



proud past, promising future

**PUBLIC WORKS
DEVELOPMENT ENGINEERING PROGRAM**

**AGENDA
DEVELOPMENT and ENGINEERING ADVISORY BOARD**

Thursday, October 1, 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 • DEAB member announcements 	2:30	15 min	Gunther
2. Retaining Walls & Set-backs/Updates (Move to Nov Meeting)	2:45	30 min	Wollam/Snell/Muir
3. Final Plat Process/Updates	3:15	30 min	Wriston
4. Comp Plan/Updates	3:45	30 min	Orjiako
5. Public Comment	4:15	15 min	All

Next DEAB Meeting:

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

Agenda:

Bio-diversity Discussion – Gunther/Tyler/Davis
Retaining Walls & Set-backs/Updates – Wollam/Snell/Muir



proud past, promising future

**PUBLIC WORKS
DEVELOPMENT ENGINEERING PROGRAM**

County Manager Briefing and BOCC Hearing

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

BOCC Hearing – every Tuesday at 10 a.m. **

BOCC Hearing - Shoreline Master Program – Tuesday, October 13, 10:00 a.m.

BOCC Hearing - 2016 Comprehensive Plan Update – Wednesday, October 20, 10:00 a.m.

BOCC Special Meeting – Public Transportation Improvement – Tuesday, October 27, 3 p.m. at
Downtown Vancouver Library

PC Work Sessions and Hearings

PC Work Session – Clark County Stormwater Manual & Code Update, School Impact Fees –
Thursday, October 1, 5:30 p.m.

PC Hearing – Clark County Stormwater Manual & Code Update, School Districts Capital
Facilities Plans (CFP) Update – Thursday, October 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

* Unless cancelled, which some are if there are no topics

** Except first Tuesday when the hearing is typically in the evening

**Development and Engineering Advisory Board Meeting
September 3, 2015
2:30 p.m.-4:30 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.

Board members not in attendance: Jeff Wriston

County staff: Dean Boening, Gordy Euler, Oliver Orjiako, Ali Safayi, Peter Silliman, Marty Snell, Nicole Snider, Rod Swanson

Public: None

Administrative Actions

- DEAB meeting is recorded and posted to the county's website.
- Review/Adopt Minutes: Minutes from August 2015 adopted.
- Reviewed Upcoming Events:
 - County Manager Briefing – every Wednesday at 10 a.m. (Unless cancelled, which some are if there are no topics)
 - BOCC Hearing – every Tuesday at 10 a.m. (Except first Tuesday when the hearing is typically in the evening at 6:00 p.m.)
 - Joint Public Hearing BOCC and PC – The 2016 Comprehensive Plan Update Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement – Thursday, September 3, 6:00 p.m.
 - DEAB member announcements: From Greg Shafer regarding By-Laws, there are some minor changes to the By-laws. There are included in your packet.
 - Jamie Howsley provided a copy of his correspondence with the BOCC regarding the GMA Draft EIS and the population growth rate.
 - Mike Odren regarding Park Impact Fees –request to have Laurie Lebowsky come back and explain further. Don Hardy added that he would be interested to know what park projects might have occurred if the funds were in place? Terry Wollam suggested asking for more information following the November elections. Mike Odren will send an invite to have her to come to an upcoming meeting.

Stormwater Code & Manual Update

Rod Swanson gave a presentation on the update; he provided a power point that is included in your packet. He said he and other Clean Water staff have been working on this project for 3 years. He discussed who's involved in the update, the key project highlights and timelines. The Clark County Stormwater Manual and Code update is required by the NPDES Stormwater Permit from Ecology. The goal is to create a unified and consistent single stormwater manual for development and redevelopment projects that meets local needs and complies with the NPDES permit. The key addition to the manual is the mandate to use low impact development (LID) stormwater infiltration BMPS wherever feasible.

Questions from member(s) about fish consumption: how does this relate? Rod Swanson said that it does not. The State has to set water quality criteria for surface water bodies under the clean water act; they delegated that authority, the EPA has to approve them. Fish consumption is the study of how much fish you eat and the relative concentration of pollutants in your body. This is studying the amount of fish people eat and the risk of cancer; this is a fairly new science. It comes down to setting the standards for certain PCBs and cancer causing pollutants.

One of the primary goals was to adopt the LID standards and make sure that Title 40 doesn't have barriers that impact using LID. The permit makes LID the preferred method for site development. For example; permeable pavement in bio-retention facilities.

