CLACKAMAS COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Study Session Worksheet

Presentation Date: April 3, 2012

Time: 11:00 AM

Length: 30 minutes

Presentation Title: Building Codes and Planning Fee Considerations

Department: Department of Transportation & Development

Presenters: Barbara Cartmill, Deputy Director, Scott Caufield, Building Codes

Administrator, and Mike McCallister, Planning Director

Other Invitees: N/A

WHAT ACTION ARE YOU REQUESTING FROM THE BOARD?

Direction on remaining fee options.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

During the annual review of proposed fees on February 28, 2012, the Board requested clarification on some Building and Planning Division fees. Staff is presenting options for the Board's consideration.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS (current year and ongoing):

Proposed fee and fine changes are set to respond to the demands of constituents and market forces. Fee adjustments assist divisions that are dependent on cost recovery to maintain a high service level.

LEGAL/POLICY REQUIRMENTS:

Unless otherwise delegated, the Board of County Commissioners establishes fees and fines.

PUBLIC/GOVERNMENTAL PARTICIPATION:

Development Liaison Committee and Mobile Vending Units were presented through a public outreach process.

OPTIONS:

- 1. Approve fees and fines as discussed in study session.
- 2. Provide further direction regarding proposed fees and fines.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff respectfully recommends approval of fees and fines as discussed in today's study session.

ATTCHMENTS:

- Building Codes Division memo packet
- Planning Division memo packet
- Operating Efficiencies memo
- Letters from Development Liaison Committee

SCHEDULE FOR STUDY SESSION

Division Director/Head Approval
Department Director/Head Approval A. D. Carfmill 3/27/12
County Administrator Approval

For information on this issue, please contact Barbara Cartmill at 503-742-4326 or barbc@co.clackamas.or.us

Building Codes Proposed Fee Increase – Study Session Responses

During the proposed fee increase study session held on February 28, 2012, a number of questions were raised with regard to the building permits fees proposed by the Building Codes Division. The following are responses to those questions:

Comparative Costs of Aggregated Project Fees: Please see first attachment for example of a single family residence.

Cost Recovery for Repeated Plan Reviews & Inspections: At the recent study session, the BCC suggested graduated fees for services that exceed those included in the basic permit. Included in the spread sheet are the following proposed fees:

- Inspections outside normal business hours \$85.00 / hour (min. 4 hour charge)
- Reinspection fee \$85.00 / inspection
- Inspections where no specific fee exists \$85.00 / hour (min. ½ hour charge)
- Additional plan review \$85.00 / hour (min. 1 hour charge)
- Additional scope of work (varies by either additional construction valuation or additional fee items or both plus State of Oregon Surcharge of 12%)
- Work not ready for inspection when requested \$85.00 / inspection
- Corrections not completed at time of reinspection \$85.00 / inspection
- Electrical inspections only where number of inspections provided by statute is exceeded \$85.00 / inspection

Frequency of Fees: Building Codes Division fees are typically one-time charges for plan review and inspections, paid at or before the time of permit issuance. Additional fees are charged only when additional costs are incurred after-the-fact due to plan revisions or field changes, where reinspection fees are owed or where the scope of work originally included in the initial application is exceeded (see previous item).

Full Cost Recovery for Contracts with Cities: The Building Codes Division does achieve full cost recovery for services provided to cities via contract. In cases where we have revenue sharing agreements, the percentage split is adequate to cover the costs of our services. Additionally, in most instances, the County can assess additional fees as outlined under Cost Recovery above, where administrative costs exceed basic charges.

Satellite Offices: At the time of the move from the Sunnybrook Service Center to Red soils Campus in 2008, satellite offices were considered in an effort to better serve builders and developers in the Clackamas and outlying areas. Even during what was then a robust economy, the costs of staffing and the additional overhead expenses associated with operating multiple offices were prohibitive. Given the Division's current financial situation and lagging construction, such satellite offices remain impractical.

Charge More for Increased Travel Times in Remote Area / Inspection Zones: The State of Oregon Building Codes Division (BCD) which provides administrative guidance and oversight to building departments throughout the state, has consistently held that a jurisdiction may not add administrative fees or surcharges, issuance fees and the like to permits to offset the cost of code administration.

