



proud past, promising future

**AGENDA
DEVELOPMENT and ENGINEERING ADVISORY BOARD**

Thursday, February 2, 2017

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 • DEAB Work Session Updates • Review upcoming events • DEAB member announcements 	2:30	15 min	Wriston
2. Dedications of Open Space, Critical Areas, Undevelopable Remnant Lands, and Stormwater Tracts	2:45	30 min	Boening
3. Tidemark Replacement Updates	3:15	30 min	Snell/Brown
4. DEAB Annual Report and 2017/2018 Work Plan	3:45	30 min	Hardy/Wriston
5. Public Comment	4:15	15 min	All

Next DEAB Meeting:

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

Agenda:
TBD



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 Work Session – Clark County Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan – Wednesday, Feb 8, 10:00 a.m.

BOCC Work Session – Overview of Homeless Crisis Response System in Clark County – Wednesday, Feb 15, 11:00 a.m.

BOCC Work Session – Clark County Schools – Wednesday, Feb 22, 10:30 a.m.

PC Work Sessions and Hearings

PC Work Session – Prohibit Nuisance Fowl Within the Urban Growth Boundary of the City of Vancouver – Thursday, Feb 2, 5:30 p.m.

PC Hearing – Prohibit Nuisance Fowl Within the Urban Growth Boundary of the City of Vancouver – Thursday, Feb 16, 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
December 1, 2016
2:30 p.m.-4:30 p.m.
Public Service Center

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

Board members not in attendance:

County staff: Greg Shafer, Mark McCauley, Julie Olson, Marty Snell, Rod Swanson

Public: Steve Madsen with Aho Construction

Meeting called to order: 2:32

By: Don Hardy

Administrative Actions

- Introductions
- Review/Adopt minutes: Minutes were approved with the following correction: page two first full paragraph fourth sentence should read "Ellinger added that it is easier and quicker if items come in Land Use packages."
- Review upcoming events
 - BOCC Work Sessions and Hearings
 - BOCC Work Sessions - every Wednesday at 9:00 AM. Check the county web site for current updates.
 - Work Session on January 18th at 10:30 AM will be a review of the vacant buildable land model. There are no Planning Commission work sessions or hearings scheduled in the month of January.
 - BOCC Hearings - every Tuesday at 10:00 AM except on the first Tuesday of the month which held at 6:00 PM.

Golemo requested more information regarding buildable land model. Shafer to contact Bob Pool and Planning Commission personnel and will get back to DEAB with details on the subject.

Golemo - is there comp plan adoption scheduled?

Hardy - Growth Management Supreme Court Hearing hosted at the BOCC hearing room Thursday, January 12th 9:00 AM. Some discussion regarding the hearing and process decision expected in early February.

McCauley – Friends of Clark County 30 minutes opening, Clark County Citizens United 30 opening, Clark County 80 minutes response, several representative speakers. After lunch break Friends of Clark County and CCCU each have 10 minutes to respond to Clark County's presentation. McCauley to email Golemo hearing schedule.

DEAB Member Announcements

- Howsley - Washington Supreme Court on December 29th Snohomish County vs. Pollution Control reversed a decision regarding stormwater. A conversation regarding impact on permit timelines, contingent vesting and other issues was held amongst the board members.

Election of Board Chair and Vice Chair

- Jeff Wriston nominated for Board Chair motion seconded and passed
- Steve Bacon nominated for Vice Chair motion seconded and passed

Jeff Wriston took over administration of the meeting.

Work Plan

Hardy and Wriston will work on the final document and will distribute.
Shafer to McCauley - last year looked at charter change as part of managers meeting with the board should we schedule? McCauley – I'm not doing those anymore so if you would like a work session we could do that.
Shafer – OK.

Date footer needs correction.

Odren comment – 1st paragraph

Description of board and number of members. After general discussion the verbiage should describe a total of ten (10) members, eight (8) members and two (2) at large. Bylaws will be referenced to assist with final verbiage. Mark McCauley approves all ten members, but two at large are recommended by the DEAB board.

Odren comment - page 2 under Development – Related Issues item 5

Believes the process is underway and started in 2016 and so the statement is a little misleading and needs to be corrected.

