



proud past, promising future

**PUBLIC WORKS
DEVELOPMENT ENGINEERING PROGRAM**

**AGENDA
DEVELOPMENT and ENGINEERING ADVISORY BOARD**

Thursday, June 1, 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 • Review upcoming events • DEAB member announcements 	2:30	15 min	Wriston
2. Comp Plan/Updates on Appeals and Amendments	2:45	30 min	Orjiako/Euler
3. Fee Waiver/Resolution	3:15	30 min	Snell
4. Public Comment	3:45	30 min	All

Next DEAB Meeting:

Thursday, July 6, 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 Hearing – Regional Transportation Council meeting – Tuesday, June 6, 4:00 p.m.

BOCC Work Session – Fee Waiver Pipeline Projects; 2016 Comp Plan Remand – Wednesday, June 7, 9:00 a.m.

BOCC Hearing – Franchise Agreement w/WA State re: Installation of Pipe in State ROW – Tuesday, June 13, 10:00 a.m.

BOCC Hearing – 2016 Comp Plan Update Remand & Interim Ordinance on Land Divisions on Rural & Resource Lands – Tuesday, June 20, 10:00 a.m.

PC Work Sessions and Hearings

PC Work Session – Annual Reviews & Dockets– Thursday, June 1, 5:30 p.m.

PC Hearing – CPZ2017-00019 Wiard: A proposal to amend the comprehensive plan and zoning map from a designation of Mixed Use (MX) to Industrial (IL) on the following parcel: 200105000; CPZ2017-00020 Mill Plain Commercial: A proposal to amend the comprehensive plan and zoning map from a designation of Urban Low (R1-6) to Commercial (C-3) on the following parcel: 200124000; and CPZ2017-00022 Riverview Asset Mgmt. & Trust: A proposal to amend the comprehensive plan and zoning map from a designation of Industrial (Business Park) to Urban Low with R1-6 zoning and one acre of Commercial with Neighborhood Commercial zoning on the following parcel(s): 200305000; 200326000 and 200355000 – Thursday, June 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

May 4, 2017

2:30 p.m.-4:30 p.m.

Public Service Center

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

County staff: Marty Snell, Nikki Olsen, Dean Shadix, Ali Safayi, Greg Shafer

Public: Nick Flagg, Brian Kelly, Larry McDonald, Seth Halling, David Tetz,

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. *

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

- BOCC Work Session – Fee Waiver Pipeline Projects Follow-Up Discussion – **Rescheduled for Wednesday, June 7, 11:00 a.m.**
- BOCC Work Session – Cybersecurity Focus in Clark County Government – Wednesday, May 24, 10:30 a.m.

PC Work Sessions and Hearings

- PC Work Session – TIP Evaluation System and 2016 Comp Plan Remand – Thursday, May 4, 5:30 p.m.
- PC Hearing – Open Public Meetings Act & Public Records Act and 2016 Comp Plan Remand – Thursday, May 18, 6:30 p.m.
- Wetland and Habitat Staffing Request and Fee Modifications – Wednesday, May 10, 9:30 a.m.

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

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

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

DEAB member announcements

- None

Utility Coordination - Development Joint Trench/SFR Utility Setbacks – Dean Shadix, Nick Flagg, Larry McDonald

- Shadix gave an overview of issues with the Utility Coordination process. Due to new Stormwater requirements facing new developments, it is important to research a better process for the Joint Trench Installations for subdivisions; problematic situation for erosion control, pervious sidewalks and pervious pavement. Need to explore better ways to handle and shorten the timeframe to protect infrastructure under construction. Conversations led to utility issues throughout the development process. Brought to DEAB to share good suggestions to better serve everyone's needs. Top soil amendment issue is a direct impact on utilities. Previously discussed setbacks and driveways from intersections and how to better accommodate those; narrowing those lots creates a greater impact on the need for space and the ability to provide the necessary separation of space. Working to address the needs of the utilities coming in later. From Stormwater and Transportation perspective, dealing with the need to protect the infrastructure before signing off on project. Current way of constructing developments needs to change for development to be successful; find better ways to work through construction process and make sure needs are met. Utilities are willing and committed to work with DEAB to explore opportunities to provide a better overall coordination process.
- Nick Flagg with PUD spoke about the conversations that started in Joint Trench meetings regarding Stormwater and its impact on the construction process. PUD, Century Link, NW Natural Gas and Comcast met and discussed current development practices. Flagg explained their process for new developments:
 - With commercial sites, the developer, investor or contractor will contact PUD's office. Utilities get the information from the developer too late in the process: things might already be approved, ready

to break ground, but PUD is just hearing about it. There could be facilities that need to be relocated. Newcomers are unaware and find it will be expensive to move poles, etc. They have already started construction and now have clearance issues and might be in violation if they proceed. PUD may stop construction because they received the design from the developer too late.

