

MEMORANDUM

To: Honorable Metropolitan King County Councilmembers

From: Permit Technical Advisory Committee

Date: September 15, 2008

RE: Recommendation

C:manhese ✓
MReed ✓
file
RECEIVED
2008 SEP 15 PM 2:16
CLERK
KING COUNTY COUNCIL

INTRODUCTION

What follows are the recommendations of the Permit Technical Advisory Committee (“Committee”) formed by the Metropolitan King County Council (“Council”) to look into various aspects of the permitting operations of the King County Department of Development and Environmental Services (“DDES”). After six months of work we have reached a general consensus about a variety of permit-related topics. Among the highlights discussed below are:

- Agreement that DDES’s billing policies need to be revamped to reduce the number and amount of “past due” or never-collected receivables;
- Consensus that establishing a cap on preapplication meeting fees would do applicants more harm than good but that the land use preapplication process should be revised to offer a range of meeting options and estimate a range of fees;
- A recommendation that the Project Management concept be expanded to allow applicants to voluntarily have their applications project managed (thus benefitting from a binding fee estimate);
- Accord in favor of establishing a No Fault Cooperation Pilot Program for addressing certain small-scale, first-time code enforcement cases;
- A recommendation for treating forestry somewhat like agriculture in terms of subsidized permit fees; and
- Consensus that future DDES fee increases should be tied to an annual index that reflects the cost of doing business.

In addition, after reviewing and discussing a draft of DDES’s separate, Council-mandated study, we recommend against the wholesale expansion of flat fees and for consideration of an alternative to the current base-plus-hourly fee structure. We also recommend “benchmarking” DDES’s activities to comparable peer jurisdictions.

BACKGROUND

Via section 7 of Ordinance 15946, the Council created the Committee and charged it with reviewing and making recommendations on nine items related to DDES permitting: financial policies, flat fees for financial guarantee management and monitoring, fee waiver procedures, an administrative appeals process for regulatory fee disputes, capping fees relating to pre-application meeting research, exploring non fee-for-service funding for permit-related customer information, improving project management, determining the necessity for continuing the Committee, and any other applicable permitting issues.

The Committee was comprised of one representative from or for: the Master Builders Association of King and Snohomish Counties (David Hoffman), the Seattle King County Association of Realtors (Roni Strupat), agriculture or forestry interests (Dan Bruner), environmental interests (Tim Trohimovich), the Department of Development and Environmental Services (Stephanie Warden), the King County Fire Chiefs Association (Larry Rude), the Rural Ombudsman (David Spohr), an urban Unincorporated Area Council (Gwendolyn High), and a rural Unincorporated Area Council (Gordon Moorman).

We met in person the first week of April, May, June, July, August, and September. In addition, we held a supplemental meeting in the middle of August. For the first five meetings, we heard presentations by DDES staff members of various disciplines, posed questions, made comments, and discussed possible recommendations. We devoted the final two meetings exclusively to reviewing drafts and debating the merits of potential recommendations. The agendas and minutes of those meetings are attached as Exhibit A. We provide our final recommendations directly below.

In addition, via section 86 of Ordinance 2007-544.2 the Council separately requested that DDES transmit a report ("Fee Study") discussing the impact of changing DDES's reimbursement methodology to a flat rate fee structure, considering and recommending an online solution to basic permitting, and comparing the rate methodologies for peer jurisdictions. The Ordinance instructed DDES to seek our input on that Fee Study, which it did. We include our recommendations on DDES's Fee Study later in this Memorandum. (DDES's Fee Study will be transmitted separately.)

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS REQUESTED VIA ORDINANCE 15946

1. Financial Policies Adopted by DDES

We reviewed DDES's financial policy protocol and had a primary and a secondary area of concern. Our main concern was finding some way to significantly improve the current situation where 70% of all receivables are 90 days overdue, with some not-insignificant percentage never paid. Because DDES must be self-funded, the burden for such shortfall is eventually borne by other paying customers. We agree that, whether by code change or internal DDES amendment, some strategy(ies) should be implemented to reduce the number/amount of receivables that are past due or never collected. Possible strategies, as suggested by the rural UAC and the Realtor representatives, the agriculture/forestry representative, and others, include: (a) greater upfront deposits, (b) increasing the number and types of permits requiring an applicant to make periodic payments before DDES performs additional work (much like a contractor would require payments at certain milestones), (c) offering some discount for payments made on time (to encourage early payment), (d) requiring that fees on permit applications be brought current, prior to granting any permit extensions, and (e) setting deadlines for payment after which point permits would be cancelled.

In addition, the Fire Chiefs representative raised a concern that the contingency funds are set too high. He requested that these be reviewed and, if necessary, limited to that consistent with best business practices. After some discussion and exchange of information on this topic, the environmental representative cautioned against substituting our judgment for the Council's or the court's. Based on our understanding that the Council has approved the contingency funds (as part of the budget process) and that those amounts were vetted by court in the *Tiger Mountain* case, our recommendation is simply that DDES monitor the contingency funds to insure that the agency continues to operate within the parameters set by the Council and by the court.

2. Flat Fee for Staff Members Performing Financial Guarantee Management and Monitoring

Pursuant to the *Tiger Mountain* decision, in late 2007 DDES changed the management (administration) fee for financial guarantees to a flat fee. That left us to review only the monitoring portion of the financial guarantee program, which are still charged on an hourly basis and performed by the site inspector. After reviewing data showing the variability of the actual time it took to perform annual inspections, depending on the unique conditions of each site and the work completed by each applicant, we recommend against applying a flat fee to such inspections.

3. Review of Fee Waiver Procedures as Outlined in Financial Policies

We agree that DDES's newly-established policy appears to adequately address this item. We recommend reviewing the outcomes of the fee waiver procedures in approximately two years to determine if the intent of the Council is being met.

4. Establish an Administrative Appeals Process for Regulatory Fee Disputes that Utilizes the Hearing Examiner

We believe that the Council's recent ordinance establishing an administrative appeal to the hearing examiner, along with DDES public rule for implementing the ordinance, appears to be the appropriate step to address this item. As with analyzing the related fee waiver process, determining how successfully the appeal procedure is meeting the intent of the Council will require some period of performance prior to any meaningful evaluation. We recommend that the program be reviewed in approximately two years.

5. Establish a Cap on Fees Relating to Department Research Conducted Before a Preapplication Meeting

We extensively discussed the pros and cons of capping the fees conducted prior to a preapplication meeting. Because of DDES's self-funded nature, we recognized that capping these fees would effectively cap the hours DDES could spend reviewing and providing necessary information on the sometimes myriad issues a proposal could raise. We agreed that, oftentimes, the earlier such information could be made available to an applicant, the

better predictability and value for all stakeholders. Ultimately, we are persuaded that capping the fees would do more disservice to a greater number of applicants than the cap would help.

However we did focus on the difference between the information and options available to an applicant requesting a Building Services Division (BSD) versus a Land Use Service Division (LUSD) preapplication meeting. The Rural Ombudsman observed that the BSD preapplication packet (Exhibit B) was detailed, describing and distinguishing between five different levels of pre-application meeting formats (from Scoping to Limited to Voluntary to Mandatory to Consolidated). Conversely, the LUSD form (Exhibit C) was relatively sparse, which he opined might be partially responsible for “sticker shock” when the LUSD preapplication meeting bill arrives.

We recommend that the LUSD preapplication form be re-written along the lines of the BSD document to clearly warn that the deposit will likely not cover the total cost, to provide a range of preapplication options similar to those provided by BSD, and to estimate the range of fees likely for each type of preapplication meeting.

6. Explore Funding Options that are Not Fee for Service for Customer Outreach, Information Requests and Consultation Related to Permitting, Including Funding from the Current Expense Fund

We agree with the importance of providing not-for-fee customer outreach, answers to information requests, and permit consultation (collectively “outreach”). Under its current budget paradigm, DDES already provides certain free or at-cost outreach to the public, such as presentations using supervisors and managers (who do not bill for their time) and also by having staff members from various disciplines available free of charge each morning in the permit center for 15 to 30 minute sessions. (Staff’s hours for such “open hours” activity fall within the approximately 25% of staff time DDES has budgeted as not chargeable to an applicant.) Finally, the Rural Permit Coordinator comes free to customers, supported by CX funding.

As to the question posed to us, to “explore funding options” for such outreach, we recognized that in the current budget climate, obtaining additional, current expense funds to provide additional outreach is not likely. We discussed a variety of possibilities for funding outreach from sources other than tax dollars, such as adding the past cost for information a potential applicant receives to the cost of a future permit (should the citizen proceed to a formal application), trying to get State funding for outreach related to state-mandated programs such as those required by GMA, offering classes with a high enough price tag to allow DDES to subsidize other outreach efforts, and offering contract services to other jurisdictions.

Ultimately, the only option that appears to offer a reasonable possibility of expanded revenue would be for DDES to offer classes to groups that need to take continuing education classes (architects, realtors, attorneys) or that wish to be placed on a preferred consultant list. Such groups might have enough of a professional, financial incentive to pay a substantial amount for training sufficient to create a surplus (after offsetting DDES’s costs in putting on such programs) for funding additional outreach programs.

7. Recommendations for Improvements and Refinements to the Project Management Process

Project Management was recommended by the 2003 Fee Committee and implemented on major land use and building permits in 2004, with DDES making yearly modifications and enhancements since. Given its relatively recent inception, Project Management has not been in place long enough to have a significant data pool of completed applications from which to draw truly informed observations, especially on lengthy projects such as plats. Therefore, we have no definitive assessment of the overall Project Management process, and recommend that the system be reevaluated in approximately two years.

However, with one caveat discussed below, our initial take on the Project Management process is generally positive. In fact we recommend that the program be expanded.

The Rural Ombudsman observed that the typical permit-related complaints he receives are from citizens with a relatively small project who complain about bills exceeding expectations. Unlike larger, currently project managed-efforts that provide a “binding” fee estimate (along with the new ability to appeal that estimate before expending any significant funds), non-project managed permits (such as some grading, clearing or critical area permits) are either hourly or base-plus-hourly and have no such protections for applicants. He requested that this be addressed.

In response, the DDES representative suggested that such applicants could be offered the opportunity to voluntarily have their applications project managed. Such Project Management “Lite” would add some costs for the applicant, such as a project manager making an initial site visit to gather enough information to offer a binding fee estimate. But, as the environmental representative pointed out, it should be significantly less than a project manager’s costs on larger, more complex projects. We agree that having a Project Management “Lite” option would be very beneficial, providing applicants the insurance and certainty of a binding fee estimate. It appears to have little downside, as less risk-averse applicants could still chose not to go the Project Management “Lite” route and continue with the standard hourly or base-plus-hourly fee structure.

The one criticism of the current process came in relation to Project Management for certain complex processes with multiple project managers. DDES noted that while the default is to have a single project manager shepherd an application through the entire permit process, for long projects or projects that have different types of expertise needed at different stages, such as plats, there could be up to four different project managers, one for each stage. The urban UCA representative expressed a desire for a more formalized “handoff” of identified issues between project managers, noting her experience in a past plat application of community members raisings concerns to one project manager, only to have those concerns fall through the cracks and not be implemented by later project managers, leading to a completed project that realized their fears. In response DDES agreed to formalize the procedures for transferring a project between managers that would insure that all issues are identified and addressed.