Odren comment - page 4 under DEAB 2016-/2017 action items item 8

Retaining walls at perimeter of developments has been struck and was not included in accomplishments and is been an extension of site plans and plat approval.

Bacon – We have that under other processes.

Odren – OK, that was it, those are fine as is.

Last one is final site plan process improvements as far as monitoring items I would like to keep that. I've been working with Susan on clarification on final site plans process, because we've been getting comments from the building department as final site plans related that are not really final site plan related. We need clarification on that and she (Susan) has been talking with Angie Merrill, Dave Maret and maybe Jim Muir. I haven't heard back from her (Susan) I will follow up and would like to keep that as a monitoring item.

Wriston to Odren – So on the final site plan process improvement is that closely related enough to the final plat?

Odren – No, they are separate.

Howsley – On page 3 under work plan suggestions items 1 and 2 diffidently keep them in. Economic Development (item 1) and Fee Reforms (item 2), but under proceedings and special work groups, such as projects and stack holder claims will end up covering those items.

Odren – They will, but those of us that will be on that committee will be coming back to DEAB and bring everyone up to speed.

Items on page 3 under 2017/2018 DEAB Work Plan Suggestions items 1 and 2 will remain in.

Howsley – Any other suggestions or comments, we talked about storm drains (voice fades out on recording and I can't make out what else Mr. Howsley says).

Odren - Last month we had infrastructure percent deduction as an action item and agreed to move it to a monitoring item. I don't see where that has made it to a monitoring item. I see were you've expanded on change number 2 under monitoring items, comprehensive plan update with focus on affordable housing etcetera... I have a note here that the comprehensive hearings board decision is something we should be monitoring.

Shafer – We typically target first quarter around March for board work session and how much time would you like on that.

Odren – We've been able to get through it in an hour, but we could have used more time. After a little general discussion an hour and half was agreed upon.

Golemo – Two questions: 1st - In our special work groups, two builder driven issues we've had this year are SFR stormwater plan and soil management we've kind of covered in stormwater review, but I think we should stress what a stormwater committee was; and it was for SFR stormwater plans and soil amendments. We should probably put that in our accomplishments as well.

2nd - Corner lots and site distance and we have that on here, but we should probably add site distance and add that to our accomplishments, but tentatively added it to accomplishments, because we had committee we made recommendations it's still waiting for the next biannual code, but I think we need to stay on top of it, because there is such a time period between the recommendation and the biannual.

Howsley reiterating; Recommendation to the board regarding site distance from the subcommittee.

Howsley to McCauley – If there is stuff we have not had that the board is interested in us monitoring as well that's another topic we can add on?

McCauley – Yes, we can do midyear revisions as well.

Gaither – Last month we talked about bonding certain building permits. Would that be something

that would go on here? We did make a recommendation just not sure what we do with that now.

Snell – There is a meeting tomorrow.

Gaither – Does it go on our work plan or not?

Odren – Yes, I think we need to keep track of it, because once it's completed next year it will say; provided input per recommendations and provided input for revisions to bonding.

Shafer – I think our effort is to try and make the spring code amendments updates.

Snell – confirmed. The discussion we had in December was beyond just model homes, it was about allowing final site improvements in a subdivision to be on going as you actually pull the permits so there are a number of things around bonding for final improvements and still allow home construction to occur. It may be some give and take if you want a build center a bond may not be the answer you might need something other than that, might give someone credit or an escrow account or something that more certain, we don't want to tap bonding companies we want to go through those hoops. We'll have that discussion tomorrow and we'll map out somethings in the next couple of months and get something before the next biannual code.

Odren ...and that's specifically residential building permits on plats.

Golemo - Is it specific to subdivision? Are site plans applicable also? For example you develop a 40 acre site and you want to get started with a particular vertical building do you deliver the whole thing at the same time? Right now you can concurrently build on a second improvement at the same time you're building the project. A lot of times you can't get a building permit before the engineering is approved. So two separate topics?

Gather – Yes.

Snell – Bonding is specific to subdivision statute.

Hardy – I'll do a refresh on that (the work plan) and send it back out.

Gunther – I have a comment on the work plan item 10 related to road mods needs to be more correct "these are almost, if not always, approved". We've had road mods denied somewhat routinely.

