



# DES LEAN Team

## Case Study # 2011-02

### Summary

**Scope:** Multiple State Agencies

**Business Problem:**  
The Department of Agriculture, (Ag), issues permits to apply herbicides to the waters of the state to control invasive plants. Three other agencies – DES, Fish & Game, and DRED are part of the process. Issues among these departments led to their participation in formal mediation in Jan. 2011. An outcome of the mediation was a commitment of all parties to a Lean examination of the permitting process.

**Methodology:**  
Current process mapped to bring common understanding. Customers of the process participated and brought valuable input. Everyone learned. Various modifications and agreements to communicate more, differently, or at different points in the process were agreed to.

**Solution:**  
Several small changes to communication and coordination procedures were identified for immediate action. Several other desired rule changes were identified for longer-term action.

**Benefits/Results:**  
All parties gained knowledge and respect for the other parties. The importance of a long-term approach to lake management was reinforced.

**Idea Source:**  
Agreed outcome of mediation

### **Lean Event Facilitators:**

Bob Minicucci x 2941  
Felice Janelle x 4848

## Project Name: *Permitting Herbicide Use in the Waters of the State*

### The Problem

The Department of Agriculture, Markets & Food, Division of Pesticide Control (Ag), issues special permits to apply herbicides to the waters of the state to control invasive plants. The Departments of Environmental Services (DES) and Fish & Game are required by regulation to comment on such permits; DRED does so at Ag's request because of DRED's mission to protect and conserve native plants and natural communities. The permitting process became sufficiently problematic that the affected departments participated in formal mediation in Jan. 2011. As an outcome of the mediation, the departments committed to a Lean examination of the permitting process.



### The Process

The current process was mapped in "swim-lane" fashion to clearly show what each involved party had to do and when. Work done by the applicant and/or their contractor was added, as it was immediately seen to be necessary to include this. All parties were surprised at one point or another at the level of work and coordination done by other parties. A few issues regarding the existing administrative rules were found and discussed.

Two municipalities with notable aquatic invasive-plant issues participated, as did an herbicide application contractor. Their contributions as to the "view from the other side" were invaluable and greatly helped to guide the group.

### The Results

Seven different adjustments were agreed on for immediate implementation. These include such things as DES providing a list of parties known to be contemplating herbicide application to Fish & Game and Ag long before actual permit applications are filed, to Ag changing the instruction sheet that goes with the permit application form.

Five longer-term issues were identified, which would call for rule changes and the involvement of the state Pesticide Control Board. These include removing redundancies in notification requirements, making a technical change that would allow for emergency herbicide applications, and examining whether a multi-year permit is possible, likely linked to an agreed-on long-term management plan for the specific lake.

### The Team

Ag: Bob Wolff, David Rousseau  
DRED: Melissa Coppolla  
F&G: Scott Decker, Carol Henderson  
DES: Amy Smagula, Paul Susca  
Town of Wolfeboro: Ken Marschner  
Manchester Water Works: John O'Neil  
Aquatic Control Tech'y: Marc Bellaud