8. Determine Necessity for Continuation of the Committee

No real consensus emerged as to the long-run role of our Committee. We did agree that the next step would be to re-convene in approximately June 2009, after DDES implements or proposes legislation addressing some of our recommendations and after the Council makes whatever changes it sees fit. At that point we will discuss a longer-term presence for the Committee.

9. Any Other Applicable Issues Related to Permitting Operations of the Department

a. No-Fault Cooperators Program

The Rural Ombudsman noted that many of the complaints he receives relate to code enforcement complaints on small-scale clearing, grading, or critical area disturbances. He observed that often the main dispute driver is not the existence of a violation but the cost of the remedial permits.

In response, DDES drafted a pilot, “No-Fault Cooperation Program” for certain small-scale, first-time violations. The pilot, as set out in Exhibit D, would apply to clearing, grading and impervious surface additions that require remediation yet are minor enough not to trigger the more complex SEPA, drainage, or building review. The program would emphasize increased training on the initial code enforcement side to minimize some of the adversarial nature of interactions (including treating the citizens as “cooperators” instead of “violators”), and then feature a more streamlined permit process for those disturbances that qualify.

Those property owners who qualify would be able to choose this approach in lieu of the traditional adversarial appeal process. We recognize that the pilot may require some additional CX funding, both for code enforcement training and for permitting assistance, but (if it successfully resolves a certain percentage of cases that would otherwise go through the time-consuming, contentious, adversarial process) should provide a net, long run savings to DDES, not to mention improved customer relations.

The scope of the pilot is measured. For example, DDES has not included disturbance of several categories of critical areas as an eligible category, as these would require more complex permit review. And there was some concern, especially by the environmental representative, that if not carefully structured the program could provide a loophole to encourage intentional violations.

But we believe that the pilot program deserves a green light, with the results to be analyzed after two years for possible elimination, amendment, or expansion. The rural UCA representative suggested that the program should be presented at UAC meetings; he extended a general invitation. The urban UCA representative recommended that the program be highly publicized and anticipated that it not only would generate goodwill but would result in significant mitigation and improvements that benefit individual property owners and the general public. The Rural Ombudsman believed that the proposal, if effectively implemented,

offered a promising avenue for improving relations with the public in unincorporated King County.

b. Preferred Consultants Program

We heard a description of DDES's preferred consultants program. We agreed that having such lists is beneficial to applicants, who otherwise might not have a way to realistically determine if a prospective consultant is qualified. Although such a program is most applicable in areas such as the wetlands arena (where DDES started the preferred consultant list) where no outside certification or standards for consultants exists, DDES has expanded the program to civil engineers. We recommend that the preferred consultants program be expanded further to include residential sprinkler design consultants.

c. Standard Valuation Rate Table

The rural UAC representative felt strongly that residential permits should be charged per the International Building Code ("IBC") rate. We reviewed some cost comparisons of different methodologies. The environmental representative thought that the most sensible point for any update would be once the 2009 IBC rate becomes available. We agreed and decided this issue would best be tackled after the 2009 IBC rate is released.

d. Reduced Agriculture/Forest Fees

We discussed, and favor, the agriculture/forestry representative's proposal for adopting some sort of reduced fee schedule for permits related to forestry work on parcels with approved forestry plans, much like certain agricultural permit applications receive. The environmental representative wanted to make sure that any such reduction related to true forestry, and not to the first step in a plan to construct a "trophy" house, but there was agreement that a benefit similar to that accorded agriculture be accorded to at least some small-scale forestry operations.

However, in keeping with the discussion below about not forcing some permit applicants to subsidize others, several members of the Committee were concerned with the current structure for funding reduced-rate agriculture permits. (Permits in the Agriculture Production Zone are currently billed at half the applicable rate.) We were unanimously in favor of continuing (and in the case of certain forestry, expanding) a reduced rate, given the benefits agriculture (and forestry) provide. However, several members opined that since the benefit from agriculture (and forestry) is to the County as a whole, the burden should be borne by the County as a whole. As it stands now, because DDES's permitting activities must be self-funded, DDES must in a sense "overcharge" non-agriculture permit applicants to make up for the subsidized rate accorded agriculture permits.

While we recognize the current budget realities and we would like to see the benefits accorded agricultural permit applicants expanded to include forestry, we nonetheless recommend that the Council look at funding a reduced agriculture/forestry rate through some

mechanism other than by having DDES make up the difference in non-agriculture/forestry permit fees.

e. Tying Future Fee Increases to Index

We discussed and favor tying future DDES fee increases to an annual index that reflects the cost of doing business. This would provide the benefit of small incremental rate increases rather than a larger increase every few years and additionally would provide an economically-based increase rather than one seen as politically-based.

RECOMMENDATIONS RELATED TO DDES'S FEE STUDY

1. *Expanded Use of Flat Fees*

We weighed the predictability flat fees provide versus the subsidy that will likely occur as well-prepared applicants with straightforward proposals pay to offset more complex or less complete applications. In general, we supported DDES's decision on the limited categories of fees that were good candidates for flat fee treatment. Of those DDES included in their analysis, we agreed that addressing on residential permits, land use/shoreline review on residential permits, and certain pre-selection Project Management fees were strong candidates. We agreed that none of the other candidates identified in the Fee Study appeared to be so strong.

The only major departure was a concern with DDES's base-plus-hourly pricing system. The Rural Ombudsman worried that the base-plus-hourly structure, like that employed for certain drainage, grading, and critical areas review, appeared disadvantageous to applicants. The base sets a "floor," a minimum charge an applicant would have to pay even if her issue was relatively straightforward and took less DDES review time. Thus he thought the base-plus-hourly system had the disadvantages to applicants of a fixed fee, that by placing a minimum "floor" customers with simple applications would effectively pay to subsidize more challenging, time-consuming applications. Yet, unlike a fixed fee, applicants did not have the benefit of a "ceiling" on the hours that could be charged to a given review. He viewed base-plus-hourly as the opposite of the Project Management system which provides applicants with a binding fee estimate and thus (barring unusual circumstances) a "ceiling" on fees without requiring a "floor" for those reviews that turn out to be simpler than expected.

Certainly, as the DDES representative pointed out, a base-plus-hourly structure provides an advantage to DDES in that, for all reviews that take less time than the base would account for, DDES still receives the full base fee. Such a surplus allows DDES a pot of money to make up for the losses it encounters on projects like agriculture permits (billed at half the hourly rate). But the base-plus-hourly structure also complicates DDES's internal finance system.

Some of this concern could be ameliorated by the DDES representative's suggestion, discussed above, that applicants in the hourly and base-plus-hourly categories be offered the opportunity to voluntarily have their applications project managed, providing those applicants

with the insurance and certainty of a binding fee estimate. But on a broader scale, we recommend that the Council consider eliminating the base-plus-hourly category entirely.

2. *On-Line Permitting*

We reviewed the first stage of DDES's planned on-line permitting, the soon-to-be unveiled Permits-at-a-Glance. It appears to hold promise both for applicants and interested parties to monitor permit progress in an easily accessible manner. The Realtor's representative expressed the need, for persons not familiar with the terminology, to describe fees and the reasons various fees apply. As some of this information is available in existing DDES bulletins, the urban UAC Representative suggested that the bulletins be hyper-linked, for easier access. She also noted that a functioning Permits-at-a Glance would eliminate some need for concerned citizens to file public disclosure requests or make staff inquiries.

3. *Comparing the Rate Methodologies of Peer Jurisdictions*

We thought the Council-mandated comparison of peer jurisdiction's rate methodologies provided useful information and insight.

The Rural Ombudsman suggested finding some way to expand the peer jurisdiction comparison into a "benchmark" of DDES's permit process against other jurisdictions. Although every entity is unique, including DDES's requirement to fully recoup its cost (a burden not shared by many other jurisdictions, although other jurisdictions are moving towards this funding model), he opined that benchmarking to compare DDES's rates, timing, and shortfalls and to identify and learn from innovative strategies other jurisdictions have employed, would be valuable to improving DDES's performance. The urban UAC representative pointed to the advantages of learning from other places. The environmental representative cautioned that cities (as opposed to other counties) would not necessarily be comparables.

No clear consensus emerged as to exactly how "benchmarking" might be accomplished, but we recommend that the Council and DDES consider the topic.

CONCLUSION

In sum, we on the Committee appreciate the trust the Council has placed in us. Ours was a very time-consuming process, but we hope the result will be a more efficient, more equitable DDES permit system.

ATTACHMENTS

Exhibit A: "Agendas and Minutes from Committee Meetings"

Exhibit B: "Pre-Application Meeting – Land Use: Fees, Scheduling, Information and Request Form"

Exhibit C: "Pre-Application Meeting – Building Services Division"

Exhibit D: "No-Fault Cooperation Pilot Program"

Agendas and Minutes from Committee Meetings

**Agenda
Permit Technical Advisory Committee
3:30 – 5:00 p.m.
Wednesday April 2, 2008**

✚ Welcome and Introduction of Committee Members	15
minutes	
✚ Determine the Meeting Schedule (am-pm, day of week etc)	10
minutes	
✚ Review Scope and Duties of Committee	15
minutes	
✚ Review Scope of Fee Report/Study	10
minutes	
✚ Introduction to Project Management/Preapplication at DDES	30
minutes	
• Jarrod Lewis – Building Services Division	
• Chad Tibbets – Land Use Services Division	
• Questions	
✚ Questions and Comments	10
minutes	

Permit Technical Advisory Committee Draft Minutes
3:30-5:00 p.m.
Wednesday, April 2, 2008

Gwendolyn High, Gordon Moorman, Tim Trohimovich, Larry Rude and David Spohr were the committee members in attendance. Dan Bruner and Roni Strupat could not attend. David Hoffman substituted for Bob Johns, Joe Miles substituted for Stephanie Warden, and Viet Nguyen observed the committee meeting for Councilmember Dunn. Pam Dhanapal staffed the meeting for DDES and Tim Attebery took minutes. Jarrod Lewis and Chad Tibbits provided presentations for DDES.

Ms. Dhanapal opened the meeting with introductions and explained the contents and resources contained in the notebook given to each committee member.

The committee discussed a meeting schedule and decided on the first Tuesday of each month from 10AM to Noon at DDES headquarters in Renton.

Ms. Dhanapal went over the duties of the committee and explained the ordinance that governs the committee's work.

Ms. Dhanapal summarized the DDES Fee Study that was contained in a King County Council budget proviso and how the committee was involved in the study. Several members of the committee asked for information on how other jurisdictions operate their building department revenue systems. Ms. Dhanapal said she would provide that information.

Mr. Miles discussed why DDES is nearly 100% fee-supported.

Mr. Lewis discussed how DDES came to Project Management (PM). A stakeholder task force was formed in 2003 whereby accountability and predictability issues at DDES were reviewed. In order to obtain more predictability for DDES customers, up-front fee estimates were created for some permit types. In order to obtain more accountability, single-point-of contact PM was created for some permit types.

Mr. Lewis passed out DDES Bulletin #53. The bulletin explains PM for building permits. He also passed-out information on Pre-Application meeting types and an example of a fee estimate sheet from the DDES Building Services Division.

Mr. Tibbits passed-out DDES Bulletin #54. The bulletin explains PM for land use permits. Mr. Tibbits also passed-out an example of a fee estimate sheet from the DDES Land Use Services Division.