A general discussion of different types of road mods and which are generally approved with noncontroversial items.

Shafer – We can take a look at it; we already have a tiered approach where we have a minor, a technical and maybe revisit certain other reoccurring cases where it clearly a minor if it belongs at all.

Odren – and I know that with some of those are co-riders (for lack of a better term) we simply just need to address it in our project narrative, but we still need to fill out the application for road modification those are the free ones I believe?

Shafer – Or a minimal fee, maybe \$150 if it's a minor road mod.

Odren – OK, whereas with a more technical road modification application we have to have a separate write up with exhibits potentially.

Shafer – Yes.

Odren – Stamped and signed by an engineer.

Shafer – Yes, a full report.

Odren – I just want to make sure we don't go back and somehow make it more complicated, because we have to address it anyway in our project narrative and if that's all it takes I think we're there, but it's just the fact that we have to fill out another form.

Bacon – Administratively if there are things that are rubber stamp approvable then the code should just allow them why would the code not be written to not allow something that is always just rubber stamped. If there are certain situations that these things come up and it's oh yeah that's just the way we always deal with these why is it not an issue of a code modification and allow it out right rather than go through the process of a road modification for something that's going happen regardless.

Odren – In staff's defense, correct me if I'm wrong even the no brainers go to road mod committee?

Shafer – Not the minor ones, the technical ones do.

Odren – OK, at least I would think it would give them the chance to see if there are alternatives driveway spacing, access to arterials when there is no other access available. I think it's just the situation at hand, why wouldn't we have to fill out an application, because there are certain code sections that we write up saying this is how we are meeting or not meeting it, but we're coming really close and hopefully staff has the latitude to be able to say, yes you're right you're meeting the intent of the code.

Bacon – I guess I remember when we were talking about it and it was the difference of two and three house on a private driveway and they always approved it.

Shafer – Then we got that changed and that's the direction we went.

Odren - That is what we're here to do and if there are other ones we can identify we might as well bring them before the board and purpose the changes to staff.

Bacon – There are certain things like flag lots that the driveway facing can't be standard why not have an exemption for flag lots that are right next to one another so you don't have to go through the process those types of things.

Hardy – I think if there is a black and white part of this perhaps... (Hardy is cut off by Bacon)

Bacon – It has to be pretty black and white and easy to describe otherwise you're going to start getting into the sort of fits it. It has to be fairly black and white to be a blanket exemption.

Hardy – It's discretionary, but it's something we might suggest looking at other jurisdictions if

you're not going through a road mod what you're describing is the project narrative giving staff a chance to look at it and make a determination and that might be the point some things are absolutely are a road mod some are in the middle some are every single time.

Jeff – So do we want to make change to that language or are we comfortable with the language that is in there?

Odren – We can take a look at it, for instance access to arterials if the only punch out you have is on an arterial we should not have to go through it (the road mod process) period.

It was determined that the subject of road modifications and the language in the code would be looked at in a future meeting.

Odren – There's another item to be added to the agenda.

Shafer – Yes, Dean Boening ask for time his topic is "Dedication of open space critical areas, underdeveloped lots and stormwater tracks". I think its underutilized lands and stormwater tracks

Golemo - What does he do?

McCauley – What they are concerned about is; is it has been the county's practice to routinely except slivers of land that are excess to a development. They are frequently hard to get too and we get complaints about maintenance. We have no use for the slivers of land we take and so we're going to review our practice. We're likely not going to take those slivers of land anymore, because we're under cost pressures and don't want to maintain land that has no beneficial use to the county, so they wanted to take that to the county council, but I wanted all of you to hear about it before hand.

Wriston – In the county's opinion these are nonfunctional pieces of land?

McCauley – Yes, pieces of land we have no use for.

Golemo – Is it mandated by code that we have those slivers?

Mark – They are created through the course of development and I don't know how that occurs.

Odren – It was our understanding that left over land or open space was dedicated to the HOA?

McCauley – We've got a bucket load of these things and we'll have examples for you and can probably tell you how we came to own them.

Odren & Golemo – That would be helpful.

