



proud past, promising future

**PUBLIC WORKS
DEVELOPMENT ENGINEERING PROGRAM**

**AGENDA
DEVELOPMENT and ENGINEERING ADVISORY BOARD**

Thursday, December 1, 2016

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	Hardy
2. FLD Updates	2:45	30 min	Ellinger
3. Bonding Code Amendments	3:15	30 min	Madsen
4. Review and Update DEAB Annual Report and Work Plan	3:45	30 min	Hardy
5. Public Comment	4:15	15 min	All

Next DEAB Meeting:

Thursday, January 5, 2017
2:30 – 4:30 p.m.
Public Service Center
6th Floor, Training Room

Agenda:

DEAB Annual Report & Work Plan/Prep for 2017 Report



proud past, promising future

**PUBLIC WORKS
DEVELOPMENT ENGINEERING PROGRAM**

BOCC Work Sessions and Hearings

BOCC Work Session – every Wednesday at 9 a.m. *

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

BOCC Hearing – Sorenson Neighborhood Park Dedication and Ribbon Cutting – Saturday, Dec. 3, 1:30 p.m.

BOCC Work Session – County Obligations re: Water Availability – Wednesday, Dec 14, 9:00 a.m.

PC Work Sessions and Hearings

There are no Planning Commission Work Sessions or Public Hearings scheduled for the month of December, 2016

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
November 3, 2016
2:30 p.m.-4:30 p.m.
Public Service Center

Board members in attendance: Steve Bacon, Eric Golemo, Andrew Gunther, James Howsley, Mike Odren, Terry Wollam

Board members not in attendance: Mike Nieto, Jeff Wriston

County staff: Mark Boldt, Bridget Bashaw, Bill Bjerke, Susan Ellinger, Chuck Harmon, Vicki Kirsher, Laurie Lebowsky, Angie Merrill, Julie Olson, Greg Shafer, Nicole Snider, Rod Swanson

Public: Steve Madsen

Administrative Actions

- Introductions
- DEAB meeting is being recorded and the audio will be posted on the DEAB's website, we are using the microphones today to improve quality of recording.
- Review/Adopt minutes: Minutes were approved
- Review upcoming events
 - BOCC Work Session – every Wednesday at 9 a.m. Work sessions are frequently rescheduled; check with the BOCC's office to confirm date/time of scheduled meetings.
 - BOCC Hearing – every Tuesday at 10 a.m. except first Tuesday when the hearing is typically at 6 pm.
 - BOCC Hearing – Fire Marshall Inspection Program Fees – Tuesday, Nov 8, 10:00 a.m.
 - BOCC Work Session – 1. Vision for Park Capital Facility Plan 2. Park Impact Fees – Wednesday, Nov 9, 1:30 p.m.
 - BOCC Hearing – Stormwater Updates – Tuesday, Nov 22, 10:00 a.m. Minor changes to manual per Rod Swanson
 - PC Work Session – Revision to the Parks Capital Facilities Plan and Attendant Park Impact Fees – Thursday, November 3, 5:30 p.m.
 - PC Hearing – Revisions to the Parks Capital Facilities Plan & Attendant Park Impact Fees - Thursday, Nov, 17, 6:30 p.m.
 - Chair Boldt discussed that the fee waiver termination that will happen at end of year, one of the things in the resolution is if it needs to be replaced, might be change of service, or direct fees. Might save fees or time, and as this group knows, time is more important than anything. Chair Boldt and Councilor Olson are heading this up. The Project Delivery Stakeholder Group that will be created by the BOCC and requested that DEAB recommend two candidates that represent Land use law and multidisciplinary consultancy by Friday November 11. Chair Boldt stated this would be a 6 month project, anything is on the table. Please think about this and provide names, this will start in January 2017. Hardy offered some suggestions for the work. Mike Odren and Jamie Howsley both volunteered for the group. There will be a total of 12 that will make up the group; 8 from the community and 4 from the County. Question was asked if Chair Boldt and Councilor Olson would be in the room during these meeting or review the outcomes. They both stated that Councilor Olson would be there, she stated that they didn't want to do

it to just do it, we want to do it to have a meaningful output to the stakeholders. Howsley recommend choosing someone from the Planning commission to be part of the group. Shafer added that we are 100% supportive of this effort. Boldt added that there at least 3 mayors interested in the outcomes of this too, which could help us all.