- On subdivision and multi-family side, there are two approved design contractors, Prairie Electric or Cascade, for developers to go through. Depending on how busy things are, PUD might not get the job early enough. PUD would like more involvement earlier in the process to give developers the ability to plan for moving things if needed and will work better for everyone.

For sub-divisions or multi-family, PUD is responsible for coordinating frontage relocation; Prairie Electric or Cascade does the underground or new construction design. Utilities review equipment location and service quality. Civils have preliminary or approved plans for construction, may have broken ground and utilities are still in design phase. The General Contractor is doing work that possibly exposes fixed objects in right-of-way to the development. Is an eyesore, expense and public issue. PUD would a better, earlier process.

With civil work design, some clearances with setbacks - especially flag lots, zero lot line construction or private roads - the room for facilities is limited. If layout of a structure changes, the transformer can end up in the front yard. If PUD is involved with the civil layout of the development they can find space for facilities that is more acceptable and still serve everybody's needs.

Frontage relocations are usually the bigger expense. There are impacts with clear zone i.e. travel lanes and speed. Depending on the project it can involve 3rd party easements from adjacent property owners. There are certain design assumptions during the design phase and utilities want to allow for flexibility and transparency in the construction process.

Wollam asked how frequently this comes up and if it's due to older designs or zoning changes; Flagg replied it comes up frequently enough. A project will change ownership or change building layout. Older designs weren't as clear on location information. Want builders to know if they change it there might be an impact. They need to communicate what the change is going to be to make sure power is matching, possibly during permit process or direct contact to PUD.

Gaither acknowledged appreciation for Flagg coming to the meeting and the genuine desire from PUD to improve the communication in all components of the construction process. Flagg restated the purpose for attending today's meeting is to get facilities recognized earlier in the design process so they have adequate clearance and can identify bigger ticket items for relocation sooner. Wriston asked how early PUD would be willing to get involved in the process and Odren suggested they copy PUD when preliminary plat is submitted. Get utilities involved at first review.

Flagg was unclear on the next steps in the process; utilities don't have enough room due to setbacks. He asked about another breakout group for that conversation. Wriston replied there could be a breakout group for an open discussion if PUD is willing. Wriston asked if transformers could be placed underground. Flagg stated operationally that's not available right now and would be 2-3 times more expensive.

- McDonald addressed the group on behalf of Century Link. He stated typically they end up behind transformers but prefer to be beside them. They must be 3' away from the transformer so often end up almost in private property. They would like to have a 9' pocket easement to place facility where it's not in the way. Regarding advance notification, they usually find out about a subdivision when Prairie Electric calls them.

Hardy suggested handout material given during the pre-app process. Wriston mentioned another issue can be having fiber optic on top of or in vicinity of power lines that have to be moved and is expensive.

Odren asked that the utilities send Shadix bullet points of main concerns and share their thoughts about solving issues to present to DEAB. Shafer asked if Shadix is leading a regular meeting with utilities and if DEAB

members should attend. Shadix said yes, it would be good for DEAB to attend. Howsley and Odren agreed. Shafer asked Shadix to send the meeting schedule to be forwarded to DEAB members.

