

AWS Efficiency Review  
Issues & Solutions Matrix

2<sup>nd</sup> Draft 3-30-10

Addressed?	Category	Issue	Solution
	A	DWR is too restrictive on the use of existing models	Use of revised hydro guidelines
	A	DWR should rely on judgment of registered professionals; current level of review is too detailed	Establish de minimus standards/pre approvals
Y	A	Too many second reviews and hand-offs	Examine process-eliminate repeat reviews & hand-offs
Y	A	Should have one person designated as the DWR champion for each application	File Manager ?– Section Manager?
Y	A	Reviews (legal, hydrological) should be parallel and not sequential	Examine process –concurrent review where possible
Y	A	Multiple reviews. It is not a linear process and this causes redundancy. All comments and reviews should be done concurrently.	Examine process –concurrent review where possible
Y	A	DWR should get one bite at the apple	Establish and follow internal guidelines; make redline copy of report available; don't use generic letters
Y	A	Incomplete INI letters	Establish and follow internal guidelines
	A	Unclear guidelines result in incomplete & incorrect applications initially, crating the need for incomplete letters.	“User Education” clarify external and internal requirements and expectations
Y	A	Full use of LTF clock causes unnecessary delay regardless of permit types; no internal timeframes	Establish and follow internal guidelines
Y	A	“Non-standard” permit applications clog the system and slow review of “standard” applications	Pre-screening & use of HOV concept
	A	Processing multiple applications with varying levels of complexity simultaneously (multi-tasking) slows progress for all	File managers specialize in file type Hydrologists specialize by type? Area?
Y	A	Internal communication and file management not standardized	Establish and follow internal guidelines
	B	Inability of applicants to predict what will be needed for hydrology	Use of revised hydro guidelines
Y	B	Uncertainty regarding new rules for Santa Cruz AMA	Complete rule promulgation; clarify what happens during rule modification
	B	Review process is not transparent; the applicant is not knowledgeable about what is needed	“User Education” clarify external and internal requirements and expectations
Y	B	Process does not follow the 2006 rules all the time	Establish and follow internal guidelines & rule

AWS Efficiency Review  
Issues & Solutions Matrix

2<sup>nd</sup> Draft 3-30-10

	B	There are no criteria for when which hydrologic model might be used	Use of revised hydro guidelines
	B	Modeling – there is no standard for data entry.	Use of revised hydro guidelines
	B	Uncertainty and lack of consistency in hydrologic analysis	Use of revised hydro guidelines
	B	Applications in limbo – no reason(s) stated	“User Education” clarify external and internal requirements and expectations
Y	B	Appearance of bias towards/against applicants	Establish and follow internal guidelines
Y	B	Lack of clear guidance on ensuring an audit of applications for consistency and standard review process	Establish and follow internal guidelines
	C	Need more standardization	Establish and follow internal guidelines
Y	C	Need a checklist that is publicly available online, showing project time stamps and tracking	Create public access to “dashboard”
Y	C	Need an electronic database that could be filled out and submitted online	Crte on-line application forms
Y	C	Database should be updated, especially for Wells 55, AWS, etc. Expedite this.	Files are updated as completed/issued
Y	C	Provide more info on the Web	Create on line tools –demand calculator (done); “dashboard”; committed demand (pending); application forms; tutorials;
Y	C	Need tracking info	Create on line tool- “dashboard”
	C	Incomplete & inconsistent information available to applicants on required demand information prior to initiating application process	“User Education” clarify external and internal requirements and expectations
	C	Lack of communication as to current status of application (which review phase has been completed)	Create on line tool- “dashboard”
	D	Decision makers not at meetings	
Y	D	Too many DWR employees at meetings	Only key personnel
	D	INI letters are too long and ask for repetitive info already available to DWR	Establish and follow internal guidelines
	D	Pre-application required info is not clear; there are no clear guidelines. Feedback from pre-application is not useful; applications are inconsistent.	“User Education” clarify external and internal requirements and expectations
	D	Don’t ask more than once for additional info	Establish and follow internal guidelines
	D	Current pre-application meeting structure insufficient so incomplete applications are submitted, expectations are not clearly defined, applicants are not properly educated, and appropriate decision makers are not always available	“User Education” clarify external and internal requirements and expectations
Y	D	Meeting minutes and summaries are not always clear enough so all parties know what is expected	“User Education” clarify external and internal requirements and expectations;

AWS Efficiency Review  
Issues & Solutions Matrix

2<sup>nd</sup> Draft 3-30-10

			focus on action items in summaries
	D	Applicants are not clear on steps or phases of review process	“User Education” clarify external and internal requirements and expectations
	D	Too many repeated requests on multiple errors within same application	“User Education” clarify external and internal requirements and expectations
	D	Lack of clear sign-off’s that the application has passed specific review stages	Establish and follow internal guidelines