Instead, the expectation is that these costs are considered and built into the jurisdiction's adopted fees and then applied fairly and consistently across all permit types. Toward that end, we factor in drive times, fuel use, vehicle operation and maintenance costs etc. in the development of our annual budget. Additionally, to ensure maximum efficiency, County inspectors are assigned zones in which they regularly perform their inspections. Inspections are sorted daily and grouped by zone to minimize drive times and ensure the least possible travel times. Where the costs of basic code administration are exceeded (for example, where work is not ready for an inspection after a lengthy drive) the Division can assess a fee as outline previously.

Use of Photos in Lieu of Actual Inspections: The Division allows the use of photos in lieu of inspections as a part of its Progress Inspections Program. Photos are an integral part of that program in that they allow a permit holder to demonstrate activity and progress (thus keeping the permit active) without requiring an inspector to make a needless trip to the building site. The Division does not typically accept photos in lieu of required safety inspections although it has done so in extremely limited cases.

Jurisdictional Fee Comparison: Please see second spread sheet attachment entitled Jurisdictional Fee Comparisons.

Jurisdictional Responsibility Matrix: Please see third spread sheet attachment showing jurisdictional responsibility. All jurisdictions presented in the spreadsheet use Clackamas County adopted fees except for City of Canby. Per the City of Canby IGA signed Dec 19, 2011, Canby fees are used for all building and mechanical permits issued within their city limits.

June 30, 2011 - July 1, 2012 vs. July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013 Estimations for

Single Family Residence (SFR) in Unincorporated Clackamas County

March 12, 2012

"This spreadsheet is presented in response to a request for information about the typical Clackamas County and Water Environment Services costs and fees likely to be incurred for a 2,000 square foot single family resident with a 500 square foot garage constructed in Clackamas County. Rates are reviewed throughout the year. For current information on rates refer to http://www.clackamas.us/docs/code/appendixa.pdf

WES SDC Estimate Fee Schedule http	o://www.co.clackamas.or.us/wes/rules.js	0
SFR Building Permit in CCSD#1	2011-2012	2012-2013
Sanitary Sewer SDC	\$ 6,600.00	\$ 6,600.00
Surface Water SDC	\$ 205.00	\$ 205.00
Erosion Control	\$ 310.00	\$ 310.00
Plan Review	\$ 55.00	\$ 55.00
TOTAL	\$ 7,170.00	\$ 7,170.00
Transportation SDC/Parks SDC		
TSDC Countywide	\$ 3,560.00 / dwelling unit	\$ 3,560.00 / dwelling unit
PSDC NCPRD District 2	\$ 6,760.00 / dwelling unit	\$ 6,760.00 / dwelling unit
TOTAL	\$ 10,320.00	\$ 10,320.00
Building Division:		
Building Permit fee based on 2,000 sq. ft.	sfr + 500 sq. ft. garage	
Estimated Building Permit	\$ 914.85	\$ 1,109.70
Plan Review Fee w/FLS	\$ 594.65	\$ 721.30
State Surcharge	\$ 109.78	\$ 133.16
Mechanical (based on valuation)	Included in building permit	Included in building permit
Fire Alarm	Not typical of residential	Not typical of residential
Fire Sprinkler	Not typical of residential	Not typical of residential
Electrical (Incl. limited energy)	\$ 493.00	\$ 544.00
Electrical State Surcharge	\$ 59.16	\$ 65.28
Plumbing (based on 2 1/2 bath)	\$ 790.00	\$ 956.00
Plumbing Surcharge	\$ 94.80	\$ 114.72
TOTAL	\$ 3,056.24	\$ 3,644.16
Additional surcharges/taxes assessed	d under building permit:	
Metro 0.12 Percent of Permit	\$ 268.00	\$ 268.00
School Excise Tax (SCET)	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 2,000.00
TOTAL	\$ 2,268.00	\$ 2,268.00
Engineering Division:		
Driveway Permit - *Urban	\$ 160.00	\$ 166.00
TOTAL		\$ 166.00
Planning Division:	La Tarante de la Caractería de la Caract	
Review fee for SFR	\$ 158.00	\$ 165.00
TOTAL		\$ 165.00
TOTAL ALL	\$23,132.24	\$23,733.16
Diffe	rence \$ 600.92 (2.6% net ir	

