



proud past, promising future

**PUBLIC WORKS
DEVELOPMENT ENGINEERING PROGRAM**

**AGENDA
DEVELOPMENT and ENGINEERING ADVISORY BOARD**

Thursday, January 8, 2015

2:30 – 4:30 p.m.
Public Service Center
6th Floor, Training Room

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>TIME</u>		<u>FACILITATOR</u>
	<u>Start</u>	<u>Duration</u>	
1. Administrative Actions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introductions • DEAB meeting is being recorded and the audio will be posted on the DEAB’s website • Review/Adopt minutes • Review upcoming events • Voting for 2015 DEAB Chair and Vice-Chair • DEAB member announcements 	2:30	15 min	Odren
2. Home Rule Charter	2:45	20 min	Silliman
3. Final Plat Process Improvements/Updates	3:05	20 min	Wriston
4. Residential Impact Fee Delays/Update/Q&A	3:25	20 min	Howsley
5. Code amendment for HOC and MF Zones	3:45	20 min	Snell
6. 2015 DEAB Work Plan/Tentative Update	4:05	10 min	Shafer
7. Public Comment	4:15	5 min	All

Next DEAB Meeting:

Thursday, February 5, 2015
2:30 – 4:30 p.m.
Public Service Center
6th Floor, Training Room

Agenda:
TIF Update/ Q&A - Hermen



proud past, promising future

CLARK COUNTY
WASHINGTON

**PUBLIC WORKS
DEVELOPMENT ENGINEERING PROGRAM**

County Manager Briefing

County Manager Briefing – every Wednesday at 10 a.m.

PC Work Sessions and Hearings

PC Work Session – Amendments to Home Business and Multi-Family codes, CPZ2014-00010 NE 139th Street, PC Terms & Appointments – Thursday, January 8, 5:30 p.m.

PC Hearing – Amendments to Home Business and Multi-Family codes, CPZ2014-00010 NE 139th Street – Thursday, January 15, 6:30 p.m.

Note: Work sessions are frequently rescheduled. Check with the BOCC's office to confirm date/time of scheduled meetings.

PC – Planning Commission

BOCC – Board of Clark County Commissioners

Development and Engineering Advisory Board Meeting
December 4, 2014
2:30 p.m.-4:10 p.m.
Public Service Center

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

County staff: Brent Davis, Gordy Euler, Matt Hermen, Greg Shafer, Marty Snell, Nicole Snider, Rod Swanson

Administrative Actions

- Introduction of Audience Members
- DEAB meeting is recorded and posted to the county's website.
- Review/Adopt Minutes: Minutes from November were approved and adopted.
- Reviewed Upcoming Events:
- No PC Work Sessions or Hearings in December 2014.
 - BOCC Hearing – Tuesday, December 16, 10:00 a.m.
 - CPZ2014-00005 Arterial Atlas – Fifth Plain Creek Area – change classification from rural to urban on Northeast 88th Street from Ward Road to Northeast 182nd Avenue to a C-2b (2-lane urban collector with bike lane).
 - Amendment to Clark County Code Section 40.520.070 to add a new Section 40.520.075 master planning for rural industrial land banks
 - Minor changes to code section 40.560.101 changes relating to rural industrial development
- DEAB member announcements – Greg Shafer announced that five of the current DEAB members terms are ending March 31, 2015. They should be prepared to re-apply.

Population Growth-Buildable Land Supply/Q & A

Jamie Howsley reported.

Jamie provided a copy of the Buildable Lands Stakeholder Discussion Report. This was an outgrowth of a request from Senator Roach in a hearing that was held jointly with the Senate Governmental Operations and House Government Operations to try to address the issue of buildable lands in the State of Washington. The discussion started with trying to develop consistencies between cities and counties with greater transparency to the public. One of the concerns is that some lands brought into urban growth boundaries lack infrastructure; this can impact the cost, timing, and location of development. This is a possible amendment to GMA. Another big concern for the private sector is affordable lands, people are moving farther and farther out to rural areas where they can afford a new home. This is having the opposite effect of what the goal is for GMA. Discussion will continue with some policy recommendations going forward. Intent of discussion is to inform policy makers of the need for consistent data, consistencies across jurisdictions, and the need for affordable housing. State has not given funding to counties to conduct actual, on the ground research.

Next cycle is seven years out. Jamie will continue to update DEAB as information is available.

TIF Update/Q & A

Matt Herman reported.

This is no longer a joint program with the City of Vancouver, the City choose to change for simplicity. This has led to an update of the County program. See schedule provided; goal is to have program clearly defined and ready to go by July 2015. The consultant is DKS, they also worked on the City's program. There was a press release sent out two weeks ago requesting volunteers for an advisory group, two current members of DEAB have applied. The group will be meeting about 4 times to give feedback and provide direction. Goal at the end is to have a program that is equitable to both private and public sectors while being defensible. DEAB review is scheduled for June 4th.