Wollam – There are smaller projects or certain projects that don't necessarily have an HOA established and in those instances I can see this taking place and I think there would be some kind of process for the count to review so that if it is a benefit to parks or whatever they have a chance to review and consider before passing.

Wriston – There is a lot of confusion between jurisdictions right now, not Clark County I believe that are requiring 25% parks or whatever and you can use a certain percentage for stormwater and you can use it for this or not that. I know Ridgefield gone that way, Washougal, Camas.

That's not the issue here it's more the leftover (slivers of land). That's not the issue we're talking about here, it's more the leftovers.

The subject of leftover pieces of land will be added for February.

Wollam – Is there any consideration to nonprofit entities may have an interest (in the land slivers) in it and maybe those parties aren't in formed. If there is an open piece and if it ties in with something else maybe they could be gifted to them. If someone contacted the county with a piece of land and the county isn't interested in maybe other entities could be referred to see if they have interest.

Gaither – (example of leftover sliver) When 88th Street was widened there was a parcel that was bisected with the high power voltage line right along 88th Street the same owner owned a 5 or 10 acre parcel when 88th Street was widened it left a sliver on one side of the easement was undevelopable non-useful so what does the own do with that piece. If the county doesn't want maintain a small parcel, but that's what the owner is left with. That's what I'm in visioning as the challenge. Who would want it?

McCauley – In a case like that if the county had to undertake the effort to put in some public infrastructure and we take land for the infrastructure and we rendered the remainder useless we should probably buy the remainder. We've got the make the citizen whole one way or another.

Snell – BPA line and remnants of lines are all together a different ball park though.

Mark – We have slivers and remnants in the road fund and we try to those the adjacent landowners, but frequently the say no thanks my assessed value is going to go up and I don't want to mow the extra piece, so we're stuck holding the bag on many of those things.

Snell– This year we're going to be converting all building permits types into the new system and will probably in the fall start working on our business requirements and analysis around land use, engineering and environmental, so when would DEAB want to hear the plan for this year's Posse presentation?

Snell to check with Posse personnel and will get back to DEAB members.

Public Comments

By: Steve Madson with Aho Construction

2017 will probably be the biggest year in a decade for our market in Clark County and I wanted to tell you how much I appreciate you guys and this as a great venue to get our issues out and if you ever want to add a production builders position to the membership roster he would accept. I do see this as productive venue to bring our issues forward including stormwater the way it was worked out was extremely helpful to us and bonding issues. In at least one instance we were able to proceed more quickly.

Gaither – What in particular was helpful about the way the stormwater was worked out?

Madson – With us particularly the way 385 resolution was worked out and the work Rod Swanson did.

There was some general discussion about details between resolution 385 and 386.

Steve Madson – (Continuation of Public Comment) The bonding issue is going to be potentially very valuable to our business the level of production that we want to do under a bond, the partnership with the Parks Department of course is a big deal for us, we've been extremely frustrated over the last years in terms of how we have not been able to provide an economical park product with the county. There's a lot of inertia in the process, we talk about it already as far as what can be included in a park what prescriptiveness measures how much flexibility, discretion there's a lot of things production developments can do that may or may not be economical or may or may not be in the better interest of the county right now we don't feel like there is a way to store that there's not a good set of rules and we really look forward to participating in that.

Process improvements, what we're experiencing we have made some gains in the permitting process. A lot of coding interpretation or implementation issues at the inspection level. My goal would be as we go forth in process improvements would be to make sure we go all the way down to the inspection level. We had the stormwater committee, but there still seems to be some issues out there. It seems like inspection could be brought into the process.

Snell – We've experienced a lot of turnover with staff, we have several new inspectors coming on board that there is always a spell were we have to build on consistence, so we have not had a stable crew of staff to establish that and we've had no lead inspector to attend to the issue of consistency. We are hiring these new positions Jim Muir is going to be looking at another lead inspector whose focus is going to be on consistency with inspections across the board, we have not had that in the recent past hopefully by the summer months we have staff and a lead in place that can help with that. I have been out looking at some of these sights and even with production builders given the sights and crews they have and the skill set some of these folks have its super nuts out there.

Steve Madson – Frankly we're in the same spot you are everything is going crazy and we're hiring whoever we can hire. I'm not pining it on staff I'm just saying it seems there is stuff that can done to make sure everyone stays on the same page more often.