Review Fees/Wetland and Habitat – Marty Snell

- Snell asked Brent Davis to put together a proposal on staffing and fee schedule adjustments to present to the BOCC next week. Following is the presentation summary:
 - Review Objectives & Assumptions
 - Determine whether Wetland and Habitat Review permit fees are sufficient to cover the County's cost of processing permits
 - Compare Clark County's Wetland and Habitat review fees to similar fees in other Fully Planning GMA jurisdictions
 - Identify adjustments to permit fees based on cost recovery analysis and comparisons – current fee structure in place was adopted in 2011
 - Review staffing levels needed to complete fee work and meet the demand for customer service in the Permit Center – staffed 21 hours a week, open 40 hours.
 - Key Assumptions:
 - Revenue is based on adopted permit fees and actual transactions
 - Revenue excludes General Fund support
 - Expenses include direct operating expenses, allocated administration and permit center costs
 - Attention to customer service demand in the Permit Center increases fee work efficiency by:
 - Setting expectations during due diligence
 - Reducing rework caused by deficient submittals
 - Cost Recovery History
 - Program was staffed with less than 1 FTE until mid 2014
 - Average 77% cost recovery since January 2015
 - Permit Fee/Policy Proposals
 - Use existing approach for General Fund support in place for Land Use Review
 - Adjust fees to target 85% cost recovery
 - Targeted adjustments to be considered
 - Lower pre-application & determination review fees
 - Increase to permit review fees
 - Adjust Permit Center Issuance Fees
 - Simplify fee tables
 - Summary of Proposed Fee Changes
 - 3 Fees removed
 - Combined Monitoring Review
 - Habitat Stewardship Plan
 - Stormwater Review
 - 2 new fees
 - Engineering Plan Review (\$62 on all ENG and GRD submittals)
 - Plat/Final Site Plan Review and Fully Complete Review (\$42)
 - Change in Building Permit review fee to capture review work that currently is not fee supported
 - Adjust staffing levels to meet review times with increased application volume
 - Other
 - Monitor cost recovery and fund balance annually vs. framework and targets
 - Monitor fee levels relative to other jurisdictions
 - Actively monitor and manage review times
 - Permit Fee Comparisons
 - Wetland and Habitat Determination Clark County fees @ \$898 fee vs. others \$1,150 and \$2,720
 - Residential Reasonable Use Exception CC fees \$1041 vs. other jurisdictions @ \$1,400-\$3,337

- Type II/III Development \$6,112; lower than all others except Whatcom County
- Staffing Needs
 - 3 FTEs currently support the program
 - Work and fees are programed with a 75% utilization target
 - The Permit Center is currently staffed 21 hours a week
 - Permit Center staffing and pre-application conferences limit the amount of time that staff can use for field work
 - 2016 utilization averaged 80% with 1042 hours of customer service
 - 2000 hours of customer service time allows for fully staffing the Permit Center with a Natural Resource Specialist.
 - Staffing Proposal
 - Add 1 Natural Resource Specialist to meet expected fee work load and fully staff the Permit Center
 - Capacity to support Phase 3 of POSSE LMS development
 - Capacity to revive permit compliance monitoring efforts mandated under GMA
 - Flexibility to respond to unanticipated fee work volume by reducing Permit Center hours
 - Next Steps
 - Staff to fully develop proposed fee adjustments based on Council and DEAB feedback
 - Return to Council in June with fee ordinance and specific fee changes
 - Include fee changes in new permit system implementation

Group discussion continued comparing of other jurisdictions' budget, staffing, funding and processing timelines.

Wriston asked if Snell puts this in the supplemental budget on May 30th and DEAB's next meeting isn't until June, how will he communicate back to the group? Snell will be asking the council at 9:30am on Wednesday for the additional FTE as well as a public hearing for the fee adjustment. He asked if any DEAB members would be able to attend the work session. Howsley may attend.

Snell asked if DEAB would support adding another FTE to Wetland and Habitat Review. Wriston said he would like to look at the FTE and if they are working efficiently. Gaither cited Snell's supporting evidence comparing Clark to other counties.

Based on Snell's and Brent Davis' presentation today, Howsley moved that DEAB support the proposed Fee Adjustments and additional FTE. Motion was seconded by Odren and approved.

- Howsley updated the group on the appeal filed by Friends of Clark County and Thurston County Court. It was dismissed because the county has adopted a moratorium on land divisions in certain zoning districts. Several other appeals have been filed; Clark County will be filing motion to consolidate those appeals. Noncompliance order will be going on through summer. City of Battle Ground didn't appeal. Clark County recently dismissed a separate case challenging the annexation of Ridgefield.
- Oden moved to approve minutes, Wriston seconded. Minutes were approved.

Public Comments

- Halling asked about the requirement on residential Stormwater subdivision application: 24" diameter vs. 12" diameter catch basin sump. Significant cost difference, \$100 for 12" vs. close to \$500 for 24". County wants 24", others say 12" can be as easily maintained. Shafer said they are looking at alternatives, believes Ali Safayi is working on it. Odren suggested putting the topic as a monitoring item and Shafer asked Halling for his contact information.

