

Development and Engineering Advisory Board Meeting
April 3, 2014
1:00-3:00 p.m.
Public Service Center

Board members in attendance: Steve Bacon, Ott Gaither, Eric Golemo, Andrew Gunther, Don Hardy, James Howsley, Mike Odren, Jeff Wriston

Board members not in attendance: Terry Wollam

County staff: Diana Nutt, Ali Safayi, Greg Shafer, Dean Shaddix, Marty Snell, Nicole Snider, Ron Wierenga

Administrative Actions

- Introductions
- DEAB meeting is being recorded and the audio will be posted on the DEAB's website in April, 2014
- Review/Adopt minutes – March minutes - there was a motion to amend, approved and adopted. Minutes amended, approved & adopted.
- Review upcoming events
 - BOCC Work Session - Clark County Historical Museum's Annual Update – Wednesday, April 9, 10:30 a.m.
 - BOCC Hearing - Adoption of Land Use Regulations for Marijuana-Related Facilities, Tuesday, April 15, 10:00 a.m.
 - Joint Public Meeting w/Planning Commission to discuss Surface Mining Overlay – Thursday, April 17, 6:30 p.m.
 - PC Work Session – Stormwater and Comprehensive plan – Thursday, April 3, 5:30 p.m.
- Correspondences – None
- DEAB member announcements - None.
- DEAB work plan 2014-2015 –Discussion on priorities and current challenging processes. Ideas for new items to add to work plan and present to the Board. Eric Golemo suggested simplifying the Plat Alteration process. Marty Snell pointed out that we have to be consistent with the State RCWs and work with Chris Horne. Mike Odren brought up using a site before the Certificate of Occupancy is issued for the building. He also brought up the Road Modification process. Mike Odren also mentioned that the wait times in the Permit center continue to be painful and need improvement. Greg Shafer asked if DEAB wanted to have a retreat to go over work plan? It was determined to not have a retreat this year. Please get comments back to Mike Odren or Greg Shafer within a week
- Stormwater plan update – Currently we have a technical advisory group working on this. Ron Wierenga said there will be a review draft available next week, with a 1 month comment period. He said they are still on track to submit to DOE in June. He will return to give us an update at the May meeting. There will also be a work session with Board in mid-May. Ott Gaither suggested that we focus our efforts on what we can change. Mike Odren said that those that work in the industry have a dual duty here; to comment and provide education to co-workers and clients.

Tidemark Replacement/Fee Report Updates

Marty Snell gave an update on the Tidemark replacement project. Tidemark has been in use since 1999. We had an RFP out in late 2012, spent most of last year reviewing 2 vendors. It was determined that neither of these vendors could provide what we needed. We officially rejected the RFP and revisited the sections of the RFP, we re-wrote the RFP. The proposals were due April 2nd, we received three. We will be going through an evaluation process and will do some on-site review. We have learned a great deal and we are fortunate to have a project manager out of the IT group that will write a very tight scope of work, and a contract with some stiff penalties for non-performance.

Marty Snell provided a power point handout, and discussed the work session presentation he gave in February. Since the work session we have put together a way to estimate sales tax revenue. We are working with Jeff Swanson in the Board's office, he may be taking this project over, and he is an economist. The main sources of revenue that we are looking at are sales tax and property tax. There are also the ongoing sources of revenue, such as annual levy assessments for the general fund and for the road fund. To date through February there have been 76 projects since June 2013 that we have waived fees on. Total impact fees waived or to be waived is currently 1.6 million dollars. The County's share of retail sales tax is 1.2%, half of that is non-dedicated general fund, 0.2 % goes to alcohol/chemical dependency, 0.2% goes to law & justice. He went over some different examples of projects. Larger tenant improvements seem to be the net gain. Suggestions were made to cap the amount of TIF fees, look at the return on investment, and to look at amount of TIF fees waived versus number of jobs.

Marty Snell described what the Grid was and where to locate on the County Web page.

Sewer District's CFP

Heidi Rosenberg with the Sewer District and Steve Bacon presented their Capital Facilities Plan. He gave a brief overview. They are a special purpose sewer agency, which provides public sanitary sewer only. That includes 500 miles of pipelines, 65 pump stations, as part of the GMA process they do a Capital Facilities Plan, which includes expansion, repair & replacement needs, campus improvements, and some local improvements into subdivisions that don't have sewer yet and putting in sewer. They provided copies of their six year Capital program, the Discovery Corridor plan, and the City of Ridgefield's Capital program. The City of Ridgefield will be connected into the District for Sewer capacity and will eventually abandon the City's treatment plant. DEAB members commented on how well done this was.

Question on revenue bonds – How are they paid? General receipts or specific? What are the sources of Funds? Is the area of improvement targeted? If it is a project that is funded through Capital Facilities Plan it would be general receipts, district wide. If it is a more local collection, then it would be an assessment against the area that would be paid back through increased connection fees over that specific geographic area.

Driveway Curb Cut

Alex Mattila of Diamond Concrete Cutting, Inc. gave a presentation regarding field cutting of existing vertical cement concrete curbs to allow for the removal of existing cut section of the concrete curb and gutter to provide opening for installation of new residential driveway approaches and sidewalk ramps. They have been in business in Clark County since 1997. A lot of times when a subdivision is constructed the driveway approaches change locations. They have a machine that will cut the approach in place. They

are proposing that we review and accept the proposal as an Alternative County Standard Detail for use in residential applications. Greg Shafer said that this could be a viable alternative with some intermediate added dowels. Greg Shafer suggested he put together a small group to work on this. **Motion made** to accept this for residential and add some dowels for commercial only. **Amendment made** to add dowels to both residential & commercial. **Second motion** made that we adopt this as a County Alternative with dowels required for both residential & commercial. **Motion passed.**

Final Site Plan Review Process Updates

Diana Nutt gave an update. She talked with Eric Golemo and Mike Odren; they had 3 main issues; the timing of the FSR submittal, the approval of the FSR and when documents need to be submitted. The FSR should be submitted at the same time as the final engineering plan; the FSR has to be approved prior to the engineering plans being approved. The documents depend on when the conditions require them; this is out of Development Engineering's control. Before they give provisional acceptance they need to make sure all the documents are submitted, this is the only way to control. Mike Odren gave examples of conditions that are challenging. Ali Safayi said some of these maybe required by code, not staff. Diana Nutt will check the code, work with Marty, and return in May with an update.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Meeting adjourned at 2:51p.m.

Meeting minutes prepared by: Nicole Snider

Reviewed by: Greg Shafer

Board Adopted: May 1, 2014