that have occurred in Phase 1 and 2 of the project so far.

4.11.   Suzannah asked if the Steering Committee representatives were already identified. Staff responded that the representation has been suggested, but specific staff members have not been identified.

4.12.   Holloway asked if the BPI project is coordinating with projects other than Amanda 7. Lisa responded that Eplans and DevHub are being coordinated with the project and some recommendations from the BPI project could be about how to better work with Eplans and DevHub.

4.13.   Suzannah asked if the project will pick up speed now. Ross responded affirmatively, but mentioned the first step is setting up the Steering Committee (which is set up as of 3/7/20). Ross mentioned that easy wins are hoped for but the work sessions will be key, and then recommendations will need to be formulated and then they'll need to be prioritized. Matt mentioned that prioritization also involves another project BPI is coordinating with: the governance structure project.

4.14.   Suzannah stated that the development community can be skeptical of stated "goals to change" because in the end, some staff may be reluctant to change or the overall change may be minor.

4.15.   Suzannah asked what had happened to feedback from a NAIOP/BOMA focus group in September 2019. Ross responded that customer service may be a component of the BPI recommendations. Angie added to keep the ideas coming because reluctance to change can be avoided. (Need an example). (A draft summary of the focus group notes has been located and reiterates previous findings).

4.16.   Sean brought up a lean process improvement story from Toyota about a car manufacturing plant in California that adopted a motto of "If Japan Can Do It, Why Can't We?" and that the approach involves empowering employees to make the organization a better place through the lean approach.

4.17.   Kate mentioned that process shouldn't be the only aspect evaluated but prioritization also needs to involve the desire for a quick and simple way of communicating issues.

4.18.   Holloway said it would be a good idea for the subcommittee to have a work plan to see

what will be in store for the next year and also mentioned that this subcommittee needs to attract more DRAC members. Holloway suggested a change to the RACI chart to ensure the subcommittee's responsibility to report back to DRAC.

5. Revisit edited suggestion input flowchart. The subcommittee didn't have any comments on the updated flowchart but did not one redundancy which was corrected.

6. Update regarding the Process Improvement and Technology Suggestion form and database
   6.1. The subcommittee recognized time would not allow for much further discussion and didn't have further input on the flowchart. The subcommittee also stated they have access to view the Process Improvement and Technology Suggestion database and form.
   6.2. Further discussion included… Krista asked whether the subcommittee will try to be a conduit to attract other participants. Lisa responded that the subcommittee is one component of the participants in the project, other groups will include the Employee Steering Committee and input will also be received through employee and customer work sessions.
   6.3. Kate suggested a change to the RACI chart to reflect that the subcommittee would be consulted on an item rather than informed. The RACI chart was updated.
   6.4. Lisa asked subcommittee members their opinion of splitting employees and customers into separate work sessions. Krista responded that if the expectation is to greater address the "pinch points" in the permit review process for new commercial construction then reconciling the suggestions between employees and customers will be valuable. Some pinch points may be identified by both groups.
   6.5. Suzannah added that having facilitators at the work sessions who can answer why permits get delayed will make the conversation more relevant.
   6.6. Lisa described a rough concept of the work sessions which involves customers seeing a process map with the pinch points and delays points indicated, then in a later session they look at the outcomes and discuss where the focus of improvement should be. Krista added that direct dialog between users (customers) and staff can be beneficial, but would need to be appropriately moderated.

Follow-up: No follow-up items this meeting

Draft agenda for upcoming meeting:
1. Customer engagement and how to make it successful
2. Business Process Improvement Project and the workshop structure
3. Send follow up email and get ideas for agenda – to me, this means we can make the agenda
4. Send list of desired topics and what input/outcome you would like over the next 4-6 months (I think this has to do with the request to see a year calendar for the BPI Project).

Next Subcommittee Meeting: Thursday, March 19, 2020 at 10:15 in 2500B (2nd Floor)

Meeting notes prepared by Matt Wickstrom, BDS