JURISDICTIONAL BUILDING PERMIT FEE COMPARISON: JANUARY 2012

**(REPORT CONTINUES 2ND PAGE) **

	Tualatin	Hillsboro	Beaverton	Wash Co.*	Clark County, Wa.*	Lake Oswego	Scappose	Wilsonville	Sherwood	Clack Co	King City	Milwaukie	Clack Co
New Single-Family										Current			Proposed
Value 2000 sq π nouse W/ 500 sq π garage													
\$200.000 Value					6								
Building Permit	\$887.00	\$949.15	\$1,031.20	\$862.75	\$1,224.10	#000 00	04.070.44	#4 050 40	0005.05	00/0 #0	01.101.00	44.040.00	
Plan Check	\$576.55	\$616.95	\$670.28	\$560.79	\$1,224.10	\$996.00	\$1,076.14	\$1,056.49	\$965.25	\$842.50	\$1,134.30	\$1,318.52	\$1,022.20
State Surcharge	\$106.44	\$113.90	\$123.74	\$200.19	\$4.50	\$647.40	\$699.49	\$686.72	\$820.46	\$547.63	\$855.17	\$857.04	\$664.43
Plumbing (3 bath)	\$420.00	\$528.64	\$352.35	\$200.19		\$119.52	\$129.14	\$126.78	\$168.83	\$101.10	\$136.12	\$158.22	\$122.66
Mechanical*	\$117.60	\$92.51	\$208.82	\$69.44	\$489.64	\$450.80	\$675.36	\$390.66	\$420.00	\$940.80	\$446.88	\$517.44	\$1,070.72
Electrical**	\$308.84	\$256.39	\$219.18	\$308.84	\$0.00 \$150.50	\$209.44	\$101.96	\$91.11	\$72.80	\$95.20	\$81.20	\$104.72	\$95.20
Total	\$2,416,43	\$2,557,54	\$2.605.57			\$246.46	\$0.00	\$372.96	\$308.84	\$372.96	\$321.38	\$372.96	\$449.12
Total	\$2,416.43	\$2,557.54	\$2,605.57	\$2,618.01	\$2,664.41	\$2,669.62	\$2,682.09	\$2,724.72	\$2,756.18	\$2,900.19	\$2,975.05	\$3,328.90	\$3,424.33
*Kitchen Hood, 3 - Bath Fans, 100k Furnace, Clothes Dryer, Gas Piping						#							
** 200 Amp Service, 20 - Circuits		-V											
Single-Family Addition		8		æ									
\$50,000 Vale	\$366.00	\$408.65	\$688,30	\$447.25	\$655,60	\$461.75	\$446.64	\$456.99	\$415.25	\$347.50	\$470.80	\$542.02	6407.00
Plan Check	\$237.90	\$265.62	\$447.40	\$469.61	\$426.14	\$300.14	\$290.32	\$297.04	\$352.96	\$225.88	\$306.02	\$352.31	\$427.20
Total	\$603.90	\$674.27	\$1,135.70	\$916.86	\$1,081.74	\$761.89	\$736.96	\$754.03	\$768.21	\$573.38	\$776.82	\$894.33	\$275.00 \$702.20
	\$000.00	ψ01 I.Z.1	ψ1,100.70	φ510.00	ψ1,001.74	\$701.03	Ψ130.30	\$154.05	\$100.21	\$313.30	\$110.02	\$034.33	\$702.20
New Multi-Family													
\$711,000 Value (10-units, 8,000 Sq. Ft.)	\$2,420.00	\$2,579.24	\$3,788.05	\$2,988.50	\$6,304.12	\$2,434.05	\$3,084.37	\$3,354.39	\$2,939.25	\$2,426.60	\$3,066.41	\$3,182.20	\$2,938.45
Struct Plan Check	\$1,573.00	\$1,676.51	\$2,462.23	\$1,942.53	\$4,097.68	\$1,582.13	\$2,004.84	\$2,180.35	\$2,498.36	\$1,577.29	\$1,993.17	\$2,477.93	\$1,909.99
FLS Plan Check	\$1,089.00	\$1,031.70	\$1,515.22	\$1,195.40		\$973.62	\$849.31	\$1,341.76	\$1,447.99	\$849.31	\$1,226.56	\$1,524.88	\$1,028.46
Total	\$5,082.00	\$5,287.44	\$7,765.50	\$6,126.43	\$10,401.80	\$4,989.80	\$5,938.52	\$6,876.50	\$6,885.60	\$4,853.20	\$6,286.14	\$7,185.01	\$5,876.90
New Commercial Office)				
\$3,200,000 Value (30,000 Sq. Ft.													
Office)	\$9,887.00	\$7,329.15	\$8,180.55	\$12,322.25	\$17,527.74	\$6,801.00	\$13,255.14	\$13,907.75	\$11,983.25	\$10,142.50	\$10,230.60	\$15,500.00	\$12,272,20
Struct Plan Check	\$6,426.55	\$4,763.95	\$5,317.36	\$8,009.46	\$11,393.03	\$4,420.65	\$6,953.38	\$9,040.04	\$10,185.76	\$6,592.63	\$6,649.89	\$10,075.00	\$7,976.93
FLS Plan Check	\$4,449.15	\$2,931.66	\$3,272.22	\$4,928.90		\$2,720.40	\$3,549.87	\$5,563.10	\$4,793.16	\$3,549.87	\$4,092.24	\$6,200.00	\$4,295.27
Total	\$20,762.70	\$15,024.76	\$16,770.13	\$25,260.61	\$28,920.77	\$13,942.05	\$23,758.39	\$28,510.89	\$26,962.17	\$20,285.00	\$20,972.73	\$31,775.00	\$24,544.40
Commercial Alteration												<u> </u>	
\$75,000 Value	\$475.00	\$519.40	\$865.80	\$572.25	\$1,510.46	\$579.50	\$564.90	\$636.75	\$560.25	\$440.00	\$607.55	\$686.27	\$535.20
Struct Plan Check	\$308.75	\$337.61	\$562.77	\$371.96	\$981.80	\$376.68	\$367.19	\$413.89	\$476.21	\$286.00	\$394.91	\$446.08	\$347.88
FLS Plan Check	\$213.75	\$207.76	\$346.32	\$228.90		\$231.80	\$154.00	\$254.70	\$224.10	\$154.00	\$243.02	\$274.51	\$187.32
Total	\$997.50	\$1,064.77	\$1,774.89	\$1,173.11	\$2,492.26	\$1,187.98	\$1,086.09	\$1,305.34	\$1,260.56	\$880.00	\$1,245.48	\$1,406.85	\$1,070.40