Mr. Moorman asked if every rural project would require PM. Mr. Lewis said, "No" and explained the options available.

Ms. High requested a list all DDES fees.

Mr. Moorman asked how Critical Areas Designations (CADs) work. Mr. Miles explained the CAD process.

Mr. Trohimovich asked for information on the percentage of homes that require a CAD.

Mr. Trohimovich asked for information on the percentage of homes that require PM.

Mr. Miles said that flat rates versus hourly rates for some permits types could be a topic of conversation for the committee at some point.

Mr. Trohimovich asked for information on how often DDES meets its fee estimate.

Ms. High wants to see the 2008 DDES budget in detail.

Ms. High wanted to see the estimated 2007 DDES budget compared to the actual budget for 2007 in an attempt to review revenue forecasting.

Agenda
Permit Technical Advisory Committee
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Tuesday May 6, 2008

- ✦ Approval of April Minutes and follow-up from last meeting minutes 10

- ✦ Review History of DDES Fees 25
 - Joe Miles, DDES Deputy Director minutes

- ✦ Road Map to Title 27 (DDES Fees) 30
 - Elaine Gregory, DDES Finance Manager minutes

- ✦ Review the financial policies adopted by DDES 35
 - Elaine Gregory, DDES Finance Manager minutes
 - Review flat fee for staff members performing financial guarantee management/monitoring
 - Review of fee waiver procedures as outlined in financial policies

- ✦ Review of the establishment of an administrative appeals process for regulatory fee disputes that utilizes the hearing examiner 20
 - Elaine Gregory, DDES Finance Manager minutes

Permit Technical Advisory Committee Draft Minutes
10:00 a.m. to Noon
Tuesday, May 6, 2008

Gwendolyn High, Gordon Moorman, Dan Bruner, Roni Strupat, Larry Rude, Stephanie Warden and David Spohr were the committee members in attendance. David Hoffman substituted for Bob Johns. Joe Miles, Pam Dhanapal and Elaine Gregory staffed the meeting for DDES. Tim Attebery took minutes.

Ms. Dhanapal opened the meeting with introductions and the minutes from April were approved.

Mr. Rude wanted to see a line-item review of the DDES budget.

Ms. High requested information on how DDES funding relates to other agencies in King County.

History of DDES Fees -

A detailed presentation was made by Joe Miles on the History of DDES Fees from 1975 to the present.

Mr. Miles also mentioned that DDES currently has a \$4.3 million rate stabilization reserve fund that is funded by interest income on the fund balance. This is one of several reserve funds. The others include revenue shortfall, facilitation of staff reduction and technology replacement.

During this presentation Mr. Miles mentioned that in 1993 DDES had 371 employees and today there are 219 employees. This can be tracked to several factors one is the annexations and incorporations that have occurred. Most importantly it is due to improved efficiencies within the department including the use of project management, a new routing and tracking system and the employees themselves.

DDES Fees

A presentation was made by Elaine Gregory on a Road Map to Title 27 and Title 27a that cover development fees and financial guarantees.

Mr. Moorman mentioned that the DDES level of service was very high for standard residential permits and therefore the costs of standard residential permits were very expensive especially when compared to other jurisdictions. Part of that high level of service was evidenced by DDES engineers using very complicated maps and systems such as ISO lines to determine snow loads that have been common for decades in King

County. Mr. Moorman mentioned that he has seen this on his own permit submittals where DDES engineers have "back checked" a structural engineer's calculations causing additional time spent by DDES and raising the cost of permits (implied). This drives up the cost of engineering for the person submitting the permit.

The group agreed that it would be a worthwhile exercise to investigate a typical residential permit and all of its associated fees at a future meeting. Mr. Moorman offered his latest permit as an example.

Ms. High asked which permits pay for themselves and which don't.

Ms. Strupat asked about fees on additions to existing homes.

Financial Policy and Fee Appeals

A presentation was made by Elaine Gregory on the DDES Financial Policies and Fee Appeal Process.

When discussion occurred on the financial guarantees Mr. Miles mentioned that the Master Builders Association requested higher standards for applicants who have a history of not finishing their work.

Mr. Rude thought it was interesting that the department's fee waiver work was not billable.

Ms. Warden mentioned that since the inception of Project Management, fee waiver requests numbers have reduced from 500 requests per year to 250 requests per year.

Ms. Warden also mentioned that our processes are set-up so that customers can receive fee technical assistance at an early stage before they invest in architectural and engineering fees. The free technical assistance is available every morning in the DDES permit center.

June Meeting

Ms. Dhanapal went over the agenda for the next meeting which will be held on June 3rd.

Agenda
Permit Technical Advisory Committee
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Tuesday June 3, 2008

1. Adoption of the minutes from May 6,2008
2. Discussion on when the timing of the July meeting
3. Follow-up on hand outs at May meeting
4. Discussion on focus of what committee needs to accomplish and how to accomplish it.
5. Follow-up to questions on flat fee for staff members performing financial guarantee management - Elaine Gregory
6. Ongoing Project Management Process Improvements
 - o Presentation by Jim Chan
7. Brainstorming Session – Led by Joe Miles
 - o Exploring funding options that are not fee for service for customer outreach, information requests and consultation related to permitting – including funding from current expense fund.
8. Fee Study
 - o What the fee study covers
 - o What permit types are going to be covered
 - o Residential Fees what and how are they charged
 - Presentation by Jarrod on residential fees.

Future Agenda's

July –

- Establishes a cap on fees relating to department research conducted before a preapplication meeting
- Review of draft fee report/study for FMD and BSD permit types
- Presentation On-Line Permitting by Tom McBroom

August

- Review of draft fee report/study for LUSD permit types
- Review of committee comments on draft fee report/study to date
- Additional questions

Draft Minutes
Permit Technical Advisory Committee
Tuesday, June 3, 2008 10:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

Attending: Dan Bruner, Gwendolyn High, David Hoffman, Gordon Moorman, David Spohr, Roni Strupat and Stephanie Warden were the committee members in attendance. Joe Miles, Elaine Gregory, Jim Chan, Joelyn Higgins, Jarrod Lewis and Pam Dhanapal staffed the meeting for DDES. Joe Miles took minutes.

General – It was noted that Bob Johns will be out about another 6-8 weeks and David Hoffman will become a permanent replacement for him.

1. Adoption of Minutes

The meeting was opened by Ms. Dhanapal and the revised minutes from May 6, 2008 were adopted by those present. Mr. Miles apologized for the brevity of the original minutes from the last meeting.

2. Discussion of July Meeting

A discussion was held on keeping the next scheduled meeting on Tuesday July 1, 2008 due to its proximity to the 4th of July holiday. A majority of the committee members felt it should be kept on this date.

3. Handouts from May Meeting

There were no additional questions asked about the handouts from the previous meeting dealing with residential permits having CAD's, the number of residential permits being project managed and permits meeting their budget. It was noted that Mr. Rude was not able to be at this meeting and discussion and information of the budget would be delayed to the July meeting when he could attend.

4. Discussion on Survey Comments and Recommendations

Ms. Dhanapal reviewed with the committee members the focus of the committee and the process that was being used to present information, and to document the comments and recommendations of the committee for the final report due in September. Ms. Dhanapal agreed to resend the survey. Mr. Spohr asked a question about intermediary comments and final comments.

5. Follow-up on Financial Guarantees

Ms Gregory provided follow-up information that the flat fee for administration of financial guarantees covered the cost of providing the service. Ms. Warden clarified that for financial guarantees the flat fee covers the administrative

costs and the monitoring work done by the inspectors was charged hourly. A question was asked by Mr. Moorman about how many financial guarantees go into bond forfeiture and Mr. Miles responded less than 5%. Ms. High noted that financial guarantees did not appear to be a hole that needed plugging.

Ms. Strupat asked the number of permits filed by individual property owners as compared with the number filed by builders and developers. Staff will get back to the group with those numbers and percentages.

6. On-Going Project Management Process Improvements

Mr. Chan gave a presentation on project management improvements and refinements. One of the tools that has been developed in house and will be made available on the web is the Permits-at-a Glance. Projected date for this to be available is Fall of 2008 and was greeted enthusiastically by Ms. High and Mr. Spohr as having great benefit to the applicants.

Mr. Moorman asked a question on the definition of the different residential drainage fees – basic, standard and complex. Mr. Chan also spent time clarifying that residential drainage fees depend on the individual characteristics of the property not on the size of the structure.

Ms. High talked about the process of presenting information to the hearing examiner in regards to subdivision applications at the public hearing and would like an entry point or opportunity to give input to the county prior to the public hearing. She felt that this could provide a service and give the county an opportunity to consider the information prior to the hearing.

7. Brainstorming on Funding other than Fee-For-Service

A brainstorming session was led by Mr. Miles regarding funding opportunities that are not fee for service. Ms. Warden spent time explaining billable and overhead staff and how for educational opportunities such as "Getting to Yes with DDES" presenters were used that were supervisors and managers that were considered overhead. The 2 hour period each morning where a staff member from each discipline is available in the permit center was explained and noted that these are technical staff and the hours for this activity fall within the approximately 25% of staff time that is not billed or charged to a permit. It was further explained by Ms. Warden and Mr. Miles that 70 to 75% of each technical staff member's time is billable or chargeable to a permit.

Mr. Spohr asked what percentage of overhead is spent on customer service and how much it would cost to have additional time available for inquires prior to a permit being submitted. Mr. Moorman asked what percentage of DDES is attributable to overhead.

The committee was reminded of the rules for brainstorming and the results of the session were:

- Look at means of adding the past cost for information to a future permit
- State funding
- Look at hiring a marketing person responsible for
 - Marketing classes to realtors
 - Getting the realtors and others on DDES side
 - Classes such as the rural series of 4 classes put on that included manure management
 - Target horse groups with simple rules and simple costs
 - Spread the word “don’t fear us”
 - Classes for other groups that have or need to take continuing education classes (architects, realtors)
 - Start an educational program for preferred consultants
 - Create a resource list of those (consultants) that have taken the classes
- Contract services – perhaps training

8. Residential Fees / Fee Study

A presentation was made by Mr. Lewis on residential fees that included a small/easy residential permit, a project managed residential permit and a middle scope residential project. The middle scope permit was one of Mr. Moorman’s that he had volunteered to be used as an example.

Ms. Strupat knew that DDES collected impact fees for schools and roads but was surprised at the amount and suggested that we need better marketing to inform applicants about the amount and that those fees are not retained by DDES.

Mr. Bruner said sewer and water fees paid for hook-ups were also substantial and wondered if DDES was responsible for collecting these. Ms. Higgins explained that those were paid to the sewer and water district and that DDES was responsible for collecting the certificates of sewer and water availability as part of a complete application but was not involved with the collection of utility hook-up fees.

Ms. Strupat asked questions’ involving how long a permit really takes.

A question was asked by Ms. High on what money owed to DDES is outstanding. Ms. Gregory indicated that 70% of the receivables are out 90 days.

Mr. Moorman talked about the other types of expenses that are incurred besides the actual permit fees before work is ever started. He had some additional concerns about what triggers the standard and complex fees in residential drainage review. Mr. Moorman stated that the information was very helpful and that he was notified or given updates as fees changed during the review process.

