Development and Engineering Advisory Board Meeting
December 6, 2012
2:30 – 4:30 p.m.
Public Service Center

DEAB members: Mike Bomar, Helen Devery, Ott Gaither, Eric Golemo, Andrew Gunther, Mike Odren

DEAB members not in attendance: Greg Jellison, James Howsley

County staff: David Bottamini, Brent Davis, Travis Goddard, Susan Ellinger, Dianna Nutt, Ali Safari, Marty Snell, Nicole Snider, Ron Wierenga

Administrative Actions

- Review/Revise/Adopt Minutes: Minutes from November 11, 2012, were approved and adopted.
- Correspondence: See attachments to agenda.
- Announcements: There will be a farewell to Commissioner Boldt, December 19th from 3 to 5 in the hearing room.

Plat Nine-Year Extension

The provision for nine year plat ordinance is specific to cities, this was Senate Bill 2152, Section 3 subsection B. Why was this limited to cities? We need to look into legislative background.

The resolution that was adopted May 2012 applied to plats granted preliminary approval June 1, 2004 to December 31, 2008. It extended the approvals to December 31, 2014.

County could look at maximum of nine years for all of these projects. County could also continue approving temporary extensions. These have been approved by the BOCC on a year by year basis.

The bill has a sunset clause; Golemo thinks the window for nine year approvals no longer applies.

- Having certainty moving forward is what is needed, extending at the last minute is problematic.
- Following/ aligning with the state is supported.
- Staff to follow up and report back to DEAB why this bill is limited to cities and if the nine year approval window is still open for cities.
- Add to agenda for next DEAB meeting.

One of the reasons this applies to cities is large phased projects are developed over time. DEAB's recommendation is that it is time to revisit this year; we want to ensure the nine years.

Ask Board to proactively extend, revisit this issue in 2013.

Legal Lot Definitions

The language went to Planning Commission last month; it was presented by Chris Horne. Planning Commission did not support the language and recommended that it be moved to the Board without their support. Snell and Horne are recommending putting this on hiatus, since the Board will ask how is this better, faster, or cheaper.

Odren asked if the purpose of this ordinance was to bring county language into line with state law.

Snell stated yes, that was the purpose. Recent case example: Hearing Examiner ruled favorably for applicant based on county code. But if this was appealed, court would likely overturn.

Odren asked if the county is opening themselves up to appeals because we are not in line with the state code. Snell stated yes.

DEAB's position has not changed.

DEAB "Self-Evaluation"

This is an open discussion to evaluate how we feel we have been doing over the last year.

Have the County processes improved as a result of what we have done and how does the County compare and rate to other jurisdictions?

Odren thinks our efforts have been such that we are able to provide real life experience for staff. The Board and Planning Commission hear us and that is one of the reasons we are here. Examples Odren gave were the developer certification process and the 60 review day process. Our expertise is vital and crucial to providing staff, BOCC, and Planning Commission with our input and recommendations for going forward with different proposals.

Gunther agreed with Odren that our private side experience is useful and valuable in guiding staff. DEAB needs to consider how their input affects processes; did it help or revise things that staff were working on putting into place? This is difficult to rate but annually could look at their impact on processes or changes under taken that year. He also believes that we should do a yearly self-evaluation. For the biannual changes and re-tooling our code our input was very effective; the fact that not all members have the same opinion helps.

Odren stated staff starts with this language and we need to give them kudos for all the work they do in responding to our suggestions and input. E-solutions are an example that once that gets on board, other jurisdictions will look at that and consider doing that too.

Devery asked would it be helpful to do a self-evaluation. Would a matrix be helpful?

Golemo wanted to hear if staff thought we were productive and helpful to them. He felt this is a good public/private partnership, both sides get insight and this allows DEAB an opportunity to see and understand what staff does. Hard to put a grade to it, but building relationships and deepening understanding from both sides is important, and working through these issues together is valuable.

Devery thought we should get some feedback from the Board and staff on what we do and what we could do better.

Odren stated that he felt the feedback we got from the Commissioners was "good job guys."

Golemo said we have gotten more feedback than that, the fact that they made some decisions based on our recommendations, provides us a good way to judge our success. On almost all recommendations other than the developer certification they have based their decision on our advice. We need to judge our success by action rather than words.

