

**Clark County Board of Commissioners**  
**Work Session: Development Engineering Advisory Board 2009 Priorities**  
**April 15, 2009**  
**10:00 – 11:00 a.m.**

AGENDA

1. Why the Development Engineering Advisory Board (DEAB) was formed.
2. DEAB's 2008 Accomplishments
3. DEAB's 2009 Priorities

# Clark County Development Engineering Advisory Board

## 2008 Annual Report to the BOCC

The Development Engineering Advisory Board (DEAB) was formed by the Board of Clark County Commissioners (BOCC) in late 2006. DEAB serves as a procedural step in reviewing new policy and code changes and works with Public Works Development Engineering staff on issues related to process improvements and technical engineering issues.

The BOCC appoints seven advisory board members: three private consulting engineers, one construction contractor, one land developer, one local municipality representative, and one Building Industry Association representative. The 2008 roster was as follows:

Greg Jellison, Chair, *HDJ Design*

Jerry Nutter, Vice-Chair, *Nutter Corporation*

Eric Golemo, *Sturtevant, Golemo & Associates*

John Graves, *RSV Construction Services, Inc.*

Steve Madsen, *Building Industry Association of Clark County*

Tim Schauer, *MacKay & Sposito, Inc.*

Steve Wall, *City of Ridgefield*

### 2008 Accomplishments

The following is a summary of DEAB's 2008 accomplishments. The format follows the six goals established by the advisory board.

#### ***Goal #1 - Achieve department-wide consistency in submittal review.***

- A. Implemented required use of Pre-Submittal checklist for final engineering construction documents.
- B. Implemented a "hold" process for final engineering reviews and charging development fees for 4<sup>th</sup> review iterations (fee was already in code but was not being charged).
- C. Staff continues to use a final engineering submittal checklist to improve consistency of reviews.
- D. Through the stormwater code update process, began discussions on the use of a county design standards manual.

#### ***Goal #2 - Standardize and accelerate Engineering Division processes.***

- A. Discussed a "primary portal" / "project manager" concept for processing permits with new Community Development Director.

- B. Began discussion of a "concurrent review process", similar to that used by City of Vancouver.
- C. As part of Development Fees/Cost Study, received staff's estimates of hours to review each type of engineering permit.
- D. Reviewed Development Engineering ongoing process improvements.
- E. The customer service level continues to improve. Communication to resolve issues occurs regularly.
- F. The first engineering review continues to identify most of the significant issues, resulting in fewer new comments on subsequent submittals.

***Goal #3 - Ensure adequate staffing levels, expertise, resources, and customer service attitudes.***

- A. Private consultants were contracted to review final engineering projects during peak workloads.
- B. Commented on proposed Performance Measurements for the Development Engineering Program.
- C. Hosted an informal meeting with Development Engineering staff.
- D. Reviewed Development Engineering mid-year performance report.
- E. With the reorganization of Development Engineering from Community Development to Public Works, accomplished goal of separating development services and engineering services revenue budgets/expenses to hold each division accountable for performance.

***Goal #4 - Facilitate collaborative partnering between the public and private sectors.***

- A. Met with BOCC during a February work session to discuss 2007 accomplishments and recommendations.
- B. Actively participated on the Stormwater Ordinance Update Process, including the Technical Advisory Committee and Stakeholders Advisory Committee. DEAB dedicated several meetings to the stormwater code, soliciting review comments from the development community and consultants.
- C. Received presentations on 2008 development fees proposal and cost study project.
- D. Be a procedural step in the engineering-related policy/code revision process, including:
  - a) Bi-annual code revisions.
  - b) Road modification review process.
  - c) Rough proportionality (transportation).
  - d) Continuance and open record hearing process.
- E. Using the DEAB general email distribution list to inform private sector of county code and process changes.
- F. Information on DEAB is on the county web page.
- G. Presentation on Case History access on county web site.
- H. Development Services presentation regarding a Type IA case category.
- I. Each meeting has a public comment period that is actively used by local development consultants.

***Goal #5 - Review and comment as requested by the BOCC and/or senior staff on project specific technical engineering issues.***

- A. Proposed bi-annual code changes are reviewed; comments are prepared for the Planning Commission and BOCC.
- B. Active participation in reviewing the stormwater ordinance revisions. DEAB members, or their delegates, are active on both the Technical Advisory Committee and the Stakeholders Advisory Committee.
- C. Heard first (and only) Project Specific Technical Engineering Review – Still Valley transportation issues.
- D. Recommendation as to selected basins for Stormwater Sub-basin Planning.

***Goal #6 - Continue to reevaluate and refine the implementation of duties in the bylaws.***

- A. Future role of DEAB was discussed; no proposed changes.
- B. The annual work plan or parking lot items are reviewed each meeting.

**2009 Priorities**

DEAB has identified their work plan topics and priorities for 2009 as described in the attached document, with an emphasis on the following:

- A. Continue to discuss and comment on the cost study project and development fee proposals.
- B. Review Development Engineering's efficiency and service levels, and how they are affected by the fee structure and current economy.
- C. Encourage and comment on the re-write of Title 40 for simplicity and clarity.
- D. Monitor the implementation and effects of the new stormwater ordinance.
- E. Continue to review and comment as requested by the BOCC and/or senior staff on project specific technical engineering issues.