Ms. Strupat indicated that on the permits at a glance it would be extremely helpful to have information/descriptions available to describe fees and why they might apply to persons not familiar with the terminology. It was described that some of this information was available in informational bulletins put out by the department and Ms. High suggested that they be linked so that a person could click on the hyper-link and view that bulletin.

Mr. Moorman and Ms. Strupat indicated we should consider phased billing for building permits to avoid doing work without ever getting paid.

Mr. Bruner said in looking at the fees for small wetlands review that the applicant would be better off having DDES do it if they couldn't find a consultant that would complete the work for less than DDES. Mr. Miles said that while DDES was not trying to go into the consulting business there were times when a small area needed to be delineated it is less costly for DDES to do the work.

Mr. Spohr voiced concern about the costs for remediation when an applicant was trying to correct work that had been done without a permit particularly in critical areas. Ms. Warden stated that while we don't have just one permit type that covers this concern DDES would look at several permit types and add one last permit type that gets at this issue.

Meeting Adjourned

The meeting adjourned with Ms. Dhanapal reminding members that additional questions will be going out and for committee members to get their comments and or recommendations in.

Agenda
Permit Technical Advisory Committee
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Tuesday July 1, 2008

1. Adoption of the minutes from June 3,2008

2. Follow-up on any questions from last months meeting
 - o Proposal for a No-Fault Cooperation Program for minor restoration or violations - Pasha Klein and Doug Dobkins
 - o Billable time – Joe Miles

3. Presentation on On-Line Permitting – Tom McBroom

4. Establishing a cap on fees relating to department research conducted before a preapplication meeting – Jarrod Lewis

5. Budget discussion – Larry Rude and Elaine Gregory

6. Beginning review of draft Fee Study - Pam Dhanapal
 - o Peer Jurisdiction Survey
 - o Fire Marshal Division Permit Types

7. Final comments and questions

Future Agenda's

August

- Review of draft fee report/study for BSD and LUSD permit types
- Review of committee comments on draft fee report/study to date
- Additional questions

Draft Minutes
Permit Technical Advisory Committee
Tuesday, July 1, 2008 10:00 a.m. to 12:45 p.m.

Attending: Dan Bruner, Gwendolyn High, David Hoffman, Gordon Moorman, Larry Rude, David Spohr, Roni Strupat and Stephanie Warden were the committee members in attendance. Joe Miles, Elaine Gregory, Tom McBroom, Peshha Klein, Doug Dobkins, Jarrod Lewis and Pam Dhanapal staffed the meeting for DDES. Joe Miles took minutes.

1. Adoption of Minutes

The meeting was opened by Ms. Dhanapal and the minutes from June 3, 2008 were adopted by those present.

2. Follow-up on questions from June meeting

Peshha Klein and Doug Dobkins made a presentation on work on a pilot No-Fault Cooperation Program for minor restoration or violations. Those property owners's qualifying would be able to use this approach or the traditional permit and appeal process in existence. The approach used by this program is to establish a cooperative relationship between the land owner and the county to arrive at a solution

Mr. Moorman asked Ms. Klein for an example of where this had worked in the past. Ms. Klein shared an example of a person that had built a barn in the buffer of a grazed wet meadow, and that as the process wore on it became more and more contentious. It was finally resolved on a one to one basis when a strong relationship was established between the land owner and the county staff and with a focus on the result – rather than the codes and what had occurred.

Mr. Moorman asked if it would be possible to pass the code enforcement costs on to the permit. Mr. Spohr pointed out that the process of adding the code enforcement fees on to those that cooperate with up and not adding the fees for those that choose the traditional path and may end up before the hearing examiner is counter productive. Mr. Spohr talked about that if the process is resolved in a cooperative timely manner the county would be saving all the time used by code enforcement in pursuing a violation and taking it before the hearing examiner.

The committee was positive about the presentation and focused on the areas of predictable fees and outcomes and concurred that training of staff would be crucial.

Ms. Strupat was concerned about how the solution would be documented and brought up the problems that the traditional notice and order cause on titles when property is being sold.

Ms. High asked if self-reported violations would also qualify or would the program be limited to those started by code enforcement.

Mr. Moorman noted that this should be presented at the area councils meeting and extended a general invitation. Mr. Miles and Ms. Warden said they would work with him to have this occur.

Ms. High suggested that this would be a good topic or presentation for Getting to Yes.

Mr. Spohr liked the program but concluded that two important factors are up-front costs and training of the staff including code enforcement officers.

The second follow-up topic was answered by Mr. Miles on staff time. He provided charts that show the chargeable, billable and non-chargeable time spent by the department and the divisions. Time was spent talking about the definitions for chargeable and billable. Chargeable time is time that is covered by all types of fees reported to a permit and billable is a subset that covers only hourly fees.

Mr. Rude asked about the billing increment – was it .25 hrs? Ms. Gregory responded that the smallest amount is .1 hrs or 6 minutes.

Mr. Moorman stated he had been thinking about the amount of fees that have been billed and not collected and suggested that building permits should start billing on a monthly basis for those fees that were not collected at the start but work has occurred.

Jarrold responded that if an applicant requests an extension of time to pick up the permit the informal policy has been to have them pay any outstanding review fees.

3. Presentation on On-Line Permitting

A presentation was made by IT Manager Tom McBroom on the current and future status of on-line permitting at DDES. That the current phrase is that it was preferable to have the person on line than in line.

The presentation was received positively with Ms. High noting that this would eliminate some need to public disclosure as the community groups would be able to access far more information than is currently available on-line.

Ms. Warden explained where DDES was in the process on the permit integrations project was on the business decision and that getting it right was extremely important. That once the business decision was complete and signed off on the next steps would be selection of software and going out to bid.

4. (5) Budget Discussion

The budget discussion item was moved from item 5 to 4 to accommodate Mr. Rude's need to leave at 11:30. Mr. Rude came in to DDES and looked through the documents and selected specific documents to have copied for the entire committee. A discussion was held on the various reserve or contingency funds and how their amounts are established.

Ms. Warden explained the rate stabilization fund and how it works, explaining that we are currently on the downside of the multi-year process and will most likely need a fee increase for the hourly fees in within the next two years.

Mr. Rude stated that some agencies have caps on their reserves and wanted to know if we had one.

Ms. Warden noted that each of the funds is looked at differently and a single percentage or cap would not fit. An example was given of the Staff Reduction Contingency – that our current union contracts require a 3 month notification from date of notice to layoff so that fund contains a reserve equal to the staff x 3 months.

Ms. Strupat asked what permits were down and how much.

Mr. Miles stated that permits were down about 20% and were anticipated to continue that way until the 3rd or 4th quarter of next year where an upturn of 2-5% was anticipated.

Ms. Warden and Ms. Gregory went through the financial plan and Mr. Moorman wanted to know if we were always projecting two years out. That was affirmed.

Mr. Moorman asked a question about the reduction in fees in the P & L Lawsuit and had the court found our fees to be too high.

Ms. Warden explained that all of the components of the hourly fee had been examined by the court and the finding was that approximately \$5 of the \$144.90 did not meet the legal test for inclusion in the fee.

Mr. Spohr made the recommendation that when looking at fees and cost for service that we should look at what benchmarks could be established for

measuring costs or fees across jurisdictions where they are funded in differing manners.

Ms. High talked about the difficulties in understanding and getting a handle on the variety of fees and programs and didn't want to create a system where we would spin the wheel or pull a knob and hope for the best result.

5. (4) Establishing a cap on fees relating to department research conducted before a preapplication meeting

Mr. Lewis spoke with the group about his experiences in preapplication meetings and discussed the pros and cons of caps on pre-application meetings. He thought it was a disservice to the applicant to cap the fees or the amount of time on a preapplication meeting as then the applicant did not receive all of the information they deserved.

Mr. Moorman clarified the difference between the 2 hours in the morning where people can obtain free information and preapplication meetings.

The observation was made that BSD appears to have tried to minimize fees and maximize information by creating the range of preapplication meeting offered. The range includes 1) free technical assistance in lobby each morning, 2) limited preapplication, 3) voluntary preapplication, and 4) mandatory preapplication.

The types of permits required to have preapplication meetings was clarified and Ms. Strupat asked where agricultural buildings went.

Mr. Moorman and Ms High did not think it made sense to cap hours on preapplications.

Mr. Spohr suggested that land use preapplication options be expanded. The types of complaints he receives about preapps range from sticker shock at the amount at the end of the process compared to the deposit to those that do not seem to fit into the options. It was suggested that each of the categories list not only the deposit but a range of fees likely to occur.

Mr. Moorman concurred that the form should be redrafted.

Ms. Warden talked about the new process for short plats that includes that applicant watching a video at the beginning that explains the entire process and what will occur at each stage. If new forms are available in conjunction with that they will be made available to the committee. Ms. Warden shared that extensive review of preapplication meetings for several permit types is in the current work plan and committed to seeing what could be done in the short term.

Mr. Spohr requested that DDES look at a number of issues and provide more information on them. They are:

- Use of an equivalent binding fee estimate for non-project managed permits.
- Information on the reduced levels of review for preferred consultants
- Expanding the cooperation program to non-code enforcement actions.

6. Beginning review of draft fee study

The format for the draft fee study was presented to the committee by Ms. Dhanapal. The contents were highlighted and committee members were asked to spend additional time reviewing and commenting on the information included. The information included the introduction and background, the peer jurisdiction survey, and the permit types chosen in the Fire Marshals Division.

The committee asked to have the remainder of the fee study sent out approximately 2 weeks prior to the next meeting. Ms. Dhanapal committed to getting as much information as possible out prior to the meeting.

Meeting Adjourned

The meeting adjourned with Ms. Dhanapal reminding members that additional questions will be going out and for committee members to get their comments and or recommendations in.

Agenda
Permit Technical Advisory Committee
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Tuesday August 5, 2008

1. Adoption of the minutes from July 1,2008
2. Follow-up on any questions from last months meeting
 - o Preferred Consultant Program
 - o Critical Areas - Betsy MacWhinney
 - o Residential Site Engineering – Jim Chan
3. Review of draft Fee Study - Pam Dhanapal
 - o Discussion of How to incorporate comments into Fee Study
4. Discussion on Committee Report
5. Final comments and questions (should we have one additional committee meeting the week of August 11th)

Future Agenda's

September

- Final Committee comments on draft fee report/study
- Committee report
- Status of Committee

Draft Minutes
Permit Technical Advisory Committee
Tuesday, August 5, 2008 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Attending: Dan Bruner, Gwendolyn High, Gordon Moorman, Larry Rude, David Spohr, Roni Strupat and Stephanie Warden were the committee members in attendance. Joe Miles, Betsy MacWhinney, Jim Chan, Joelyn Higgins and Pam Dhanapal staffed the meeting for DDES. Joe Miles took minutes.

1. Adoption of Minutes

The meeting was opened by Ms. Dhanapal and the minutes from July 1, 2008 were adopted by those present.

2. Follow-up on questions from July meeting

There were no follow-up questions from the last meeting about the budget.

Betsy MacWhinney and Jim Chan made presentations on the preferred consultants program at DDES. Ms. MacWhinney described the criteria for inclusion in the program and stressed that it is performance based. They further discussed how the lists are used, the financial and other incentives, and how consultants have reacted to being removed from the list.

Ms. Warden explained that the preferred consultant program started with wetlands as there was no certification or standards that consultants needed to meet. DDES was receiving work from consultants of varying quality and applicants had no way to determine if the consultant they were using was qualified.