Snell – I've overheard and been part of some recent discussions about some townhouses products that seem to have similar challenges with building of firewalls and separation if there is something you see as pervasive that is across the spectrum let us know.

Steve Madson – I just wanted to make sure the implementation component doesn't get lost in the process, this group does great work.

Additional Comment

Gaither – On a technical to the practical, from the technical side that we do I want to acknowledge staff's participation in good faith effort is to really find solutions, because at the end of the day at least for me, why I'm here, is probably why most of us are here is we all know folks in the community that struggle to find affordable housing it's not necessarily us, but it's people we know. The little technical things we deal with have practical application in the work place and in the field and in the community. I want thank staff and Mark (McCauley) for being here today and acknowledge the collaborative environment which is as good as I've experienced with staff as I've experienced with consultants. Everyone has differences of opinion, but at the end of the day I find staff is on the same page. The practical part is rather than have housing exceed incomes by a factor of two it's a factor of one point five we do everything possible to keep housing affordable in

a market place that is just relentless in increasing costs and pushing things to an unaffordable level. That's why I'm here and looking forward to 2017. It's the final connection point from the bureaucracy to the home owner with the staff we have real influence and opportunity.

Wriston – Adjourned meeting.

Meeting adjourned: 3:36

Meeting minutes prepared by: Kristi Mollman

Reviewed by: Greg Shafer



CLARK COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

DRAFT POLICY STATEMENT

Dedications of Open Space, Critical Areas, Undevelopable Remnant Lands, and Stormwater Tracts

Approved by:
Effective Date:
Revision Date:
File Name:

Purpose:

To define a legally sound and consistent policy for accepting or denying proposed dedication of open-space tracts, critical-areas tracts, oversized stormwater tracts, or remnant tracts of undevelopable land to Clark County by development project proponents.

Intent

This policy provides Clark County control over, and compensation for, conveyance of lands that the County would not otherwise seek to own, and that require significant maintenance expenditures from county revenues.

Responsibilities & Affected Parties of Clark County Public Works

This policy primarily affects staff in several Public Works divisions, including Clean Water, Development Engineering and Parks, as well as the Real Property Services section within the Engineering & Construction division. Responsibility for maintaining this policy rests with the Clean Water Division Manager, the Engineering and Construction Division Manager, the Real Property Services Manager, the Development Engineering Manager, the Parks Manager and the Legacy Lands Manager, under direction of the Public Works Director.

Final Authority

The final authority regarding this policy rests with the County Manager.

Background

Land development regularly results in a variety of "left-over" undeveloped land areas. These may take the form of undevelopable critical areas, remnant land slivers not large enough to accommodate additional building lots, and other unusable areas.

Developers traditionally have disposed of these areas by dedicating them to Clark County. In some cases entire tracts are dedicated as open space or wetlands. In others, remnant slivers are tacked onto stormwater tracts and dedicated as part of the stormwater facilities.

Legacy Lands, Clean Water and Parks have generally been recipients of these dedications, and in some cases there are valid reasons to accept or even desire these tracts. However, in many cases these lands represent poor-quality habitat or disconnected islands of land with little value for habitat or to the public. Historically, such dedications have been accepted as a matter of course, with no input from the divisions that are ultimately responsible for ongoing maintenance and with little regard for the true cost of accepting them.

In many cases, unwanted dedications result in significant maintenance costs in response to public complaints about vegetation growth, fire hazards, tree fall, and use of the areas by homeless individuals.

County maintenance of these unused county lands is limited due to funding constraints and statutory limitations on the use of Clean Water fee revenue and Legacy Lands maintenance funding. Because these dedicated tracts are often not stormwater facilities, it is difficult to justify spending Clean Water stormwater fee dollars to maintain them. In the case of Legacy Lands, maintenance/management spending is limited by state code to land acquired with conservation futures revenues and in an amount not to exceed 15% of the prior year's conservation futures property tax revenue. This amount is insufficient to properly manage the inventory of valuable and purposefully acquired legacy properties. It is also questionable whether such funds may be spent on lands acquired without a commitment of conservation futures funds. In the case of Parks, costs to maintain such parcels are included in the general fund appropriations.