(2)	Portland Multnomah Cty.*	Tigard	Happy Valley	Oregon City	Gresham	Vancouver, Wa.	West Linn	Canby
New Single-Family								
value 2000 sq π nouse								
w/ 500 sq π garage								
\$200,000 Value								
Building Permit	\$1,087.00	\$1,307.54	\$1,268.40	\$1,374.88	\$1,505.00	\$2,702.99	\$1,529.00	\$1,369.0
Plan Check	\$706.55	\$849.90	\$824.46	\$893.67	\$978.25	\$1,351.50	\$993.85	\$1,369.0
State Surcharge	\$130.44	\$156.90	\$152.21	\$164.99	\$180.60	\$4.50	\$183.48	\$164.3
Plumbing (3 bath)	\$1,003.52	\$770.49	\$884.80	\$884.88	\$810.88		\$729.12	\$940.8
Mechanical*	\$146.72	\$247.48	\$246.40	\$72.80	\$267.68		\$250.88	\$108.0
Electrical**	\$406.56	\$302.74	\$372.96	\$372.96	\$297.92		\$372.96	\$372.9
Total	\$3,480.79	\$3,635.06	\$3,749.23	\$3,764.18	\$4,040.33	\$4,058.99	\$4,059.29	\$4,324.0
*Kitchen Hood, 3 - Bath Fans, 100k Furnace, Clothes Dryer, Gas Piping ** 200 Amp Service, 20 - Circuits						- S4		
Single-Family Addition								
\$50,000 Vale	\$501.12	\$729.45	\$521.25	\$539.13	\$539.00	\$1,121.39	\$681.00	\$569.C
Plan Check	\$325.73	\$474.14	\$338.81	\$350.43	\$350.35	\$560.70	\$442.65	\$569.0
Total	\$826.85	\$1,203.59	\$860.06	\$889.56	\$889.35	\$1,682.09	\$1,123.65	\$1,138.0
New Multi-Family								
\$711,000 Value (10-units, 8,000 Sq. Ft.)	\$2,952.77	\$3,552.81	\$3,639.90	\$4,251.81	\$4,487.00	\$7,366.78	\$4,084.00	\$3,924.0
Struct Plan Check	\$1,919.30	\$2,309.33	\$2,365.94	\$2,763.68	\$2,916.55	\$3,683.39	\$2,654.60	\$3,924.0
FLS Plan Check	\$1,181.11	\$1,421.12	\$849.31	\$1,700.72	\$1,794.80	\$241.96	\$1,633.00	\$1,373.4
Total	\$6,053.18	\$7,283.26	\$6,855.15	\$8,716.21	\$9,198.35	\$11,292.13	\$8,371.60	\$9,221.4
New Commercial Office								
\$3,200,000 Value (30,000 Sq. Ft. Office)	\$12,037.62	\$14,782.42	\$15,213.75	\$18,264.88	\$12,939.00	\$21,795.70	\$16,052.90	\$15,500.0
Struct Plan Check	\$7,824.45	\$9,573.47	\$6,953.38	\$11,872.17	\$8,410.35	\$10,897.90	\$10,434.39	\$15,500.0
FLS Plan Check	\$4,815.05	\$5,891.37	\$3,549.87	\$7,305.95	\$5,175.60	\$725.02	\$6,421.60	\$5,425.0
Total	\$24,677.12	\$30,247.26	\$25,717.00	\$37,443.00	\$26,524.95	\$33,418.62	\$32,908.89	\$36,425.0
Commercial Alteration		7/					AA 1=	07.0
\$75,000 Value	\$611.87	\$917.70	\$660.00	\$677.00	\$439.00	\$1,425.76	\$847.00	\$719.0
Struct Plan Check	\$397.72	\$596.51	\$429.00	\$440.05	\$285.35	\$712.90	\$550.55	\$719.0
FLS Plan Check	\$244.75	\$367.08	\$154.00	\$270.80	\$175.60	\$48.04	\$338.80	\$251.6
Total	\$1,254.33	\$1,881.29	\$1,243.00	\$1,387.85	\$899.95	\$2,186.70	\$1,736.35	\$1,689.6