Mr. Moorman asked questions on the application and how the applicant was notified of the various options and the fees involved.

Mr. Spohr asked if there had been a backlash from those removed from the preferred consultants list.

Mr. Miles talked about the process of establishing the program and that the criteria had been discussed with the MBA and PAO prior to starting the program.

Mr. Chan added information about the residential civil engineer preferred provider program and the incentives as there are no direct financial incentives as there are with critical areas. He further explained that civil engineers for short plats have just been added to the program.

Mr. Spohr clarified the incentives for engineers.

Ms. High stated that it appeared that a fixed fee for engineering on short plats did not seem to be realistic as the engineering for short plats was more complex.

3. Review of draft fee study.

There was a lively discussion on the draft fee study.

Ms High asked where the extra burden of fees land when you have fixed fees. Is it with the applicants that are better prepared and thus use less review time? Another possibility mentioned was that it may inordinately impact the very small projects. Also mentioned was the possibility of stopping work on applications if the payment of fees is not current.

Mr. Spohr asked when paying fees how much is predictability worth? He wasn't sure what that point was but knows that applicants like predictability - just not sure where the line should be drawn.

Ms. Strupat proposed that due to the large number of fees that have not been collected for significant amounts of time a discount be looked at for paying early or on time. Those that pay on time should not subsidize the costs associated with late fees. Mr. Moorman stated that completion clauses in the construction industry worked both ways (financial incentives for finishing early, penalty for late performance).

Mr. Moorman has concerns about why his application was deemed complex not standard and why he was asked for a design that was then modified. Ms. Higgins agreed to look into his question and get answers back to him.

Ms. Strupat suggested that preapproved plans for such things as simple pole buildings and decks be looked at so that only the site issues would need to be addressed in a permit.

Mr. Spohr wanted to further explore fee estimates for non-project managed permits.

There was question was asked as to how the flat fees would be calculated. This question was answered by Mr. Miles to include the rate figure that was to be used.

4. – 5. Discussion on Committee report and Final Comments and Questions.

The committee accepted the offer of an additional meeting in August to further discuss the fee report. The time and date selected was Monday August 18th at 10:00a.m. Ms. Dhanapal asked the committee to focus on the pros and cons for the various fees and also the options and recommendations

portion of the draft report. Copies of this chart will be e-mailed to the applicants for them to enter information.

The committee was reminded that there are two separate reports to be submitted to the council by the middle of September. One is the fee study report that the committee has been asked to review and comment on. The second is the committee report covering the tasks as established by council ordinance. The charging language for these two reports is printed on the reverse side of the agenda each month.

Mr. Bruner asked if the committee would like to meet separately and it was decided that a lunch meeting would be held by the committee members following the meeting on Monday August 18th.

Mr. Spohr noted that a number of committee's tasks as established by council ordinance seem to have been adequately addressed by DDES. Ms. Dhanapal will prepare a listing for the committee of these tasks and the responses that were either given in the meetings or by e-mailed comments. This will be sent out prior to the meeting on the 18th.

Meeting Adjourned

The meeting adjourned with Ms. Dhanapal reminding committee members to submit their comments and/or recommendations.

Agenda
Permit Technical Advisory Committee
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Monday August 18, 2008

1. Adoption of the minutes from August 5,2008
2. Follow-up on any questions from meeting on August 5th
3. Review of draft Fee Study - Pam Dhanapal
4. Final comments and questions

Future Agenda's

September

- Final Committee comments on draft fee report/study
- Committee report
- Status of Committee

Draft Minutes
Permit Technical Advisory Committee
Monday, August 18, 2008 10:00 a.m. to 12:45 p.m.

Attending: Dan Bruner, Gwendolyn High, Gordon Moorman, Larry Rude, David Spohr, Roni Strupat, Tim Trohimovich and Stephanie Warden were the committee members in attendance. Pam Dhanapal staffed the meeting for DDES. Pam Dhanapal took minutes.

1. Adoption of Minutes

The meeting was opened by Ms. Dhanapal and the minutes from August 5th, 2008 were adopted by those present.

2. Follow-up on questions from August 5th meeting

Mr. Spohr talked about base + hourly thereafter fees and does not see how they help the customer as there is still a level of unpredictability for the hourly thereafter fees and at the other end of the spectrum some customers may end up paying for more services than they use.

Ms. Warden described them as a hybrid that provides predictability the majority of the time and also takes care of the outliers.

Mr. Spohr asked about using a non-binding fee estimate that gives customers the range of a particular review cost over the last year.

Ms. Strupat asked about the cost of an 800 square foot addition to a residence so she could get an idea of proportionality.

Ms. High concluded that since there is no one size fits all for permits hourly fees seem to be the fairest – since you are only paying for the services that you use.

3. Review of the draft fee study

Mr. Trohimovich concluded that when talking about fixed fees vs. hourly fees the most equitable fees are hourly. Those routine items may be a good fit for a flat rate as customers like a number or series of numbers. In addition the county receives an advantage for base + hourly fees.

Mr. Rude and Mr. Spohr were in agreement on concerns with base + hourly fees.

Ms. High mentioned that on base fees the one time applicant may be at a disadvantage where someone that submits a number of applications will be more likely to have them even out on the fees.

The committee inquired about what the outcome of the fee report to the council would be. Ms High requested that if the fee methodology changed significantly that public outreach occur to get their comments on the changes.

Mr. Spohr was worried about those fees that are hourly and concluded that the majority of them were land use.

Ms. Warden asked if it would make sense to have project management available to all permits at the person's discretion. The committee concluded that project management light would be similar to paying for insurance. The customer would need to be willing to pay for the estimate and field visit but would benefit from knowing what their fees would be.

Mr. Moorman was concerned about sprinkler fees especially the counter service fees and the fees for review since all designers must be certified by the state. He thought the fees worked against encouraging folks in the rural areas to have sprinklers.

Mr. Spohr wondered if the preferred consultant program could be extended to sprinkler and alarm designers for new construction with a lower fee.

Ms. Warden committed to taking a look at counter service fees for ancillary permits. Mr. Trohimovich wondered if DDES monitored fees for services on a regular basis to see if they were meeting the cost of the services.

On the table showing pros and cons for building services fees "still unpredictable for customers who go over the base" was added to the Base with hourly thereafter column. On the options and recommendations for residential permits the committee agrees with the option of converting hourly to fixed fee for addressing and the land use shoreline review. They also agreed with the flat fee for project manager prior to making a review choice but wanted to add a good explanation for what the person received for there services and an explanation about the number of permits affected.

For project managed residential and commercial permits the conclusion was that at the point in time project management is good but that it needs to be evaluated in the future when there is more data. Ms. High suggest including a target time for the re-evaluation. Mr. Trohimovich suggestion was an annual evaluation of project managed permits with appropriate refinements to the project management process being instituted.

The discussion on fire code annual inspection fees found the committee agreeing with Mr. Rude that the amount of time spent on inspections is variable depending on the size and intensity of uses within the building. The cost of even an additional hour (\$140) is considerable to small businesses on

the edge that already operate on a small profit margin. The recommendation was to leave the fees for annual inspections as hourly.

The discussion on clearing permits provided the recommendation to keep the fees as base + hourly thereafter and provide the option for an applicant to opt into project management light. Of the choices looked at base + hourly was preferable to fixed fees.

The discussion on critical area reclamation without a permit had a committee suggestion to re-label this on the report. It should be clear that it is a pilot project provided to give certainty to violators while not encouraging violations because the process was easier to use. All agreed that it should be evaluated after a specific time period with the possibilities of expansion, keeping the program, or revising it.

There was a significant amount of discussion on project management. Ms. Warden stated that questions on/about the project management program would be added to the September customer survey. There are pros and cons of one project manager for a phased project such as a plat. One project manager may provide continuity but may not have the best skills for that phase of the development. Currently there is an informal handoff process but that should be formalized. Mr. Trohimovich concluded that there should be a mechanism at each stage for the project manager to flag important issues/concerns for the next project manager. Ms. High talked about the importance of documenting not only the community concerns but the why's behind the conditions and that this could be included on a heads-up sheet that the project managers pass along.

Mr. Hoffman talked about the continuum of the platting process and liked the idea of formalizing the handoff process but wanted to know how much extra time or money it would add/save.

When the cost of a two lot short plat was discussed Mr. Trohimovich relayed that some jurisdiction heavily subsidize the two lot short plat but did not feel that King County was in a position to do that.

The committee concluded that project management was the most appropriate for all phases of the platting and short platting process due to the high levels of variability in site conditions and time spent.

Meeting Adjourned

The meeting adjourned with Ms. Dhanapal reminding committee members to submit their comments and/or recommendations.

A lunch meeting followed the formal meeting for further discussion among committee members about the committee report.

Agenda
Permit Technical Advisory Committee
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Tuesday September 2, 2008

9. Adoption of the minutes from August 18,2008

10. Follow-up on any questions from the last meeting

11. Finalize Fee Report Study – Pam Dhanapal

12. Review of draft Committee Report

13. Status of the Committee

14. Final comments

Draft Minutes
Permit Technical Advisory Committee
Tuesday, September 2, 2008 10:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

Attending: Dan Bruner, Gwendolyn High, David Hoffman, David Spohr, Roni Strupat, Tim Trohimovich, and Joe Miles substituting for Stephanie Warden were the committee members in attendance. Pam Dhanapal staffed the meeting for DDES. Pam Dhanapal took minutes.

1. Adoption of Minutes

The meeting was opened by Ms. Dhanapal and the minutes from August 18th, 2008 were corrected and the corrections adopted by those present.

2. Follow-up on questions from the last meeting

The committee was presented with additional information on base + hourly fees thereafter. Mr. Hoffman and Ms. High had submitted questions by e-mail asking of the permits that use base + hourly fees how many go over the base fee and conversely how many are under and by how much?

There was considerable discussion by the committee with the conclusion that base + hourly thereafter should be discontinued. Options considered were: 1) lower the base or 2) refund the difference between the base and what was actually used to the customer.

Additional information on the calculation of review and inspection fees under the building code was also presented and reviewed. The conclusion was that DDES should look at updating to the valuation table used the in next building code update cycle.

3. Finalize Fee Report Study – Pam Dhanapal

The committee recommendations to be included in the fee report were reviewed and amended.

4. Review of draft Committee Report

The committee reviewed the draft reports and agreed to Mr. Spohr's offer to finalize his draft and circulate it to committee members by email. Final input would be included and Mr. Spohr will submit the final report to the council.

Additional items that the committee agreed should be in the report were:

- Agriculture and Forestry are important to the county. Currently agricultural permits receive a reduced review rate (half the hourly rate) at DDES. This should be extended to those seeking Forestry permits that are in compliance with a forestry stewardship plan. The committee recognizes that CX funding

is tight in this budget cycle but also that DDES should not have to bear this entire cost.

- DDES should look at options to tie fee increases to an annual index that reflects the cost of doing business. This would be a benefit as any increases would not be seen as political.

5. Status of the Committee

The committee discussed the pros and cons of continuing the committee. The diverse make up of the committee was seen as important and provided the ability to give recommendations that considered many viewpoints. The decision was to have a follow-up meeting in approximately nine months where DDES would update the committee. At that time the committee would make a formal recommendation on its status. The meeting was then adjourned.