- DEAB member announcements
- Golemo testified at the October 18th hearing regarding extensions, and it did pass. Also, the Single Family Residence Stormwater subcommittee is making progress and should have something to present to DEAB at the next meeting.
- Hardy suggested talking about vice chair, Jeff Wriston is chair for 2017. This will be the first item on the agenda for January.

FLD & Health Department Updates

Susan Ellinger discussed process improvement and consistencies; Chuck Harmon is the program manager overseeing drinking water and on-site programs. Bridget Bashaw works in Development Review along with Carla Sowder at Clark County Public Health. Goal is to improve such that communication and coordination are going better. In the land division process they recognize that there are times when a lot of the other work has gotten done the road and staff or applicant realized that they need Health Department reviews. In the case where they have onsite septic and wells; the key issues are making sure they have enough water, and have enough sanitary setbacks in their design. In the case where they have public water and sewer; there are still Public Health issues around if there were old septic systems and wells. Overall efforts are to get these issues addressed earlier in the process.

2 handouts provided. Bashaw presented that in 2003 there was agreement between Community Development and Public Health that there would be a standard procedure letter handed out with all the Development Reviews. This is not happening all of the time, new improvement is to make sure this letter is included at all Development Review Pre-application conference comments. Letter lets applicant know that they need to do a Health Department review. New process will require having the Health Department review completed applications as part of the fully complete process. This will allow Public Health staff to visit site and verify existing conditions; location of existing wells and septic systems.

Health Department comments need to be included in staff report to require septic envelopes and setbacks on plat. The new process to complete engineering review to verify septic and well will remain, just internal routing, to improve review process and eliminate bottleneck at final plat stage. CCPH will be on the same timeline as Land Use currently is on, existing conditions plan, is done as part of the development review stage. This will apply to all land use processes. Golemo stated; time matters, every day matters, the difference between 21 and 30 days is significant. Please try and reduce the time to 21 days.

Gaither thanked them for their time and for being responsive to his questions. Does this process apply to both a new project that is decommissioning wells and septic systems, and therefore going to public water and sewer? Or is this for a new construction site project that is going to install a septic system and drill a well? Bashaw replied that it is for both, the review process will be the same.

Hardy asked if this would also apply to Site Plan Review. Is there a way to expedite if the review has been done before, for example WSU Vancouver? Bashaw added this is something they can try to do, case by case. Hardy asked about wells used for irrigation under 5000 gallons a day that are exempt, is there a review process if they remain? Bashaw stated yes, there is an irrigation review process that would need to be completed for Fully Complete.

Ellinger added that this is not a counter complete item it will be part of the fully complete process, we are also looking at ways that submittals can be made at our office rather than having to go to the Health Department office. Gaither and Odren requested that the Health Department try and complete the review within 21 days not 30. Suggestion made that consultants do this at the pre-application stage to try and help applicants avoid delays.

Ellinger discussed the improvements to final plat process, pretty minor in nature, she will bring back to December meeting.

Prep of 2017 DEAB Annual Report

Shafer discussed process, consistent with last year County Manager McCaulay has expressed interest in a preview of the report. Invite him in January along with Department Directors, Henderson, Orjiako, and Snell. The presentation to the Board will likely be in the first quarter of next year. Tentative item for the December agenda. Shafer will email County Manager McCaulay and invite him to January meeting along with Department Directors.

Howsley brought the issue of water rights & wells, Spokane County has already reacted. There may be a work session in December on this. In the past all that was required to put in a new well was the ability to demonstrate that you had a factual need to get water requirement of 8.17. There is now another additional step in the process, you have to demonstrate that you legally are not impacting superior water right. Additional testing could be required and you may have to get a water rights attorney.

Hardy attended a presentation on this last week at the APA Oregon/Washington joint session, they discussed Ellensburg and superior rights. There are some areas that would simply not have water at all.

Swanson offered an explanation that the decision is a fundamental disagreement between water rights allocation law which just gives water to people without any concept of managing the resource and the growth management act which requires Counties and Cities to protect the resource. Example in Whatcom County; the surface water rights were no longer available, they were completely allocated and the County continued to allow exempt wells under the exemption and the state's water rights law was found to be in conflict with requirements under growth management. This is a big deal. Howsley stated there is potential for a moratorium. Big implications for Clark County. Orjiako added that there is a meeting in December on this issue, discussions have started. Discussion regarding whose has the rights.