The DEAB looks forward to continued collaboration between Clark County's development community and county staff during 2009.

Respectfully submitted,

Development Engineering Advisory Board



Gregory P. Jellison, P.E., Chair



Jerry Nutter, Vice-Chair

SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD OF CLARK COUNTY COMMISSIONERS ON APRIL 15, 2009.

<b>DEAB - 2009 Work Plan Topics and Priorities (draft)</b>			
<b>Priority</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Source</b>
1	Code/Technical	Performance bonds for private infrastructure	DEAB
1	Code/Technical	Re-write of Title 40 for simplicity and clarity	DEAB
1	Code/Technical	Monitor implementation of new stormwater ordinance; Propose amendments if necessary.	DEAB
1	Financial	Consider a fee schedule that captures actual cost of reviews (penalizes consultants/developers with an excessive number of review iterations).	2007 DEAB Recommendations
1	Financial	Consider lower fees for small property owners.	2007 DEAB Recommendations
1	Financial	Implement a cost-of-service analysis for all of the department's development fees. Work towards developing a true cost-of-service model so staff time and costs are properly charged to developers.	2007 DEAB Recommendations
1	Financial	Review Development Engineering's efficiency and service levels with current fee structure	DEAB
1	Financial	Regularly review financial and performance measures	staff
1	Financial	Time tracking system for specific project reviews.	DEAB
1	Processes	Electronic as-built submittals.	staff
1	Processes	Evaluate the viability of concurrent site plan and final engineering review within defined timelines (90 or 120 days).	2007 DEAB Recommendations
1	Processes	Limit technical review time on detailed calculations. This should only be done if the reviewer suspects that there is a problem.	2007 DEAB Recommendations
1	Processes	Review and comment as requested using Project Specific Technical Engineering Review process	DEAB
1	Resources	Accountability. Provide appropriate level of staffing, but hold the division accountable for meeting their deadlines.	2007 DEAB Recommendations
2	Code/Technical	Road mod process and PST review - evaluate how it's working.	DEAB
2	Processes	Clarification and compilation of policies.	parking lot
2	Processes	Create a case log (reference manual) that organizes memos regarding special situations that come up and how they are resolved. DEAB should review formal policies and provide input.	2007 DEAB Recommendations
2	Processes	Develop training programs for the private sector that offer incentives for compliance.	2007 DEAB Recommendations
2	Processes	Establish a county design standards manual.	2007 DEAB Recommendations
2	Processes	Evaluate process of construction inspection through project completion, including performance and maintenance bonds.	2007 DEAB Recommendations

Priority	Category	Item	Source
2	Processes	Evaluate the road modification and post-decision review processes for simplicity and predictability with the goal to reduce the volume of requests.	2007 DEAB Recommendations
2	Processes	Explore the concept of offering faster review times for technically complete submittals.	2007 DEAB Recommendations
2	Processes	Explore viability of a "single point plan submittal and tracking resource" for final engineering plans. Do not require separate submittals for traffic striping and site work.	2007 DEAB Recommendations
2	Processes	Formalize the process of code interpretations. Stop creating policy judgments; change code if necessary. Gray areas of code take up staff's time.	2007 DEAB Recommendations
2	Processes	Formalize/better advertise complaint process on specific projects. (maybe a customer service input form for ENG applicants)	parking lot
2	Processes	Move level of review analysis away from "lowest common denominator" of private expertise.	2007 DEAB Recommendation
2	Processes	Refine the submittal and review process, requirements, and timelines, such as evaluating the 21/14/7 calendar day concept for final review. Have a formal process to stop the clock if issues come up until the issue has been resolved. This will help in perceptions of long turn-around times.	2007 DEAB Recommendations
2	Processes	Re-look at grading application requirements (clarify early- and stand-alone grading permits in code).	2007 DEAB Recommendations
2	Processes	Routing of signing/striping plans	parking lot
2	Resources	Allocate more staff time to actual final plan review, either with less "other mandates" or more staff, based upon predicted (not historical) workload. Approximately 2 FTE staff perform non-project related work.	2007 DEAB Recommendations
2	Resources	Create staff feedback mechanisms, both positive and negative.	2007 DEAB Recommendations
2	Resources	Need for Project Coordinator. This is a technician-level position to serve as a "primary portal" / "project manager" for providing status and processing permits.	2007 DEAB Recommendations
2	Resources	Provide review of Public Works reorganization proposals for development engineering activities.	staff
3	Code/Technical	ADA Compliance	parking lot
3	Comm Devel	Create a Type 1A land use category (between Type 1 and 2)	parking lot
3	Comm Devel	Discuss final lot grading issues with Jim Muir.	parking lot
3	Relationships	DEAB to meet with the Neighborhood Assoc of Clark County to present goals and receive feedback.	parking lot
3	Relationships	Host open house to receive feedback from developers/consultants/contractors	staff
3	Relationships	Invite other public agencies within county to collaborate on regional issues; possibly a dedicated mtg.	parking lot