Page 2

Municipal Jurisdiction Chart	B A R L O W	C A N B Y	D A M A S C U S	E S T A C A D A	G L A D S T O N E	H A P P Y V A L L E Y	J O H N S O N C I T Y	L A K E O S W E G O	M I L W A U K I E	M O L A L L A	O R E G O N C I T Y	R I V E R G R O V E	S A N D Y	W E S T L I N N	W I L S O N V I L L E
Need City Approval for Building Permit	Υ	Υ	N	N	N	N	Υ	N	N	N	N	Υ	N	N	N
Building/Mech.															
Permit	X	Х	X	city	X	city	X	city	city	Х	city	Х	city	city	city
F/L/S Review only	X	X	X	city	X	city	X	city	city	X	city	Х	city	city	city
Inspections	X	X	X	city	X	city	X	city	city	Χ	city	X	city	city	city
MH Inspections	X	Х	X	city	X	city	X	city	city	Х	city	Х	city	city	city
Plumbing															
Permit	X	Х	X	city	X	city	X	city	city	Х	city	Х	city	city	city
Plan Review	X	Х	X	city	X	city	X	city	city	Х	X	X	city	city	city
Inspection	X	Х	X	city	X	city	X	city	city	Х	X	Х	city	city	city
Electrical															
Permit	X	Х	X	city	X	В	Х	city	В	Х	city	Х	Х	Х	X
Plan Review	X	Х	X	city	X	Χ	X	city	Χ	Х	X	Χ	X	Х	X
Inspection	Х	Х	X	city	X	Х	Х	city	X	Х	X	Х	X	Х	Х
MH Feeder only	X	Х	X	city	X	city	X	city	city	Х	city	Χ	city	city	city
MFG Home Park															
Plan / Inspection	X	Х	X	city	Χ	city	X	city	city	Х	city	Χ	X	city	city
RV Park / Camp															
Plan / Inspection	Х	Х	X	city	Х	city	X	city	city	Х	city	Х	X	city	city

X - County Jurisdiction
city - City Jurisdiction
B - Permits can be obtained at either location

Mobile Vending Unit - Level 2

- This is a onetime fee.
- County staff requirements are the same, regardless of the time the cart is in operation.