We have hosted over 80 meetings so far in this process. The deadline is January 8, 2016. See the checklist schedule included in your copy of the PowerPoint presentation. November 17, 2015 is the BOCC hearing date.

Question in regards to the O & M standards; with the LID standards using the porous concrete, is there anything in relation to the maintenance of it? Yes, all the counties involved are voicing concerns, but it is coming because the Pollution Control hearings Board said it is legal for Ecology to require it.

Mike Odren asked a question regarding soil classification, Rod Swanson stated that the model for Clark County is so much better than the generic model it should be adopted.

Ott Gaither asked how much similarity is there between the county planning and the local cities. There are 2 separate permits in Western Washington. There is the Phase 1 permit that has been in place since the 90's for the big municipalities that were required to have permits under the Federal law. Then there is the Phase 2 permit which captures the smaller municipalities. The Phase 2 permittees adopt their own manuals or can use one of the other legally adopted manuals that are written into the permit, for example the King County manual or Clark County. We were hoping that some of the local phase two's could use parts of our manual if not all of it; like the O and M standards or the source control portion. Some will likely use pieces and some will do the simple thing and adopt the ecology manual.

This is a public document that anyone could adopt, even though Clark County has done all the work and expense.

There was discussion regarding the various lawsuits we have been through.

Comp Plan/Updates

Oliver Orjiako gave an update on the Comp Plan Update, he provided a copy of the staff report that was prepared for the Joint PC/BOCC hearing on the draft SEIS that starts today, September 3, 2015. He also provided a copy of the power point presentation. See page 16 which is a flow chart of the process. He went over the upcoming events. The Planning commission will start their deliberation on the 17th. The comment period required by SEPA is 30 days, we can add an additional 15 days, making it 45 days.

Jamie Howsley has submitted comments to the Community Planning, which has been submitted to the Board's office. The issues that he raised are up to the Board to address.

There will be more time to comment at the BOCC hearing in October 2015.

Eric Golemo had a question on Table 1-2. Potential new lots allowable under each alternative, how do you read this table? Oliver explained it is for potential rural lots. There were more questions about the number of potential lots available in each alternative.

Jamie Howsley raised a concern that the Planning Commission is set to deliberate on the last day of the comment period. He pointed out that did not give them enough time to read all the comments. Oliver replied that we have discussed that internally and are aware that Planning Commission will complete their deliberation; they may continue and take additional time. There will be a stand-by date.

Jamie Howsley and Eric Golemo are involved in a project in the Salmon Creek area, they were recently surprised to learn there is a new type of priority habitat designation that WDFW has adopted. It triggers stuff within the County's critical areas ordinance, it is called Bio-diversity. So now if they have a forested site in an urban area, they are being told it is a no touch area. Even County staff was surprised by it. There are still a lot of forested sites in the urban area that will be affected by it. There used to be a designation called urban natural open space, which was the old priority habitat designation under Title 40. This was scrapped a few years ago, now WDFW has gone out and adopted the new best available science. It states that if you have a forested site with this designation, it becomes a no touch area.

This is the first staff has heard of this, we will look into this and ask GIS if they are aware.

Don Hardy asked a question on Alternative 3; is the difference that this is allowing the additional expansions area only or is there a reduction in urban growth areas in the other Alternatives? Oliver Orjiako responded there are no reductions, the other cities have said they do not want the urban growth boundaries to be expanded. Of the 7 cities only; Washougal, Ridgefield, La Center, and Battle Ground are requesting very modest expansions. Camas, Vancouver, and the town of Yacolt remain the same. The total acreage asked for is around 250 acres.

Oliver Orjiako encouraged DEAB to attend tonight's meeting and comment.

Question was asked regarding the comments DEAB had already provided, are they included in the record? Oliver Orjiako stated, yes, they are included in the record. He also stated there are comments for the comp plan update process and for the EIS review process. It was suggested that DEAB re-submit the comments so that they are included in the record for the EIS process. Ali said he would have Rosie re-submit the comments.

Motion made and passed to resubmit previous comments into the EIS review process.

Oliver Orjiako said after the PC makes their recommendations he will come back and present that to DEAB.

Discussion among DEAB regarding the timelines for the Comp plan update. When would be the best time to get an update from Oliver? Don Hardy said he thought it should be next month. Ali Safayi will add that to the October agenda.