King County
 Department of Development
 and Environmental Services
 900 Oakesdale Avenue Southwest
 Renton, WA 98057-5212
 206-296-6600 TTY 206-296-7217

Web date: 07/16/2007

**PRE-APPLICATION MEETING –
 Building Services Division Package**

For alternate formats, call 206-296-6600.

Best to print on legal (8 1/2 x 14") paper.

Building Services Division Pre-Application Package

Pre-application meetings are designed to provide applicants the opportunity to present building permit proposals to Department of Development and Environmental Services (DDES) staff prior to the actual building permit intake process. This advance discussion allows DDES staff to provide feedback and comments to applicants. This process also allows applicants to ask DDES staff questions about applicable codes, process, etc. There are five types of Building Services Division (BSD) pre-application meetings:

- **Scoping Pre-application Meetings** are designed primarily to allow DDES staff to prepare a required Fee Quote for a project that has not held an optional or mandatory pre-application meeting. This process only provides a Fee Quote and does not provide any feedback or comments on the proposal. This process is typically held for smaller commercial permits, smaller additions, minor communication facilities, etc. *(See separate 2-page form for instructions.)*
- **Limited Pre-application Meetings** are designed for proposals that are extremely limited in scope or very conceptual in nature where an applicant wants the feedback of only one or two DDES review disciplines. *(See separate 2-page form for instructions.)*
- **Voluntary Pre-application Meetings** are held at the applicants' request to gain better understanding of regulatory requirements that may influence the project design. This conceptual meeting may be very preliminary in nature and is not intended to fulfill the required mandatory pre-application meeting needed prior to permit application submittal. *(See Page 3 of 9 for details)*
- **Mandatory Pre-application Meetings** are held prior to permit submittal for all permits that are required to have a mandatory pre-application meeting (per KCC 20.20.030). This pre-application meeting is designed to resolve issues that might keep an application from being declared complete or from meeting the 120-day permit processing timelines. *(See Page 3 of 9 for details)*
- **Consolidated Pre-application Meetings** can be either voluntary or mandatory and are designed for proposals that need to address both building permit review issues and land use permit review issues into one meeting. *(See Page 3 of 9 for details)*

QUICK CHECKLIST OF ITEMS TO BE COMPLETED BY THE APPLICANT

- Schedule submittal drop-off appointment with Julie Kubota at 206-296-7245.
- \$700.00 deposit check made payable to "King County Office of Finance" and the completed Pre-Application Meeting Request form (see page 2 of 9).
- Site plans, building plans, detailed written proposals, site reports, agendas, calculations, photographs, etc. for each discipline requested on page 2 plus two additional copies.
- Completed and signed Affidavit for Application Form.
- Completed and signed Right-of-Entry (see page 8 of 9).
- Completed and signed Field Investigation Delay Request (see page 9 of 9) [if applicable].

**SCHEDULE AN APPOINTMENT TO SUBMIT YOUR COMMERCIAL AND/OR RESIDENTIAL
 PRE-APPLICATION PACKAGE WITH JULIE KUBOTA AT 206-296-7245.**

NOTICE: FEES FOR PRE-APPLICATION MEETINGS

King County Ordinance Number 13664 (KCC 27.06.010) requires Department of Development and Environmental Services (DDES) to charge the current DDES hourly rate for each staff member involved in pre-application reviews, pre-application meetings and any follow-up work. **A minimum advance deposit of \$700.00 is required.**

Check out the DDES Web site at www.kingcounty.gov/permits



King County
Department of Development
and Environmental Services
 900 Oakesdale Avenue Southwest
 Renton, WA 98057-5212
 206-296-6600 TTY 206-296-7217

BUILDING SERVICES DIVISION PRE-APPLICATION MEETING REQUEST FORM

<input type="checkbox"/> I am interested in receiving FREE information and design assistance regarding compliance with Green Building and/or Low Impact Development. King County will contact the applicant and agent noted below.	Please Indicate if Pre-Application Meeting is: <input type="checkbox"/> Voluntary <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory <input type="checkbox"/> Consolidated option with one of the above <small>(Request for staff from Land Use Services Division)</small>
Pre-Application Number: <small>(to be filled out by King County DDES)</small>	

Project Name:	Date:
Applicant Name:	Agent Name:
Applicant Address:	Agent Address:
Applicant Phone:	Agent Phone:
Applicant Fax:	Agent Fax:
Applicant E-mail Address:	Agent E-mail Address:
Project Description:	
Project Address/Location:	Parcel Number(s):

All pre-application requests require submittal of an agenda (topics, questions, issues, etc.), drawings, project document and indication of issues to be discussed (check applicable boxes below). Please submit enough copies of the agenda, drawings and project documents for each person (checked box below) requested to attend the meeting, **along with two additional copies**. Please note that a minimum of the first five boxes must be checked for all mandatory pre-application meetings (check additional boxes as necessary for the proposal).

- Building Issues:** Building/Mechanical (HVAC)/Energy/Barrier-Free
- Fire Issues:** Fire Protection/Fire Flow/Fire Access/Sprinklers/Alarms/Hazardous Material
- Site Issues:** Drainage/Site Development/Flood Plains
- Site Issues:** Traffic/Road Access/Road Improvement/Parking Layout
- Site Issues:** Zoning/Landscape/Parking Count/Commercial Site Development Permit
- Land Use Permits:** Conditional Use/Rezone/Zoning Variance/Shoreline
- CAO/GEO Issues:** Landslide/Seismic/Coal Mine/Erosion/Steep Slopes
- CAO/Wetland Issues:** Streams/Wetlands
- Grading Issues:** Grading/Site Development
- SEPA Issues:** Environmental Concerns/Check List/Off-Site Improvements
- Health:** Septic/Well/Commercial Kitchen/Pool
- Field Check:** Field investigation and field check report
- Other (Specify):** _____



King County
Department of Development
and Environmental Services
 900 Oakesdale Avenue Southwest
 Renton, WA 98057-5212
 206-296-6600 TTY 206-296-7217

A **Voluntary Pre-application Meeting** is one that is held at the applicant's request to gain better understanding of regulatory requirements which may influence the project design. This meeting may be very preliminary in nature and is not intended to fulfill any required mandatory pre-application meeting needed prior to permit application submittal. The applicant is free to choose as many or as few review disciplines as they feel necessary to discuss the desired topics that may help refine their proposal. See also the **BSD Review Discipline Descriptions** form to help choose review disciplines.

A **Mandatory Pre-application Meeting** is one that is held prior to permit submittal for all permits that are required to have a pre-application meeting per the requirements of King County Code (KCC) 20.20.030. A mandatory pre-application meeting generally requires a higher level of plan detail and reports than a voluntary pre-application meeting. This pre-application meeting is designed to resolve issues that might keep an application from being declared complete or from meeting the 120 day permit processing timelines. The first five boxes on Page 2 of 9 must be selected as a minimum and additional boxes can be selected as necessary to discuss the full scope of the proposal.

At a mandatory pre-application meeting, King County DDES reserves the right to have present all staff that is considered to be essential to the review and processing of your permit application. We will attempt to honor your request in focusing on the issues and staff you have identified. Depending on the complexity of your proposal and the level of information provided, staff may recommend that additional sessions be held. These sessions would focus on specific issues and to assist in making sure that your permit submittal addresses all issues raised during the pre-application meeting.

A **Consolidated Pre-application Meeting** can be either voluntary or mandatory and is held when an applicant is requesting consolidated review of both a building permit application and a land use permit application (conditional use permit, shoreline permit, rezone permit, or zoning variance). Land Use Services Division requires pre-application meetings for certain types of land use permits and this consolidated pre-application meeting may eliminate the need for additional Land Use Services Division pre-application meetings. If you are going to request consolidated processing, it is important to identify all of the aspects of your permits that you wish the pre-application meeting to cover. This is particularly important when there are multiple parts to a project so that all staff understands the scope of the project and what changes may impact other reviews. **Consolidated Pre-application Meetings are scheduled and arranged by the Building Services Division.**

Indicate those members from your team that will attend the meeting:

DISCIPLINE	NUMBER ATTENDING	WILL NOT ATTEND
Applicant		<input type="checkbox"/>
Architect		<input type="checkbox"/>
Civil Engineer		<input type="checkbox"/>
Developer		<input type="checkbox"/>
Geotechnical Consultant		<input type="checkbox"/>
Landscape Architect		<input type="checkbox"/>
Legal Consultant		<input type="checkbox"/>
Property Owner		<input type="checkbox"/>
Structural Engineer		<input type="checkbox"/>
Traffic Engineer		<input type="checkbox"/>
Wetlands/Stream Consultant		<input type="checkbox"/>
Others:		<input type="checkbox"/>
Total Number Attending		



King County
Department of Development
and Environmental Services
900 Oakesdale Avenue Southwest
Renton, WA 98057-5212
206-296-6600 TTY 206-296-7217

PRE-APPLICATION MEETING FEES AND SCHEDULING INFORMATION

FEES:

King County Ordinance Number 13664 requires Department of Development and Environmental Services (DDES) to charge the current DDES hourly rate for each staff member involved in pre-application reviews, pre-application meetings and any follow-up work. A minimum advance deposit fee of \$700.00 will be required to schedule a pre-application meeting.

Please note that the deposit of \$700.00 covers approximately 5 hours of total staff time. Any staff time spent beyond that 5 hours will be invoiced at the current DDES hourly rate to the applicant (the financially responsible party on the Affidavit of Application Form).

TO SCHEDULE A MEETING:

1. Complete a Pre-Application Meeting Request Form
 - a) Applicant's name, address and telephone number
 - b) Description of project
 - c) Address of project **and Parcel Number(s)**
 - d) Provide number of people attending meeting from your design team (see page 3 of 9).

2. Provide a meeting agenda, detailed written proposal, drawings, reports (Technical Information Report, Geotechnical Report, Structural Calculations, etc.) and any other related project documents. Submit enough copies for each person requested to attend the meeting plus two additional copies. This material must be submitted at the time of making your Pre-application meeting request to DDES Building Services Division.

3. A field investigation of the site is typically done by DDES Building Services Division as part of the mandatory pre-application process. This field investigation can be requested as part of the voluntary pre-application process. The investigation and the subsequent field check report will be charged at the hourly fee noted above. Additionally, individual reviewers requested on Page 2 of 9 may visit the site as part of their review in order to provide you with comprehensive information at the Pre-application meeting.

4. Schedule an intake submittal appointment in advance with Technical Screening Team Support Staff to submit the completed Pre-Application Request Form and supporting documentation in person at 900 Oakesdale Avenue Southwest, Renton, WA. **Applicable pre-application fees will be charged at the current DDES hourly rate for each staff member involved in pre-application activities, including time spent for: research, plan review, meetings and any follow-up work (e.g. faxed documents, meeting notes, telephone calls, etc.).** All checks must be made payable to: "King County Office of Finance." Please note the neither DDES BSD voluntary or mandatory pre-application packages can be submitted via mail and must be submitted in person at a scheduled appointment.

5. A meeting date and time will be arranged during your submittal appointment with Technical Screening Team Support Staff. Pre-application meetings are scheduled at least two weeks from the date of submittal in order to provide review staff with adequate time to prepare for the meeting. Incomplete submittal packages will result in a delay in scheduling the meeting and may result in the return of the entire submittal package for resubmittal by the applicant when complete.