The \$1,100 fee, is based on experience with similar application size involvement and is broken down as follows. The hourly rates are slightly subsidized. Actual rates are \$110/hr.

Planning

2 hours File intake (time with customer), set up and distribution

2 hours Research and coordination with other divisions

1 hour Write decision

5 @ \$100 \$ 500.00

Engineering

2 hours Review application

Research property history

1 hour Site visit

2 hours Conditions of approval

1 hour Inspection

6 @ \$100 <u>\$ 600.00</u>

Level 2 Fee \$1,100.00

These hours are based on averages.

• Some applications have a more complicated history and some applications, such as one in Government Camp, involve more hours due to the site being a two hour drive time.

Level 3 Mobile Vending Fees

- This is a onetime fee.
- County staff requirements are the same, regardless of the time the cart is in operation.
- SDCs are not yet determined as we continue to research actual impacts. There is little historical data as carts are a relatively recent occurrence. Government Camp is an example of an area where SDCs do not appear to apply based on seasonality. The proposed policy identifies units remaining on a site up to 120 days be exempt.

The \$1,700 fee, for a Level 3 cart, is based on the current planning director's fee of \$814.00 plus the Development Permit fee, minus rounding, of \$936.00.

Planning & Engineering

2 hours 2 hours	File intake (time with customer), set up and distribution Research and coordination with other divisions
4 hour	Write decision
4 hours 5 hours	Research, field visit, Write recommended conditions
Jilours	Inspections, file management, permitting, coordination with applicant and Planning

Level 3 fee

17 @ \$100 \$ 1,700.00

These hours are based on existing planning and engineering permit fees combined.

March 20, 2012

To: Cam Gilmour, DTD Director

From: Mike McCallister, Planning Director

cc: Barbara Cartmill, DTD Deputy Director

RE: Response to Fee Study Session Issue / Operating Permitting Services Efficiently

The following information is in response to your email dated February 28, 2012 requesting follow up information to the Fee Study Session regarding operating efficiencies for permitting services in the Development Services Division.

- 1. Developed a Business Plan to provide a framework for monitoring goals and objectives for the division.
- 2. Building Codes Division staff was reduced by 55% in 2009/2010 through layoffs, the elimination of vacancies, and retirements. Planning and Zoning Division staff was reduced by 3 FTE in 2009 / 2010.
- 3. Expenses in Materials and Services and training categories were cut significantly and all expenses are carefully monitored.
- 4. Existing vehicle fleet for Building Services is carefully maintained to ensure longevity, safety, and maximum fuel efficiency.
- 5. Building inspectors combine inspections where possible to minimize trips and to perform as many inspections at each jobsite as possible.
- 6. Lobby hours open to the public were reduced to provide uninterrupted time each day for Building Division staff to complete plan reviews, answer phone calls and perform administrative functions. Planning and Engineering Staff is available by appointment and during non-lobby hours to assist customers with planning and engineering related inquiries and permits.
- 7. The County recently added contracts with two cities to provide planning and building services. The Planning and Zoning Division now provides planning services for the City of Molalla and the Building Division provides building services (permitting, plan review and inspection services) for the cities of Canby and Molalla.
- 8. The Department of Transportation and Development is implementing Accela's Automation software, a web-based permitting software which will provide access to County services via the web in the fall of 2012.