Andrew Gunther suggested adding the new Bio-diversity issue to the work plan. Who at the County can help us with this? Jamie Howsley suggested Kevin Tyler and Brent Davis. He also suggested reaching out to other jurisdictions and see how they are handling it. More discussion followed.

Meeting adjourned at 4:15

Meeting minutes prepared by: Nicole Snider

Reviewed by: Ali Safayi

DEAB FINAL PLAT WORKING GROUP REPORT

January 8, 2015

UPDATE FROM WORKING GROUP MEETING 7-22-2015

Note: Anything not commented on was not identified as an issue and/or is working as previously described.

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 DEAB Final Plat Working Group met again on July 22, 2015 for additional updates and discussion.**

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 **(2017 goal for full electronic distribution system capabilities)**
- 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) **Marty still looking into plotter and scanner, sharing with Engineering is working.**
- 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. **Appointments are a week out. Angie or Chuck can set their own appointments.**
- Look at ability to setup "overflow" staffing, or other ideas, to receive plats on same day appointments (e.g., Engineering's "Bat Line") **Staffing is tough. Need to budget another Planning Tech.**

- 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. **Areas of this need work. Angie will work with group to resolve.**
- 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. **Marty is working with Jan on potential code change suggestions.**
 - 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. **Get next day. Used to be 2-3 days. New question to be answered: With Council what happens if Chair is not there to sign?**
- 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. **Time savings realized. (Note: Still currently unavoidable 3-4 day lag with GIS to wait for plat to record.**
- 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. **More communication may be needed here so people know this is available. Contractors and inspectors communicating well.**
- 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. **Staff working with Chris Horne and potentially some industry lawyers to identify areas to improve.**
 - Develop more template legal documents with “read only” function. Essentially, fill-in PDF. **Staff to follow-up.**
- Communicate that Maintenance Bond may be pursued early in the process off of Construction Bid to avoid unnecessary delays in obtaining Bond **Working great. Staff communicating opportunity at the pre-con.**
- Dedicate staff to be responsible for processing and movement of final plat. **Angie Merrill. Doing great!**

Future and Follow-up

- Recommend a 6 month follow-up
 - Review progress on issues and solutions above

- **Current areas of potentially unnecessary process timing: Fire Marshall, Environmental Services**
- 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?
 - 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 implications

CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT
2011 - 2015 SCHOOL IMPACT FEES

<u>DISTRICT</u>	<u>2009 CFP</u> <u>2010 – 2011 fees</u>	<u>2011 CFP</u> <u>2012 - 2013 fees</u>	<u>2015 CFP</u> <u>2016– 2018 fees</u>
Battle Ground	SF \$9,880 MF \$3,500*	SF \$5,128 MF \$2,649	SF \$6,397 MF \$2,285
Camas	SF \$5,528 MF \$3,269	SF \$4,460 MF \$2,604	SF \$5,371 MF \$5,371
Evergreen	SF \$7,169 MF \$3,069	SF \$6,989 MF \$2,678	SF \$6,100 MF \$7,641
Green Mtn	Sf \$3,387 MF \$0	SF \$3,387 MF \$0	SF \$3,387 MF \$0
Hockinson	SF \$5,906 MF \$1,617	SF \$5,906 MF \$1,617	SF \$6,080 MF \$2,781
La Center	SF \$6,991 MF \$2,626	SF \$6,991 MF \$2,626	SF \$4,111 MF \$5,095
Ridgefield	SF \$4,490 MF \$2,315	SF \$3,983 MF \$1,796	SF \$7,900 (2016) SF \$11,200 (2017) MF \$4,900 (2016) MF \$6,947 (2017)
Vancouver	SF \$4,117 MF \$3,030	SF \$1,523 MF \$845	SF \$2,880 MF \$2,381
Washougal	SF \$5,857 MF \$4,795	SF \$2,683 MF \$2,689	SF \$5,600 MF \$5,800



Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement Alternatives 2016 Comprehensive Plan Update