This is separate from the comp plan process. The current CFP in place will provide backbone to the TIF program. Annexation could affect rates; MOU with the City is currently in the works.

There was a discussion regarding TIF credits and need for notification process. Matt responded that everyone with TIF credits will be notified and asked for input. Discussion followed regarding stakeholders input and need for an open process.

Matt will return in February with an update.

Infrastructure Percent Deduction/Update/ Q & A

Eric Golemo reported.

We are waiting on Community Planning staff to respond formally to DEAB's letter, we are requesting a response as to why they are using the 28%.

Eric found information that in the last comp plan it was 38% and the City of Vancouver made a request to the County to move it to 28%. We would like to understand why they are using that percent, we would like an explanation.

Motion made - to resubmit our letter to Oliver and request a response. Motion passed unanimously.

Updated Presentation on the Permitting System Replacement Project

Marty Snell reported.

Marty thanked Mike Odren and DEAB for giving him time for his presentation today. Marty provided a handout of his PowerPoint presentation.

The team has been working for 3 years on the project to replace a 15 year old system. Tuesday, December 9th will be the formal presentation of the contracts at the BOCC Hearing. The team has chosen Computronix out of Edmonton Alberta with offices in Lakewood Colorado. We will be using systems called Posse and Blue Beam. Assuming that the Board approves the contract, the kickoff date will be February 24, 2015. This is not just a new system; there will be new and improved processes. The team

decided to go with the Vendor-Hosted system for greater savings, the hosting site is Lakewood, Colorado.

Marty discussed the project overview, phased implementation, cost components, the contracts, and oversights. Marty will be leading the effort with Carol Brown who is the business technology manager that he hired in July to go through the change management plan. We will look at procedures, communication, training, and accountability. We will work with staff and the management team to make sure that we are not just getting a new system, that we are actually doing some things slightly different.

We will have a certificate of acceptance before we make payments.

Total cost is 4.7 million; two major subtotal costs; one is to the vendor with five years of maintenance support at 3.6 million and the other is to the county project staff through the implementation. This includes: project manager from IT, business/management analyst, and a report writer. We have about 12% contingency and third party contracts with the IVR and electronic plan review. The hosting will be hosted in the cloud, not on site. The budget that is before the board with the staff report does include some expenditures for staff. There has been nearly 1.2 million of general fund dedicated to pay for a portion of the system. The other is in non-general funds. We did a query today and 69% of the use of the system is in Building and Development, 25% is in general fund or general public inquires, 5% is in Development Engineering, and 1% is in the Clean Water program. The budget allocation is broken down by the percentage of the use of the system. There have been some questions and concerns recently that not all development types are paying for the new system and our fund balance shows that up until July 2013 all projects were contributing to the fund balance. The funding is there – no fee increases to implement the new system.

Some of the projected benefits with the new system include; improved customer service, efficiency and technology gains. A lot of time has been spent reviewing the contracts; Marty is very excited about executing this contract. The firm has been excellent to work with; Marty was able to visit Douglas County, in Colorado. They are currently using the system and have only good things to say about the system and the customer service provided.

Marty added that we will not fail on lack of training or lack of resources to help with training and implementation.

Fee Holiday Audit/ Discussion

Jamie Howsley reported.

BIA members have expressed concerns regarding the effectiveness of the program, and that residential construction is subsidizing not only the program but, also Community Development. At a recent work session the question was asked directly by the Board; “is residential development subsidizing the program?” And the answer was “Yes”. This was again high-lighted in the report that came from the Auditor’s office which again was independent. The additional data shows that there have been 799 single-family residential permits issued this year with a valuation of \$287 million. Non-residential, there have been 353 permits issued this year with a construction value of \$63 million. There are 169 applications that have had fees waived in the pipeline year, with only 48 gone to occupancy. It was

reported recently in the Columbian that there have been 7300 jobs added in the County. It is unlikely that these jobs have come from these 48 developments. Again, the concern from the BIA that was raised from this body at the conception of the program is still the same concern that residential isn't unfairly targeted or supporting this program. Evidence suggests that is and what can we do to respond to these concerns? Is this in DEAB's purview to make recommendations and try to change that?

Mike Odren responded that we talked about this recently and we discussed our original position, that it was not a unanimous support of the program. Even though we voted in support, we were very reserved about that support. We had a laundry list of about a half dozen items that we presented in writing as well as testified in person at the hearing about before the program was approved.