Additional information regarding BSD pre-application meetings can be secured by contacting Julie Kubota at 206-296-7245 or visiting the DDES Web site at www.kingcounty.gov/permits.



King County
Department of Development
and Environmental Services
900 Oakesdale Avenue Southwest
Renton, WA 98057-5212
206-296-6600 TTY 206-296-7217

BUILDING SERVICES DIVISION PRE-APPLICATION MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The purpose of this information is to provide a composite list of required and suggested design criteria for a pre-application meeting in preparation for filing a **complete** permit application. For detailed requirements for submitting a permit application, please refer to the "DDES Customer Information Bulletins" located in the "Main Lobby" on the 1st floor of the Department and Development and Environmental Services (DDES) building, 900 Oakesdale Avenue Southwest, Renton, Washington.

Review staff will provide written notes for applicant use during the pre-application meeting and the chair of the pre-application meeting will discuss the DDES permit process. After a mandatory pre-application meeting, the chair will be available prior to the applicant's permit intake appointment to discuss submittal requirements. The chair of the mandatory pre-application meeting will generate a preliminary Submittal Checklist for the applicant's use for the permit intake appointment. The chair of a mandatory pre-application meeting will also generate a Fee Quote which will be required to schedule a building permit intake appointment.

Submittal of requested information for a pre-application meeting does not vest the proposed site and/or building design. Pre-application reviews are based on the information available at the time of the review. If additional information becomes available during review of a building or commercial site development permit application, additional conditions or studies may be required. **Information presented at or required as a result of the pre-application meeting shall be valid for a period of 180 days following the pre-application meeting.**

SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS FOR PRE-APPLICATION MEETINGS:

Each level of pre-application meeting requires a minimum amount of information in order for staff to review the materials. If the minimum amount of information is not submitted then staff will not be able to adequately review the submittal and thus the pre-application may not be beneficial to the applicant. Regardless of the level of the pre-application meeting, the more information that is submitted and the greater detail that is provided will allow DDES staff to provide better feedback and comments. Below are the minimum requirements for each level of Building Services Division Pre-application meeting. Please provide the following information for your selected level of pre-application meeting:

REQUIRED IN ALL PRE-APPLICATION PACKAGES

- The name of the project.
- The names, addresses, telephone numbers, fax numbers, and e-mail addresses of the owner, agent, architect and/or engineer of record. **Indicate who is the agent to be contacted for questions.**
- A detailed description of the proposal including final land ownership objectives (separate lots, condominiums, etc.).
- The location of the property (i.e. address, assessor mapping, cross street(s), etc.).
- Any prior or pending pre-application meeting(s).
- All of the parcel number(s) for the site.
- The current zoning of the project site and the zoning of any adjacent parcels.
- Any other Land Use permits or actions that are pending or proposed affecting this application or that have been issued affecting this application, including rezones, conditional use permits, variances, shoreline master development permits, grading permits, plats, short plats, other pre-application meetings, or lotline adjustments. **Provide the application file number.**
- Any existing recorded easements that affect the property, (i.e. ingress, egress, utilities or drainage), as depicted on the assessor's map and/or legal survey.



King County
Department of Development
and Environmental Services
900 Oakesdale Avenue Southwest
Renton, WA 98057-5212
206-296-6600 TTY 206-296-7217

REQUIRED IN VOLUNTARY AND MANDATORY PRE-APPLICATION PACKAGES

- The area, in square feet or acres, of the project site.
- Calculation of the area of the parcel is currently in native vegetation and what percentage of the parcel will be built out
- For schools and daycare facilities note the number of anticipated students and staff.
- A site plan that includes a marker showing the direction of North.
- The location of existing and proposed fire department access roadways (fire lanes).
- Be prepared to discuss the core requirements and special requirements of the Surface Water Drainage Manual.
- For additions or modernizations, distinguish the new from the existing, both in plan view and in square footage calculations, and include site/building history (e.g., prior name/use/any related building permit numbers).

REQUIRED IN MANDATORY PRE-APPLICATION PACKAGES

- A site plan that includes the location, identification and dimension of all existing buildings, structures (i.e. rockeries, retaining walls, underground vaults), property lines, streets, alleys, easements, septic tank, drainfield, wells (including those located within 100-feet of property lines), etc. Indicate the level of improvement of all adjacent public rights-of-way.
- If your project was covered under a prior SEPA determination, please provide copies of the determination or copies of an impact statement if one was prepared.
- A vicinity map (drawn to approximately 1" = 2,000' scale) on the site plan showing sufficient detail to clearly locate the project in relation to arterial streets, natural features/landmarks and municipal boundaries.
- Boundary and topographic survey.
- All existing and proposed buildings with projections and roof overhangs shown, as well as covered breezeways and covered pedestrian walkways. Distinguish graphically between proposed vs. existing buildings.
- The location of required means of egress discharge walkways to the public way or parking aisleways.
- The location of required barrier-free walkways to site facilities, primary building entrances, barrier-free parking spaces and site entrance (reference WAC 51-30).
- Buildings scheduled for demolition or removal are to be indicated on the plan. Refer to Customer Information Bulletin #3, "Demolition Permits," for specifics on demolition and removal of buildings.
- Location of wetlands, streams, steep slopes, any known hazard areas (i.e. flood, erosion, landslide, seismic, volcanic or coal mine) and their required buffers and Building Setback Boundary Line (BSBL).
- All existing and proposed contours (preferably at 5 foot intervals), including property corners and access easements from a current assessor's map.
- The existing edge and width of the pavement of any adjacent roadways and all existing and proposed off-street parking facilities, loading areas, aisle-ways, driveway approaches, curbing, sidewalks, street channelization; indicate types of surfaces, etc.
- The existing vegetation in general, identifying the approximate location and size of all significant trees. Note whether these trees are to remain or to be removed.
- The type and width of landscaping proposed along streets, property lines, and within parking areas.
- The location of proposed and existing watermains, valves, and fire hydrants (reference King County Ordinance 5828 for regulations pertaining to fire flow and distribution).
- The location of any play areas and athletic fields (including bleachers).
- The location of recycle/storage areas (reference King County Code 21A.14.210).
- The location of fuel storage tanks.
- Geotechnical (soils) report.



King County
Department of Development
and Environmental Services
900 Oakesdale Avenue Southwest
Renton, WA 98057-5212
206-296-6600 TTY 206-296-7217

Required in Mandatory Pre-Application Packages (continued)

- Available soils or wetlands consultant reports, photographs, or surveys which may be used for a critical areas evaluation of the site.
- Wetland evaluation and delineation report.
- A brief description of the proposed and existing storm drainage conveyance system and retention/detention facilities, as well as storm drainage drawn on the site plan.
- Technical Information Report (surface water).
- A breakdown of the total impervious area of the site by sub-basin(s) and note the amount of new impervious area being developed. Include any area on the right-of-way being developed or improved. Identify total new impervious surface area subject to vehicular use.
- The number of existing, required, and proposed parking stalls located on the property; include calculations for how the required number was determined. Note the location of barrier-free accessible parking spaces and van barrier-free accessible parking spaces on the site plan (reference King County Code 21A.18, IBC Chapter 11, and ICC/ANSI A117.1).
- For school projects please note school attendance boundaries, walking/bicycle routes, and potential traffic increases from proposed additions/playfields.
- Show and identify driveways or streets, in vicinity, on the opposite side of the access street.
- Detailed and dimensioned floor plans.
- All rooms and areas properly identified by their use.
- Detailed description of all rooms and areas where hazardous materials are stored/handled/used.
- Occupancy classification(s).
- Type(s) of construction.
- State whether new and existing buildings have fire protection systems (e.g. sprinkler, fire alarms).
- Building area (include a code analysis sheet with a proposed vs. allowed area tabulation).
- Elevation views of building (story vs. basement) dimensioned and identified. Building height.
- Location of fire walls, fire barriers, and fire partitions.
- Location of exterior walls of buildings with respect to the property lines or other adjacent building(s) on the proposed site.
- Means of egress (exiting) design.
- Barrier-free accessibility and accessible means of egress design (reference IBC Chapter 11 and ICC/ANSI A117.1 for accessibility in general and IBC Section 1007 for accessible means of egress).
- Number and location of existing and proposed plumbing fixtures.
- Type and location of any food service.
- Detailed layout of food service establishment including, but not limited to: kitchen sinks, equipment, finishes, etc.
- Certificate of Water Availability (flow test or calculation required for fire flow availability).
- Septic as-built.
- Approved Site Application from the Health Department if on-site sewage disposal proposed (this may require King County Sewage Review board approval).
- Residential density calculation form for residential and mixed use projects.
- Be prepared to briefly discuss compliance with Washington State Energy Code.
- A summary of hazardous materials, listed by classification/quantity/container size (include material location within the building and whether materials are stored, handled and/or used). Two copies of summary required.
- A schedule of construction phasing, note if existing buildings will be occupied during construction.
- Heights of any proposed retaining walls and/or rockeries.



King County
Department of Development
and Environmental Services
 900 Oakesdale Avenue Southwest
 Renton, WA 98057-5212
 206-296-6600 TTY 206-296-7217

OPTIONAL FOR ALL PRE-APPLICATION PACKAGES

- A completed SEPA environmental checklist, unless your project is categorically exempt.
- Type and location of garbage service.
- Downstream analysis at least 1/4 mile from the site.
- Available traffic studies or, at minimum, trip generation projections from proposed project and distribution at access point(s).

OTHER BULLETINS THAT MAY BE HELPFUL (THESE MAY BE FOUND ON THE KING COUNTY DDES WEB SITE AT: www.kingcounty.gov/permits OR AT THE DDES LOBBY INFORMATION CENTER):

- DDES Customer Information Bulletin 8 – Commercial & Multifamily Building Permits
- DDES Customer Information Bulletin 13 – Fire System Permits
- DDES Customer Information Bulletin 19A – Zoning Code: Irrigation System Requirements
- DDES Customer Information Bulletin 21 – Critical Areas Review
- DDES Customer Information Bulletin 22 – Zoning Code: Landscaping Requirements
- DDES Customer Information Bulletin 24 – On-Site Recreation
- DDES Customer Information Bulletin 28 – Clearing and Grading Permits
- DDES Customer Information Bulletin 29 - Drainage Review
- DDES Customer Information Bulletin 31 - Right-of-Way Use
- DDES Customer Information Bulletin 34A - Road Variances
- DDES Customer Information Bulletin 34B – Surface Water Design Manual Variances or Adjustments
- DDES Customer Information Bulletin 36 – Mechanical Permits
- DDES Customer Information Bulletin 40 – Financial Guarantees
- DDES Customer Information Bulletin 42 – Laws and Rules Governing Building and Development
- DDES Customer Information Bulletin 45A – Zoning Code: Recyclables

RIGHT OF ENTRY

Property Owner

Signing and submitting this application authorizes DDES staff to access and inspect the subject property at any reasonable time for the purpose of permit review, inspection, and enforcement through the completion of this permit.

Applicant (Not Property Owner)

The applicant has been granted authority by the property owner to sign as his/her proxy authorizing DDES staff to access and inspect the subject property at any reasonable time for the purpose of permit review, inspection, and enforcement through the completion of this permit.