Alternative	Option Description	Preferred Alternative?
Alt. 1	NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE	
1	The 'No Action' alternative. This option re-adopts the current plan, planning assumptions and moves the planning horizon out to 2035.	Motion to Approve: AYE – 6 ; NAY – 0 Motion Passed
Alt. 2	COUNTY-INITIATED ALTERNATIVE	
	RURAL LANDS	
2.a	Rural Lands. Change the comp plan map legend from three comp plan designations to one Rural designation to be consistent with current comp plan-to-zoning matrix table.	Motion to Approve: AYE – 6; NAY – 0 Motion Passed
2.b	Agriculture Lands. Change the minimum lot size for parcels zoned AG-20 from 20 acres to 10 acres (AG-10).	Motion to Deny : AYE – 4; NAY – 2 Motion Passed
2.c	Forest Lands. Change the minimum lot size for parcels zoned FR-40 from 40 acres to 20 acres (FR-20).	Motion to Approve: AYE – 2; NAY – 4 Motion Failed
2.d	Rural Lands. For parcels zoned R-20, from 20 acres to 10 acres, in some areas.	No Vote Taken
2.e	Rural Centers. Combine rural center commercial (CR-2) and rural commercial (CR-1) into a single comp plan designation of 'rural commercial'.	Motion to Approve AYE – 5; NAY – 1 Motion Passed
2.f	Urban Reserve. Urban reserve (UR) becomes a true overlay. Zoning defaults to underlying zone; some parcels given R-5 zoning. UR code moved to the overlay chapter of Title 40. No change in allowable land uses.	Motion to Approve AYE – 5; NAY – 1 Motion Passed
	URBAN LANDS	
2.g	Commercial Lands. Combine the three commercial zones (C-2, C-3 and GC) into a single comp plan (C) designation.	Motion to Approve AYE – 5; NAY – 1 Motion Passed
2.h	Public Facilities. Creation of public facilities zone.	Motion to Approve



Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement Alternatives 2016 Comprehensive Plan Update

		AYE – 6; NAY – 0 Motion Passed
2.i	Urban Holding. Urban holding (UH) becomes a true overlay. Zoning defaults to underlying zone. UH code moved to the overlay chapter of Title 40. No change in allowable land uses.	Motion to Approve AYE - 5; NAY – 1 Motion Passed
2.j	Battle Ground UGA. Changes comp plan and zoning designations to better reflect surrounding land uses.	Motion to Approve AYE – 6; NAY – 0 Motion Passed
2.k	Ridgefield UGA. Add the Tri-Mountain Golf Course to the Ridgefield UGA retaining Parks and Open Space (P/OS) zoning and adding an Urban Holding UH-20 overlay.	Motion to Approve AYE – 6; NAY – 0 Motion Passed
2.l	Vancouver UGA. Remove reference to the Three Creeks Special Planning Area.	Motion to Approve AYE – 6; NAY – 0 Motion Passed
2.m	Vancouver UGA. Approve the Discovery/Fairgrounds subarea comp plan map and zoning changes.	Motion to Approve AYE – 6; NAY – 0 Motion Passed
2.n	Vancouver UGA. Approve the Salmon Creek subarea comp plan map and zoning changes.	Motion to Approve AYE – 6; NAY – 0 Motion Passed
2.o	Vancouver UGA. Change some parcels that have a mixed use comp plan designation to a comp plan designation that matches current zoning.	Motion to Approve AYE – 6; NAY – 0 Motion Passed
2.p	Vancouver UGA. Remove UR adjacent to the Vancouver UGA and replace it with R-5 and AG-20 zoning.	Motion to Approve AYE – 5; NAY – 1 Motion Passed
2.q	Vancouver UGA. Remove UH in the Fisher Swale area between Vancouver and Camas.	Motion to Approve AYE – 6; NAY – 0 Motion Passed
2.r	Washougal UGA. Correct mapping error on parcels with city zoning inside the UGA but outside city limits.	Motion to Approve AYE – 6; NAY – 0 Motion Passed



Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement Alternatives
2016 Comprehensive Plan Update