Question was raised regarding the general fund back-filling and making Community Development whole as the resolution requires. Has this happened? Marty responded that at the end of 2012 the general fund did transfer about \$385,000.00 to the Building fund to pay for the earlier programs. The general fund budget has not transferred money this year to the Building and Development fund. One answer is you have a fund balance, why would we pad your fund balance? That's a policy and a decision for the budget department.

Review of audit, discussion followed. What can DEAB Do? Is this a BIA stand-alone issue? Should DEAB review our support of the program?

DEAB choose not to provide formal comment on the current fee holiday program.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Meeting adjourned at 4:25

Meeting minutes prepared by: Nicole Snider

Reviewed by: Greg Shafer

DEAB FINAL PLAT WORKING GROUP REPORT

January 8, 2015

DEAB's Final Plat Working Group held meetings on September, 30, 2014, and December 18, 2014. The purpose of the meetings was to revisit the Final Plat Process with the following goals in mind: (1) Review issues and results from the meeting of the Group in August, 2013; (2) Assess how the plat process is working currently; (3) Identify areas and ideas for process improvement.

The consensus appeared to be that the Final Plat process as a whole had improved since the meeting in August of 2013. However, there are still areas that can improve; especially in light of the expected potential increase in plat volume.

Areas Identified for Improvement

- Better and faster communication back from staff
- Electronic distribution of files
- The influence of outside agencies on timelines
- Proper staffing: Levels of staffing
- Turning in of Plat and materials to County where fees involved
- Turning in of subsequent materials where no fees involved
- Ability to keep process moving ("multi-task"); not hold up process wherever possible
- Minor technicalities in Conditions, Hearings Examiner decision, etc.
- Timing of Mylars to BOCC
- Processing/review of Building Permits pending recordation of Plat
- New issues identified late in the process
- Review of as-builts

Solutions Discussed

- Continue to work on and emphasize good communication
- Improve Community Development's access to plotters and scanners to improve and maximize electronic distribution of files (recognizing some people still prefer paper submittals)
- Continued communication and awareness of the ability to make same day, or next day, appointments to turn in Plats to avoid wait times at the Permit Center
- Look at ability to setup "overflow" staffing, or other ideas, to receive plats on same day appointments (e.g., Engineering's "Bat Line")
- Set up process to accept additional plat information requests/submittals (non-fee based) on an expedited walk-in basis
 - Current goal: "Non-fee based" submittals to be taken in by end of January. Continue to work on process to accept fee-based materials on same day/walk-in basis.
- Emphasize the importance to execute "multi-layered" final plat process simultaneously (i.e., wherever possible keep the process moving and not stop it because missing something not critical to other pieces)

- Explore examples of where problems have been experienced on minor issues/conflicts/Conditions/etc., where Planning Director may have authority to resolve short of Post Decision Review. Explore any potential Code changes needed for such authority.
 - Potential of specific conditions having an “out” built in at the Hearings Examiner level. Probably applicant specific?
- Have BOCC sign the Mylars when they approve the Plat
- Work on process to shorten timing to load Plat in the system after recording and/or explore allowing some Building Permits to move forward with review prior to recording/loading in the system
 - Process developed: Submit paper plat with Health Department signature to allow processing of building permits during the wait on plat processing, recording and upload into GIS. Building permits are then ready to be issued. Potential 11-14 day savings.
- Develop a procedure to allow first review of as-builts to be “paper review” if punch list is only non-critical items unrelated to the Plat
 - Current goal: First review on paper. Next review on inspector stamped as-builts (paper). Do not have to resubmit to engineering on Mylar, and do not have to wait for engineering to call for Mylar.
- Provide an area for inspector to sign-off on punch list (rather than just verbal), but short of being interpreted as Completion of Construction
- Continue to emphasize/communicate using “template” legal documents wherever possible
 - CC&Rs “low-hanging fruit”. Take all covenants out of CC&Rs and make separate covenants so legal does not have to review entire set of CC&Rs.
 - Develop more template legal documents with “read only” function. Essentially, fill-in PDF.
- Communicate that Maintenance Bond may be pursued early in the process off of Construction Bid to avoid unnecessary delays in obtaining Bond
- Dedicate staff to be responsible for processing and movement of final plat

Future and Follow-up

- Recommend a 6 month follow-up
 - Review progress on issues and solutions above
 - Continue to explore areas for improvement – possible items to discuss
 - Improving outside agencies response
 - Reviewing how other Urban Washington Counties process plats
 - Any Code changes needed?
 - Timing to get to BOCC for sign-off
 - Any unnecessary steps in the process
 - The County’s new permit tracking system should provide improvement in real-time information, accountability, checklists, tracking, etc.
 - Process implications of new Charter
 - Discuss/explore timing and submittal of plat. Goal: See if can shorten process time to BOCC by a week.