New PIF Rates

Bill Bjerke the Parks Manager for Clark County & Laurie Lebowsky with Community Planning gave a presentation regarding the Capital Facilities plan, a major part of that is revising the Park Impact Fees. They will also give this presentation at the PC work session tonight. The Park Impact Fee had not been updated since 2003. The new rates are part of the Capital Facilities Plan that was adopted with the Comp Plan Update. During the deliberation for the comp plan update the Councilors indicated an interest in revisiting how the new fee rates were phased in. Staff did some research to determine how we could meet that requirement and per state law we can do that is through an out of cycle comp plan amendment. Which requires that we adopt it at the same time as the County adopts it budget, December 6, 2016.

A major component of a Capitol Faculties plan for parks is a level of surface standard, similar to transportation level of standards; traffic impact fees, and traffic studies. Parks work in a similar way, not as technical. The National standard is 10 acres of park per 1000 people; the County's adopted standard is 6 acres of park per 1000

people or 60% of the National standard. In Neighborhood parks we have 170 acres deficit or 67% of our adopted standard. In Community parks we are at 76% of our adopted standard. That is for acquisition.

Parks Advisory Board recommended phasing in the new fee rates over 3 years. That passed through the planning commission and the Board, alternative scenarios that were investigated in the consultant's report. There was interest in lessening the impact which is why we are discussing the alternatives including a 5 year step. Parks has acquired four properties this year, including Prairie Fields.

Question was asked if private parks count towards the standard, Bjerke stated they do not. Usually because they don't meet the standards. Golemo suggested giving credit for building parks, example he gave was an apartment complex that builds a small park. Currently the County does not give credits for private parks. Discussion followed after statement made that private sector can build parks for less. There are creative things that need to be looked at and considered.

Gaither stated that he hopes that there is some recognition that flexibility matters and options that have been presented matter because what we read in the newspaper nearly every day is that we have a housing and an affordability crisis. This is adding to that, we are pricing people out of home ownership. How can we justify a 100% increase in a park fee when the average household median income over the same period has gone up a third of that? Staff responded the increases are based on calculations based on the value of property, cost to construct parks, which have gone up dramatically. Fees have not changed since 2003.

Gaither suggested that DEAB make a motion to support the 5 year rollout of park impact fees scenario two. Golemo made a friendly amendment to look at areas that are not included; this could help the budget outfall. Bacon stated this is a work plan item. Wollam asked about the cost per acre, it helps to see that. Howsley added that the PIF districts are drawn tightly and land costs are higher in some of the districts with limited land available.

Motion made that DEAB support the 5 year rollout plan of park fee impact fee increase (scenario two), 20%.

Motion passed and approved.

2nd motion was made requesting the parks department include in the calculation used areas of private recreational facilities, churches, active open space, planned unit development parks, pocket parks and school properties. Consistent with the functional requirements of the park department.

Motion passed and approved

Public Comments

Steve Madsen discussed the letter he submitted regarding Bonding for model homes. Shafer stated that it was circulated to staff, including Chris Horne and Carolyn Heinges transportation manager and given that it is directly affected code would it not proceed through the code amendment process? Shafer will send to DEAB members. DEAB will review and comment. Add to agenda for December.

Meeting adjourned: 4:30pm
Meeting minutes prepared by: Nicole Snider
Reviewed by: Greg Shafer

Final Plat Submittal Requirements

The following checklist identifies information and documents to be included with each submittal package. **In order to accept an application, each numbered item must be submitted at the same time. Partial submittals will not be accepted.**

PACKAGE A

1. ___ Cover Sheet

Each submittal packet shall contain a cover sheet that contains the project name and applicant's name, address, email address, and phone number.

2. ___ Application Form

The application form shall be completed and original signed in ink by the applicant.

3. ___ Application Fee

The required **final plat review** fee shall accompany the application. The check is to be made payable to Clark County Community Development. We also accept credit cards and electronic checks.