Practice Provisions

1) *Open-space, critical area, and remnant tract dedications*

If an applicant desires to dedicate unused property to Clark County, the following provisions will be considered before any decision is made.

Acceptance or denial of open-space, critical area, and remnant tract dedications will be at the discretion of the County, as represented by the Clean Water Manager, Legacy Lands Manager, Parks Manager, and Real Property Services Manager, with approval of the Public Works Director.

The preferred approach is to establish acceptance or non-acceptance of proposed dedications during preliminary approval. With prior consent from Public Works, the decision may be deferred to final plat review. In either case, review must include an opportunity for comment by the above-listed managers or their designees. No tract dedications may be accepted without approval from the responsible manager(s) with the concurrence of the Public Works Director. Tract dedications approved in this manner will not require additional compensation from the applicant. The County shall not issue Park Impact Fee credits for such dedications, and such dedications do not relieve the landowner of the obligation to fully comply with all critical areas mitigation requirements for the subdivision.

Criteria for Acceptance

Tracts will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis and acceptance is at the discretion of the above-listed managers. Community Development staff should be consulted during evaluation of proposed critical areas dedications. Parcels most likely to be accepted include:

- Lands within or adjacent to planned or existing county greenways or trail systems
- Lands identified as priority acquisitions under Parks master plans or Legacy Lands acquisition plans
- Lands consisting primarily of identified high-quality habitat or Category I/II wetlands
- Lands that establish habitat connectivity between two or more larger parcels of protected habitat

If none of the above-listed managers choose to accept the proposed tract dedication, the applicant may still elect to dedicate the tract to Clark County but must compensate Public Works for the long-term maintenance costs of the property as follows:

- Applicant must provide up-front funding sufficient to maintain and manage the property over a 30-year period
- Required funding will be calculated as follows:
 - For each tract < 1.0 acre in size, the fee will be calculated as \$500/year* (fee = \$15,000)
 - For each tract 1.0 acre or larger, the fee will be calculated as \$500/acre/year
 - Example: for a 2.5 acre tract, the fee will be $500 \times 2.5 \times 30 = \$37,500$
- Public Works must be in receipt of full, one-time payment prior to plat recording

*estimated costs to maintain typical stormwater facilities over a 30-year lifespan range from \$1000 - \$2000/year. Anticipated costs to maintain open space and remnant tract dedications are lower, but include 3 to 4 visits per year for vegetation control, trash removal, complaint response, and other maintenance needs.

2) *Stormwater tract dedications*

If an applicant desires to dedicate stormwater tracts to Clark County, the following provisions will be considered before any decision is made.

- Stormwater tracts to be dedicated to Clark County must incorporate all functional treatment and flow control practices within the tract (whether above or below ground). Outfalls and associated conveyance are not required to be within the dedicated tract, but an easement must be provided to allow Clark County access to this infrastructure for inspection and maintenance.
- Any additional land included in the tract that is unneeded for stormwater treatment and flow control or access shall be minimal and may not exceed 25% of the functional stormwater facility area.
- For all storm facilities requiring fencing, the fencing shall conform to the boundary of the dedicated storm tract. Additional land area outside the fenced portion of the tract may not be dedicated to Clark County.

3) *Split parcels*

In no case may a single tract to be dedicated to Clark County be split into geographically separate areas. Each separate contiguous area must be a separate legal tract.



DEVELOPMENT and ENGINEERING ADVISORY BOARD

2016 Annual Report & 2017/2018 Work Plan

The Board of Clark County Commissioners (now, Board of County Councilors, BOCC) formed the Development and Engineering Advisory Board (DEAB) in late 2006. DEAB works with the County Manager, Community Development, Community Planning, Public Works, and Environmental Services to review process improvements, proposed code changes, and development fee strategies.

Although initially formed to focus on development engineering issues, the BOCC broadened DEAB's responsibilities in 2010 to cover the County's entire development and building activities. DEAB's bylaws are attached to this report.