Signature of Property Owner/Applicant

Print Name

Date



King County
**Department of Development
and Environmental Services**
900 Oakesdale Avenue Southwest
Renton, WA 98057-5212
206-296-6600 TTY 206-296-7217

FIELD INVESTIGATIONS FOR PRE-APPLICATION MEETINGS

DDES Building Services Division staff will prepare a field report for all pre-application projects prior to meeting with the applicant (unless a field report has already been done for a site within 180 days of the meeting date). This field report provides preliminary site information regarding the project site that is useful for staff to provide feedback to the applicant on the proposed project. Applicants may request a delay of this field report for the voluntary pre-application meeting if the proposed project is still in the conceptual stages (see delay request below), though a field report may help to refine a conceptual project. If a field report is delayed for a voluntary pre-application meeting then it will be required to be done prior to the mandatory pre-application meeting.

FIELD INVESTIGATION DELAY REQUEST

(for Voluntary Pre-Application meetings only)

I would like to request at this time that the field investigation of the site not be done during the voluntary pre-application process. I understand that before the Mandatory Pre-Application meeting a field investigation will be done, and I will be charged the current DDES hourly rate for the investigation and subsequent field check report.

Signature of Applicant or Agent

Print Name

Date

Check out the DDES Web site at www.kingcounty.gov/permits



King County

**Department of Development
and Environmental Services**

900 Oakesdale Avenue Southwest
Renton, WA 98057-5212

206-296-6600 TTY 206-296-7217

**PRE-APPLICATION MEETING –
LAND USE: FEES, SCHEDULING
INFORMATION AND REQUEST FORM**

For alternate formats, call 206-296-6600.

Fees:

King County Code 27.06.010 authorizes the Department of Development and Environmental Services (DDES) to charge an hourly fee** for pre-application reviews. This includes an hourly fee for each staff member involved in pre-application research, pre-application meetings, and any post-meeting follow-up work. (See below for a description of the different types of land use pre-application meetings that may be requested.)

An advance deposit of \$383 will be required to schedule a pre-application meeting.

To schedule a land use pre-application meeting, an applicant must:

1. Complete the Land Use Pre-Application Meeting Request Form on page 3 that identifies:
 - a) Applicant's name, address and telephone number
 - b) Project description and type of permit(s) requested
 - c) Address of project and parcel number(s)
 - d) Type of pre-application meeting requested (see below)
 - e) Issues for discussion at the meeting
 - f) Number of people attending from the applicant's team.

2. Provide a site plan and as much other information as possible, such as a completed environmental checklist, technical reports and any other related project documents that may assist DDES staff in reviewing the proposal. A meeting agenda is optional. Submit enough copies for each DDES staff person requested to attend the meeting. In most cases, at least three (3) copies of each document should be sufficient; except for preliminary plat proposals, submit at least five (5) copies. These materials must be submitted at the time the pre-application meeting request to DDES is made.

3. Submit the required deposit. Make all checks payable to King County Office of Finance.

Pre-application meeting requests may be filed in-person or mailed, provided they include all the required submittal materials and a check for the advance deposit, to:

**Department of Development and Environmental Services
ATTN: Permit Center
900 Oakesdale Avenue Southwest
Renton, WA 98057-5212**

Pre-application meetings will be scheduled as soon as possible following the date of the request, usually within 30 days from the date received. The applicant will be contacted via telephone regarding a date and time for the meeting. DDES will also send out written confirmation of the meeting schedule.

** DDES fees are based on the latest fee ordinance adopted by the King County Council and are subject to change. As of June 1, 2007, the DDES standard hourly rate is \$140/hour.

Types of land use pre-application meetings

Mandatory: A required meeting that is held prior to filing any Type 2 land use permit (e.g., conditional use permit, zoning or SAO variance, shoreline permit, or short plat); Type 3 land use permit (e.g., preliminary plat or plat alteration); or Type 4 land use permit (e.g., rezone, special use permit). The primary purpose of the mandatory pre-application meeting is for DDES staff to discuss the application process timeline, submittal requirements needed to file a complete application, and permit application fees.

Land use feasibility: Also known as a "voluntary" pre-application meeting. This type of meeting is held at the applicant's request to assist in preparing an application. This may be very preliminary in nature and is not intended to fulfill the required pre-application meeting for permit submittal. A land use feasibility meeting may also be requested by an applicant who desires a more thorough and in-depth review of the proposed project. An applicant may request DDES to waive the required mandatory pre-application meeting if a land use feasibility meeting has already been held.

Note to applicants for minor telecommunication facilities: When a community meeting is required to be held prior to application submittal, DDES is requiring applicants to request a land use feasibility meeting as described above. Such request should be submitted to DDES at least four weeks prior to the tentatively scheduled date of the community meeting. After the request is received, a DDES planner will confirm the date of the community meeting with the applicant. A DDES planner will attend the community meeting, and, in most cases, will conduct the land use feasibility pre-application meeting with the applicant at the conclusion of the community meeting.

Consolidated: A pre-application meeting requested by the applicant to consolidate and combine land use permit review and building permit review into one meeting. If an applicant requests consolidated processing, it is important to identify all aspects of the proposal to be covered at the pre-application meeting. This is particularly important when there are multiple parts to a project so that DDES staff can understand the scope of the project and what changes may affect other reviews.

Additional information regarding pre-application meetings can be obtained by contacting DDES at 206-296-6600.



King County
Department of Development
and Environmental Services
 900 Oakesdale Avenue Southwest
 Renton, WA 98057-5212
 206-296-6600 TTY 206-296-7217

Land Use Pre-application Meeting Request Form

To be completed by DDES Staff Pre-application No. _____ _____	Date Received (Stamp)
--	--------------------------

<input type="checkbox"/> I am interested in receiving FREE information and design assistance regarding compliance with Green Building and/or Low Impact Development. King County will contact the applicant.
--

Please print

Applicant Name	Date	
Address		
Phone - -	Fax - -	E-mail
Project Description		
Permit(s) being requested		
Project Address/Location	Parcel No(s)	
Please indicate if pre-application is:		
<input type="checkbox"/> Land Use Feasibility <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory <input type="checkbox"/> Consolidated		

Check the box(es) regarding issues you wish to discuss:

- Land Use Permit Issues: Subdivision / CUP / Variances / Reasonable Use / PAUE
- Site Issues: Zoning / Setbacks / Density / Subdivision Design / Landscaping
- Site Issues: Traffic / Road Access / Road Improvement / Road Variances / Parking Layout
- Site Issues: Drainage / Site Development / SWDM Variances & Adjustments
- Shoreline Issues: Substantial Development Permit / Permitted Uses / Shoreline Setbacks
- SEPA Issues: SEPA Checklist / Off-Site Improvements / Mitigation
- Wetland/Stream Issues: Buffers / Building Setbacks / Flood Plains / Mitigation
- Geotechnical Issues: Steep Slope / Landslide / Seismic / Coal Mine / Erosion
- Clearing/Grading Issues: Site Development / Clearing Restrictions / Site Restoration
- Building Issues: Building / Mechanical: HVAC/Energy/ Barrier-Free Standards
- Fire Issues: UFC / Fireflow / Access / Sprinklers / Alarms / Hazardous Materials
- Health Issues: Sewer / Septic / Water / Groundwater/Noise Impacts
- Other (Specify): _____

Please indicate the numbers and types of representatives that will be at the pre-application meeting from your design team:

Will Attend	Will Not Attend		Will Attend	Will Not Attend	Will Attend	Will Not Attend
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Applicant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Architect	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Civil Engineer	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Developer	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
				Geotechnical Consultant		Structural Engineer
				Landscape Architect		Wetlands Consultant
				Legal Consultant		Others: _____
				Property Owner		

Total Number Attending _____

I certify that I am the applicant for this pre-application meeting request and I understand that DDES will assess hourly review fees for each DDES staff member involved in pre-application research, meetings and post-meeting follow-up work, and that I assume financial responsibility for all fees associated with this request.

Applicant's signature

Note: An advance deposit of \$383 is required to schedule a pre-application meeting. Make checks payable to King County Office of Finance.

If you have any questions about your pre-application meeting, please contact DDES at 206-296-6600.

Check out the DDES Web site at www.kingcounty.gov/permits

No-Fault Cooperation Pilot Program

What is a No-Fault Cooperative agreement?	This agreement is patterned after one used by other entities such as the King Conservation District. The agreement is based on a cooperative relationship between the County and the cooperator (formally called the violator). This will reduce cost and time to the cooperator and the county. Once the plan for remediation is completed it is followed up with a good faith agreement.	
How do these get initiated?	This program would be explained at the time a violation has been determined by Code Enforcement Staff as part of a code enforcement investigation.	
The Scope of the program		
What is the No-Fault Cooperation Program for First Time Violators?	What violations <i>may</i> qualify	What violations do <i>not</i> qualify
	Size: Outside of certain areas, clearing less than 7,000 sq. ft, grading less than 100 cubic yards, or adding less than 2,000 sq. ft impervious surface.	Size: Clearing, grading, or adding impervious surface over these limits, or anything else triggering SEPA review, do not qualify.
	Critical areas: Disturbance may have been in channel migration, erosion control and CARA areas.	Critical areas: Disturbance may not have been in any other critical areas or shorelines.
	Critical area buffers: Disturbance may have been in the buffer for wetlands, aquatic, or steep slope areas.	Miscellaneous: May not have added impervious surface to floodplains; does not cover structures, such as sheds, driveways, or certain utilities.
Pre-Application Meeting	Pre application meeting would be used to determine scope of work and set the standards used in the Joint No-Fault Cooperative agreement. This meeting would be held onsite with Site Development Specialist, Critical Areas Staff and the Code Enforcement officer. This would be the only field time prior to issuance of the permit. Information will be gathered to develop a mitigation plan and to draft a No-Fault Cooperative agreement.	
Should a Joint No-Fault Cooperative agreement be required?	Yes. A signed No-Fault Cooperative agreement would be formalized with scope of work, mitigation plan and fees associated with the process.	
Fees among appropriate groups	Opportunity to develop a cooperative agreement that has a flat fee with DDES as consultant or standard process with standard fees using a private consultant.	
Are financial guarantees required – if so how and how much?	A minimum financial guarantee would need to be determined with a process to reduce the bond.	
New permit type	Establish a new permit type in permits plus so that staff responses, time and costs can be tracked. Possible determine a flat fee in the future.	
How do we treat if relates to another permit application on the same property?	A separate clearing/grading permit would be required and the property owner would have the choice to go through the standard process or the No-Fault Cooperative agreement.	
How do we educate the cooperator about impacts to critical areas?	Treat it as an opportunity for the land owner to learn about doing the right thing for their property. What it means to be a good steward of their land and the environment. Discuss other best management practices that could voluntarily be incorporated, and learn about the long-term benefits not only the natural resources on and off the property but to their family and community.	
How do we highlight successes – the cooperators successful remediation, DDES not the bad guy – others?	Recognition for those cooperators that have gone above and beyond what was required for the permit and have a commitment to being good stewards of their land. Customer satisfaction surveys could be conducted. Cooperator now has a DDES outreach contact for future questions. Long term success depends on CX funding for outreach.	
What are the benefits of this program?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ability to build good working relationship between DDES and Cooperator ▪ Less expensive, relatively quick turnaround, and predicable outcome ▪ Educational component about the environmental benefits and permit process ▪ Cooperator now has a contact at DDES for future questions ▪ Long term success depends on CX or other funding for outreach 	