Recording Fee (may also be paid at time of Final Mylar Submittal)

4. ___ Development Decision Approval

A copy of the approved preliminary plan/**decision and any post decision review plans/decisions.**

5. ___ Proposed Final Plat

The proposed final plan shall include:

Subdivision/Short Plat name;

Legend;

Location, including one quarter (1/4) section, section, township, range, and, as applicable, donation land claim and/or subdivision;

Boundary survey;

Lot, block and street right of way and centerline dimensions;

Street names;

Scale, including graphic scale, north arrow and basis of bearing;

Identification of areas to be dedicated;

Surveyor's certificate, stamp, date and signature;

Signature blocks to include County Engineer, County Auditor, Board of County Council Chairperson, County Assessor, Clark County Public Health (if septic or well systems are proposed), and the Responsible Official;

Special setbacks;

Private easements;

Utility easements;

Walkways;

Parcel area of lots in square footage **for developments in the urban area and acreage for developments in the rural area;**

6. ___ Mathematical Closures

7. ___ Legal Description

Legal description of the boundary which has been certified by the land surveyor, with seal and signature.

8. ___ Submittal copies

- Four (4) full-size copies of proposed final plat; plus
- One (1) full-size copy of proposed final plat for **each** of the following reviews, if applicable:
 - Water Purveyor
 - Sewer Purveyor
 - Environmental
 - Public Health
- Electronic copy of the proposed final plat submitted via email or on a CD.**

PACKAGE B

The submittal package shall contain all information and documents identified below. Partial submittals will not be accepted.

1. ___ Applicant's Response to First Review Comments (if applicable)

2. ___ Legal Documentation

Legal documentation must include, but is not limited to:

- Private road maintenance agreement **if applicable;**
- Conservation covenant, **if applicable;**
- Latecomer's Agreement, if applicable;**
- Copy of recorded public and private off-site easements and right-of-way dedications for required improvements (if applicable);
- Developer Covenants to Clark County;
- Other legal documents required in preliminary land division decision;

3. ___ Supporting Documentation

- Site plan for certain residential developments (e.g., narrow lots, townhomes, Highway 99, etc.), if applicable;**

4. ___ Submittal copies

- Four (4) full-size copies of proposed final plat;
- Electronic copy of the proposed final plat submitted via email or on a CD.**

PACKAGE C

The submittal package shall contain all information and documents identified below. Partial submittals will not be accepted.

1. ___ Applicant's Response to Review Comments (if applicable)

2. ___ Supporting Documentation

Supporting documentation must include but is not limited to:

- Utility letter(s) **from water and sewer providers verifying services have been installed, inspected and approved;**
- Verification of required landscaping installation **with copy of approved plans;**

- Home Owners Association/Conditions, Covenants and Restrictions (if applicable);
- Other documents required in preliminary land division decision;

3. ___ Submittal copies

- Four (4) full-size copies of proposed final plat;
- Electronic copy of the proposed final plat submitted via email or on a CD.**

FINAL MYLAR SUBMITTAL

Upon compliance of the final plat with all conditions of preliminary approval, the applicant will be asked to submit the final plat mylar for signature and recording. No mylars will be accepted until requested by county staff.

1. ___ Legal Documentation

- Certification for platting from a title company;
- Dedication of plat;
- Treasurer's certificate;

2. ___ Supporting Documentation

- Receipt for payment of concurrency **modeling** fees;

3. ___ Final Plat Mylar

- One (1) full-size copy of final plat;

4. ___ Recording Fee (if not paid at time of Package A submittal)

CCC 40.260.175 shall be amended to add the following section (C):

C. Residential building permits for any additional individual residences may be issued on lots within recorded final plats prior to the construction of all required public improvements subject to the following conditions:

1. Performance bonds or financial guarantees required under Section 40.540080(B) equal to 125% of the estimated cost to complete the required infrastructure improvements have been accepted and approved by the County Engineer for those public and/or private infrastructure improvements which have not been constructed;

2. The decision to approve and accept any proposed bond or financial guarantee under this section shall be at the complete discretion of the County Engineer;

3. The bond or financial assurance shall include an itemization of all public and/or private infrastructure improvements to be constructed and shall specify that all such improvements shall be constructed within 18 months of the recording of the plat.

4. No occupancy permit shall issue prior to the completion of all required infrastructure improvements as identified in the bond or financial assurance itemization of improvements.