The DEAB panel consists of ten members: three private-sector planners or engineers, one construction contractor, one public-sector planner or engineer, one land developer, one Building Industry Association representative, one associated with commercial or industrial development, and two other professionals associated with development. **The County Manager is authorized to select DEAB members.**

During 2016, one additional member, Mike Nieto, was added to represent commercial and industrial development with his term starting on September 1, 2016. The 2016 roster included:

Chair	Don Hardy	BergerABAM
Vice-Chair	Jeff Wriston	Moss Wriston
	Mike Odren	Olson Engineering, Inc.
	Ott Gaither	Gaither Homes, LLC
	Eric Golemo	SGA Engineering, PLLC
	Terry Wollam	RE/MAX
	James Howsley	Jordan Ramis PC
	Steve Bacon	Clark Regional Wastewater District
	Andrew Gunther	PLS Engineering
	Mike Nieto	Catworks Construction

2016 Accomplishments

The past year was a busy and challenging one for DEAB. The following is a summary of DEAB's accomplishments.

Code Revisions

1. DEAB has been provided regular input on the Comprehensive Plan updates. DEAB provided input and raised concerns related to population growth assumptions, calculations of the buildable land supply, and assumed infrastructure deduction percentage.
2. DEAB has been provided regular updates and has commented on and participated in the Stormwater Ordinance updates.
3. DEAB initiated discussions with staff regarding potential revisions to regulations for retaining walls at the perimeter of developments and code text changes were adopted by the BOCC.
4. DEAB provided suggestions on policy and code changes/improvements.
5. Single family residential stormwater review criteria and soil amendment provisions.
6. Recommendations to the Board of County Councilors regarding corner lots and site distance.

Development-Related Issues

1. Received an update and participated in discussion regarding updates to the Parks' Master Plan.
2. Expressed continued concern over development review staff's ability to meet timelines and have sufficient staff and resources with the increase in development activity.
3. Reviewed proposed delays in the payment of residential impact fees. Discussed pending state legislation that would assist builders by deferring these payments to the time that the impact is created.
4. Provided comments, and data for substantiation, to Clark County Community Planning that the current infrastructure percent deduction for residential development in the Comprehensive Plan does not reflect the actual amount of land set aside for infrastructure (roads and stormwater facilities).
5. Coordinated with County staff and created a revised Shoreline Exemption submittal process for low-impact construction (e.g., utility repairs, etc.).
6. Provided recommendations on implementation of park impact fee rates.
7. Provided recommendations to allow bonding for final site improvements within residential subdivisions.

Process Improvements

1. Worked on committee with County staff to improve the Final Plat process.
2. Provided input to and requested improvements to the Final Site Plan process.
3. Continued to encourage review of potential changes to the Plat Alteration process to identify ways the process could be simplified.
4. Supported an all-electronic final engineering review process.

Technology

1. Received a staff update on County website revisions and provided comments on potential adjustments.

2. General discussion of technology trends in the development and building construction industries.

Participation on Special Work Groups

In addition to the regular monthly meetings, DEAB members assisted on several special working groups:

- Stormwater Committee
- Final Plat Process Committee
- Retaining Wall Committee
- Corner Lot Driveway Committee
- Single Family Residential Stormwater Review and Soil Amendments
- Project Delivery Stakeholder Committee to start in 2017

Economic Development

DEAB continues to be an active supporter for economic development in Clark County.

2017/2018 DEAB Work Plan Suggestions

DEAB looks forward to continuing to discuss the following proposed top priorities with the BOCC:

1. Economic Development. DEAB could continue to assist with the BOCC's commitment to economic growth and development processes that encourage job growth.
2. Fee Reforms. Fees include fee holiday programs, impact fees, concurrency, and development and building permit fees. Are fee reforms and current practices successful in generating job growth?
3. Process Improvements. DEAB could continue to provide guidance in the following areas:
 - a. Staffing levels and resource strategies as development activity increases.
 - b. Customer service enhancement.
 - c. Continued LEAN efficiency implementation for other development review processes.
 - d. Early review of proposed policy and code changes, possibly in a work session format to provide an early dialogue with staff.
 - e. Tidemark (permit software) replacement project and other technology.
4. Affordable Housing.