Alt. 3	CITY-REQUESTED UGA EXPANSIONS	
3.a	Battle Ground. Add 80 acres, now designated R-5, to the UGA for jobs.	Motion to Approve AYE – 6; NAY - 0 Motion Passed
3.b	La Center. Add 17 acres, now designated R-5, for a school site.	Motion to Approve AYE – 6; NAY – 0 Motion Passed
3.c	La Center. Add 56 acres, now designated AG-20, for jobs.	Motion to Approve AYE – 3; NAY – 3 – TIE VOTE – No Recommendation
3.d	Ridgefield. Add 111 acres, now designated AG-20, for residential.	Motion to Deny AYE – 5; NAY -1 Motion Passed
3.e	Washougal. Add 41 acres, now designated R-5, for residential.	Motion to Approve AYE – 2; NAY – 3 ABSTENTION – 1 Motion Failed
Alt. 4	RURAL, AGRICULTURE, AND FOREST LANDS CHANGES	
4.a	Rural Lands. Eliminate R-10 and R-20 zones unless publicly owned property. Create R-1 and R-2.5 zones. Maintain R-5 zone.	Motion to Deny AYE – 5; NAY – 1 Motion Passed
4.b	Agriculture Lands. Eliminate AG-20 zone unless publicly owned property. Create AG-5 and AG-10 zones.	Motion to Deny AYE – 4; NAY – 2 Motion Passed
4.c	Forest Lands. Add FR-10 and FR-20 zones to existing FR-40 and FR-80 zones.	Motion to Approve AYE – 2; NAY – 4 Motion Failed
OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS		
	A Motion was made for the councilor’s to allow for a process for flexibility and opportunity for land owners who continuously owned	Motion to Approve AYE – 4; NAY 2 Motion Passed



Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement Alternatives 2016 Comprehensive Plan Update

	<p>property prior to the 1994 plan to possibly divide their property. The vote was 4-2 to approve. There was discussion as to whether the effort, discussion of the process will come to the PC work session, meetings, etc.</p>	
--	--	--

Washougal School District 2015 Impact Fee Calculation

APPENDIX A

$$SIF = \left[CS(SF) - (SM) - \left(\frac{(1+i)^{10} - 1}{i(1+i)^{10}} \times AAV \times TLR \right) \right] \times A - FC$$

Single Family Residence:

Elementary	Middle School	High School	Formula
\$14,371,000.00	\$5,299,604.00	\$3,906,070.00	Facility Cost
301	111	78	Additional Capacity
\$47,744.19	\$47,744.18	\$50,077.82	Cost per Student (CS)
0.147	0.077	0.080	Student Factor (SF)
\$7,018.40	\$3,676.30	\$4,006.23	CS x SF
\$200.40	\$200.40	\$200.40	Boeck Index
90.00	117.00	130.00	OSPI Sq Ft
59.76%	59.76%	59.76%	State Match Eligibility %
\$1,584.41	\$1,078.91	\$1,245.49	State Match Credit (SM)
\$5,433.98	\$2,597.39	\$2,760.73	CS x SF - SM
<hr/>			Cost per Single Family Residence
		\$10,792.11	
		0.00356	Average Interest Rate
		0.03617576	Tax Credit Numerator
		0.003688786	Tax Credit Denominator
		9.806956251	Tax Credit Multiplier (TCM)
		\$256,643.00	Average Assessed Value (AAV)
		2516886.67	TCM x AAV
		0.00167	Tax Levy Rate (TLR)
		\$4,203.20	TCM x AAV x TLR = (TC)
		<hr/>	Cost per Single Family Residence - Tax Credit
		\$6,588.91	
		\$988.34	15% reduction (A)
		\$5,600.57	Calculated Single Family Fee Amount
		\$5,600	Recommended Fee Amount

Multi-Family Residence:

Elementary	Middle School	High School	Formula
\$14,371,000.00	\$5,299,604.00	\$3,906,070.00	Facility Cost
301	111	78	Additional Capacity
\$47,744.19	\$47,744.18	\$50,077.82	Cost per Student (CS)
0.165	0.089	0.087	Student Factor (SF)
\$7,877.79	\$4,249.23	\$4,356.77	CS x SF
\$200.40	\$200.40	\$200.40	Boeck Index
90.00	117.00	130.00	OSPI Sq Ft
59.76%	59.76%	59.76%	State Match Eligibility %
\$1,778.42	\$1,247.05	\$1,354.47	State Match Credit (SM)
\$6,099.37	\$3,002.18	\$3,002.30	CS x SF - SM
<hr/>			Cost per Multi-Family Residence
		\$12,103.85	
		0.00356	Average Interest Rate
		0.03617576	Tax Credit Numerator
		0.003688786	Tax Credit Denominator
		9.806956251	Tax Credit Multiplier (TCM)
		\$55,262.00	Average Assessed Value (AAV)
		541952.02	TCM x AAV
		0.00167	Tax Levy Rate (TLR)
		\$905.06	TCM x AAV x TLR = (TC)
		<hr/>	Cost per Multi-Family Residence - Tax Credit
		\$11,198.79	
		\$1,679.82	15% reduction (A)
		\$9,518.97	Calculated Multi-Family Fee Amount
		\$5,800	Recommended Fee Amount