Odren said that next month we should ask to hear from staff on what things we could do differently. Do we go into too much detail? Are we doing what staff is expecting?

Snell had several observations; that it was good to have a consistent group meet to run things by and act as a spring board. In terms of reviewing code and technical work it is good to have DEAB review since it affects our daily work. A good example of these was the grading code work. DEAB has a niche as a sounding board on the technical issues. Planning Commission has more of a policy view, not nuts and bolts.

Devery asked if we could meet as a group with the Planning Commission so that both groups could meet and get to know each other. When we are working on our work plan let's meet with them and work on how we can get information to them more quickly. Staff needs to make sure that the Planning Commission can get DEAB's recommendations before work sessions. Helpful to get Board expectations for DEAB. Example is Retooling Our Code, Planning Commission tabled this and asked for revisions on many items, staff expected things to go forward.

Snell suggested having a DEAB, Planning Commission, and Board meeting. The Board sets the Planning Commission work plan. The Planning Commission schedule may conflict with DEAB meetings. The Planning Commission meetings are 1st and 3rd Thursdays. The work sessions are the 1st Thursday and the hearings are the 3rd Thursday.

Devery said that with the rural and comprehensive plan update it would be good for us to let the Planning Commission know what we can and can't provide to them in advance and learn what they want from us throughout the process. Devery requested that Stepan give us a general report on how staff feels we are doing and how we can improve.

Safayi said that he appreciated DEAB's input and time greatly. Staff has learned a lot from DEAB too. There are not as many citizens going to the Board to complain about the Development Engineering reviews. He thinks that is a direct result of DEAB.

Golemo said that we are not really seeing that kind of request and we would like to see more of it. Maybe this can be expanded upon the website.

Devery requested that DEAB review the website and make suggestions for improvement.

Bottamini said that this forum provides communication and a bridge to improve communication. The gate through which we communicate through is the website. DEAB has ignored the website and that needs improvement. There is lot we could be discussing and a whole spectrum of issues we could be working on.

Devery suggested this can be an element of our work plan.

Snell said he had learned a lot from everyone and he agrees with Bottamini that we can review our website.

Gaither added that looking at DEAB bylaws, he wants boundaries since there are some areas that we should not work on and others we should be. He felt we needed more direction on some areas; there is a Planning Commission and a DEAB for a reason. Sometimes we need to say "not our area"; we are not a policy board.

- DEAB needs to look at web page.
- Work with staff and give input on electronic plan review
- Have Oliver come and give us another update on the Rural and Comp Plan Discussion.
- Solicit and review comments from staff regularly.

Ellinger discussed Tidemark replacement and how we hope to reduce customization. We may be changing some of processes to be more in the line with the system to streamline things. It will be critical to have DEAB involvement in replacing permitting system.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

Next DEAB Meeting: Jan 10, 2012 - 2:30 to 4:30 p.m.

Meeting Minutes prepared by: Nicole Snider
Reviewed by: Susan Ellinger
DEAB Adopted: January 10, 2013

Development and Engineering Advisory Board
Parking Lot

Development and Engineering Advisory Board - Parking Lot Items					
#	PRIORITY*	SUBJECT	DATE REQUESTED	ORIGINATOR	ACTION
1		Concurrency – Reconsider policy relating to multiple developers required to do same improvement (first in responsible for full cost of improvement if no cost-sharing developers agreement.)	10-1-2009	DEAB	
2		Form a Technical Stormwater Subcommittee	5-6-2010	Peter Tuck	
3		Gate Access Standard and pursue county code or design standards detailing requirements for gates on private roads	11-2-2010	John Meier/DEAB	
4		Streamline the handling of approval signatures on Final Engineering Mylars	11-2-2010	DEAB	
5		Traffic Impact Fees, including those related to Parks	8-4-2011	DEAB	
6		ADA requirements throughout Title 40 (discussion during the parks code review related to conflicting codes and Building Official discretion). DEAB desires consistency so that the flexibility proposed for parks applies to all developments.	10-6-2011	DEAB	
7		Urban cottage housing the code section will be revisited in one year.	1-5-2012	DEAB	
8		DEAB will form a subcommittee to visit with Environmental Services to better understand the erosion control fees.	4-12-2012	DEAB	
* Priorities: 1 = High/Important, 2 = Average, 3 = Low/long-term goal					