DEAB is in agreement with the following 2017/2018 work plan:

DEAB 2017/2018 action items (no particular order):

1. SEPA thresholds and exemptions.
2. Engineering/stormwater reviews/requirements for Single Family Residences.
3. Plat Alteration process – look at ways to simplify where allowed by state law.
4. Continuing encouragement for concurrent review processes and other application processing procedures to expedite projects.
5. Review County policies and regulations with regard to driveway locations on corner lots.
6. Encourage the use of technology where applications can be made, such as inspections, meetings, etc.
7. Streamline engineering reviews e.g., final engineering submitted with Type I Post Decision Review process.

8. Grading Permit process improvements for early grading permits.
9. Accessory dwelling units in rural zones.
10. Review the need for road modifications; that are minor and non-technical that are almost, if not always, approved.
11. Partnerships with Parks Department on development of parks within subdivisions.

DEAB 2017/2018 monitoring items:

1. Final Plat process improvements (some continuing committee work but primarily monitoring effectiveness/implementation of process improvements identified by committee work in 2016).
2. Comprehensive Plan update with focus on affordable housing and use of development code tools (infill lots, Accessory Dwelling Units and other incentives).
3. Comprehensive Plan Review Update based on Hearings Board Decision.
4. Monitoring required water rights and exempt wells based on the Hirst Case.
5. Fee Holiday program to establish a “cost per job.”
6. Vacant Buildable Lands model.
7. Infrastructure percentage deduction.
8. Tidemark replacement.
9. Single Family Residential LEAN process.
10. Staffing levels in all departments and ability to maintain high level of service.
11. Stormwater Ordinance update. Monitor any issues with new ordinance and Manual, in light of recent Washington Supreme Court decision.
12. Residential building permits and unfinished plats.
13. Reducing Permit Center wait times.

DEAB looks forward to continuing their successful collaboration with Clark County.

Don Hardy
2016 DEAB Chair

Attachments:
DEAB Bylaws



Pony Express Update

Development and Engineering Advisory Board



Topics

- Project overview...
- Successes so far...
- In the works...
- Next steps
- Overall project health
- Questions

Project Overview...

- Multi-Phase, Multi-Year project
 - Phase 1
 - Pilot - New Home Construction
 - Phase 2
 - Building
 - Fire permits
 - Phase 3
 - PW Development Engineering
 - PW Development Engineering Inspections
 - PW Forestry
 - Land Use Planning and Wetland/Habitat
 - Phase 4
 - Code Enforcement
 - Animal Complaint / Pet Licensing
 - Community Planning
 - Phase 5
 - Electronic Plan Review

Successes so far...

June 2016

- ✓ New Home Construction
 - Pilot project, Lean, Subdivision in Urban Area
 - Mobile Inspections
 - On Line

October 2016

- ✓ Mechanical and Plumbing –Residential
 - Quick Permit
- ✓ New Home Construction expansion
 - Open contractors
- ✓ IVR Inspection scheduling

January 2017

- ✓ Impact Fee Changes, system updates

In the works...

March 2017

- Fire Permits (6)**
 - User Acceptance Testing, Training
 - Mobile
 - IVR

- New Home Construction**
 - Single Family Residential in LMS
 - Subdivisions, Short Plats and Tax Lots
 - Expanded system users
 - Additional Reviews

November/December 2017

- All Building permits (22 remaining)**
 - Residential and Commercial

Next steps...

- ✓ Phase 1
 - Pilot - New Home Construction
- ☐ Phase 2
 - Building
 - Fire permits
- ☐ Phase 3 → Late Q4-2017 Preliminary Analysis
 - PW Development Engineering
 - PW Development Engineering Inspections
 - PW Forestry
 - Land Use Planning and Wetland/Habitat
- ☐ Phase 4 → Q1-2019
 - Code Enforcement
 - Animal Complaint / Pet Licensing
 - Community Planning
- Phase 5 → TBD
 - Electronic Plan Review

Overall Project Health...

Challenges

- Parallel systems
- Paper submittals still required
- Project team resources
- Project timeline

Opportunities

- Strong team of subject matter experts - SME's
- Excitement and anticipation
- Great partnership with our vendor
- Resource planning Phase 3

The background of the slide features three dark silhouettes of riders on horseback, moving from left to right. They are set against a bright, glowing yellow and orange light source, likely the sun, which creates a strong backlighting effect. The overall scene is hazy and atmospheric.

Questions?