Meeting adjourned: 4:12 pm

Meeting minutes prepared by: Leslie Ernesti

Reviewed by: Greg Shafer

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE

Board of County Councilors
Public Hearing
June 20, 2017



Comprehensive Plan Update

- ▣ Final Decision and Order
 - Issued March 23, 2017 by the GMHB
 - 25 issues decided
 - Clark County prevailed on 18 issues
 - 30-day appeal period (April 24)
- ▣ 180-day compliance period (September 19)
- ▣ GMHB Compliance Hearing, November 7, 2017

Comprehensive Plan Update

- ▣ Non-compliance Issues
 - The need for UGA expansions in Battle Ground, Ridgefield and La Center
 - Ag land de-designations (Ridgefield and La Center)
 - De-designation of 602 ag land acres for the RILB
 - No maximum size for RILB designation
 - Urban Reserve Overlay uses
 - No 'variety' of rural densities
 - Upzone of ag and forest lands (AG-20 to AG-10; FR-40 to FR-20)

Comprehensive Plan Update

- ▣ What the County is Appealing
 - The need for UGA expansions in Ridgefield and La Center
 - Ag land de-designations (Ridgefield and La Center)
 - De-designation of 602 ag land acres for the RILB

Comprehensive Plan Update

- ▣ What the County is Proposing for Compliance
 - Changing AG-10 and FR-20 zoning back to AG-20 and FR-40; eliminating the clustering option; changing R-10 zoning back to R-20 zoning
 - Amending the comp plan map to provide for three Rural designations (R-5, R-10, and R-20), each implemented by its own zone
 - Urban Reserve Overlay: Leave as an overlay; eliminate the use list; change only with a comp plan update
 - Establishing a maximum size for RILB as 700 acres
 - Removing 17 parcels from the Battle Ground UGA

Comprehensive Plan Update

- ▣ Proposed changes will be to the comp plan map and text, and to CCC Title 40
- ▣ Changes highlighted in the staff report
- ▣ County adopted a moratorium April 25, 2017 on the acceptance of land division applications for resource and rural lands

Comprehensive Plan Update

▣ Next Steps

- Commerce review in progress
- Notice to Adopt 2007 EIS/2016 SEIS May 5, 2017
- Council Work Session, June 7, 2017, 10:30 a.m.
- Council Public Hearing, June 20, 2017, 10:00 a.m.
 - Compliance Issues
 - Land Division Moratorium (from April 25)
- Effective date of June 30, 2017, if an ordinance adopted

Comprehensive Plan Update

- ▣ Planning Commission
 - Work Session May 4, 2017
 - Public Hearing May 18, 2017

Compliance Proposal	Planning Commission Vote
Changing AG-10 and FR-20 zoning back to AG-20 and FR-40; eliminating the clustering option	6-0 to recommend Board approval
Changing R-10 zoning back to R-20 zoning	6-0 to recommend Board approval
Amending the comp plan to provide for three Rural designations (R-5, R-10, and R-20), each implemented by its own zone	6-0 to recommend Board approval
Leaving the urban reserve (UR) overlay as an overlay; eliminating the use list; allowing changes to UR only during a comp plan update	6-0 to recommend Board approval
Establishing a maximum size of 700 acres for the rural industrial land bank	6-0 to recommend Board approval
Removing 17 parcels from the Battle Ground urban growth area	6-0 to recommend Board approval
Adding a UR overlay to the 17 parcels removed from the Battle Ground UGA	4-2 to recommend Board approval

Comprehensive Plan Update

- ▣ Information on the Compliance Issues and Schedule:

<https://www.clark.wa.gov/community-planning/comprehensive-growth-management-plan>

- ▣ Questions?

- ▣ THANK YOU!

Clark County
Fee Waiver
Program Update

Goal

- Establish an endpoint for the fee waiver program

Why Now?

- Plan forward allows county and customers predictability and certainty
- Encourage fee waiver projects to move forward in process, which meets original intent to incentivize development immediately
- Fairness and equity for all developers
- Economy has improved
- Maintain staffing and workload balance



Project Statistics

- Fee estimates - 105 projects
- If all projects moved forward, the following are estimates of the fees that could be waived
- Most projects have activity in 2016 and 2017

Stage of Project	Stage Description	Number of Projects	Possible Application Fees To Be Waived	Possible TIF to be Waived
1	Pre-Application Conference	52	\$4.26 M	\$6.14 M
2	Preliminary Review	30	\$1.71 M	\$6.38 M
3	Final Review or Building Permit	23	\$.74 M	\$3.49 M
Total			\$6.71 M	\$16.01 M

Project Statistics

Total by Program	Fees Remaining
Wetland/Habitat	\$.08 M
Fire Marshal	\$.18 M
Land Use	\$.95 M
Building	\$2.69 M
Public Works Dev. Eng.	\$2.81 M
Total	\$6.71 M

Recommendation

- Allow normal timeframe for pre-application validity – 1 year
- Require projects to complete preliminary and final engineering review in 18 months
- Secure building permit within 6 months after final engineering review (e.g. site improvements complete)