- 9. The Building Division and Planning and Zoning Division has not filled certain vacancies in an effort to control costs.
- 10. Most Division employees perform multiple functions. For example, plans examiners also double as field inspectors (as their state certifications allow) and cover the Public Service Lobby. The Engineering Division has completed cross-training for development review staff so that more than one person is available to respond to customer inquiries and prepare written responses to land use applications.
- 11. Planning and Zoning, Engineering and Surveyor Divisions have streamlined the process for submittal of partition and subdivisions plats including a process for the developer / property owner to have one point of contact to coordinate the review of plats.
- 12. The Development Services Division is implementing a Job Costing program to monitor costs of services (processing applications).
- 13. The Planning and Zoning Division and Engineering Division have two on-going LEAN projects (Land Use Application Intake and Repurposing an Existing File Room).
- 14. Continue to create more opportunities to provide information and services via the web, including Document Retriever Program to review land use applications and decisions, a program to review permit history for a specific property, C-MAP program to review zoning, floodplain and other property specific information.
- 15. Improved office space management that consolidated office space in the Development Services Building and reduced division costs by releasing unused space that was leased to other divisions.
- 16. Recently completed improvements to the Pre-Application Conference process for land use applications, including process improvements, agency coordination and updates to the pre-application form.
- 17. County Surveyor has released the vacant position of Land Surveyor Manager (Deputy County Surveyor) for the duration of the economic down turn. Ultimately, this should be filled again to allow training for future staff planning and succession.
- 18. The Office Supervisor in the Surveyor's office is now working 1/3 time supervising office staff in Engineering. The Surveyor's Office Specialist 1 (scanning specialist) is now working ½ time scanning projects for Engineering.
- 19. The Surveyors' office front counter staff has been cross training with the Engineering counter staff. This will allow both groups to provide back up support for each other improving customer contacts and potentially providing cost reductions for both groups. This will be easier to accomplish due to the wall removal and new common front counter. This is a major step in merging the Surveyor with Engineering.

Cartmill, Barbara

Subject:

FW: Proposed building departmer

From: Justin Wood [mailto:justinw@hbapdx.org]

Sent: Thursday, March 01, 2012 5:21 PM

To: Mulder, Deana - DTD

Cc: Caufield, Scott; camq@co.clackamas.or.us; eeplatt@frontier.com

Subject: RE: Proposed building department fees

Deana, Scott and Cam, A couple of questions I had to follow up to the meeting the other day. If you have it, it would be helpful to also list the SDC's for the county in comparison to the neighboring jurisdictions. Although SDC's are not permit fees and they are not paid to the development department, when one asks "what does a building permit cost in Clackamas County?' generally we include SDC's in what a permit costs. If my chart is still accurate, Clackamas County has the regions second highest SDC/impact fee.

I understand the department has a basic service level that needs to be met and with current funding these services are not being met. A couple of other things I would ask to be considered —

- I think there should be some push to the Commissioners that the department needs to get a certain amount of general fund money yearly for providing basic services not related to building homes. I have no problems with a developer paying for the services he receives, however when a general homeowner comes in to get a dryer duct permit for \$7.00 or a deck permit, or even just to come in and ask a basic question about "can I build an addition onto my house?" I think these should be a basic general service provided by the county for its citizens and should have general fund support for it.
- I fully support charging for additional inspections or reviews during permit review when the corrected item was not fixed and it had to be re-inspected. I think builders who do things right should not have to pay for builders who don't do things right.
- I know the intention of this fee increase is not just to pay for the departments costs, but to build up reserves again. I think there should be some discussion or mention of what happens if activity picks up and reserves get back to acceptable levels? I would suggest that if reserves get back to a 6 month reserve, then the department should reevaluate the fees, considering a scaling back of the fee. This may not happen but I think it is acceptable to have the discussion now.

Hope my input helped. Please let me know if you have more questions.

Justin Wood

Government & Builder Relations Manager

Home Builders Association of Metro Portland

(503) 684-1880

(503) 684-0588 fax

(503) 997-7966 cell

Your HBA membership could be worth thousands! Being an HBA member means getting huge discounts on employee health insurance, fuel, cell phones and more. Your membership doesn't just pay for itself. It can pay you back. Click here to find out how to get the most from your HBA membership.

Connect with us on <u>Facebook</u>, <u>Twitter</u>, and <u>LinkedIn!</u> 503-742-4710

Cartmill, Barbara

Subject:

FW: Proposed DTD 2012/2013 fe

From: Bruce Goldson [mailto:thetaenq@comcast.net]

Sent: Tuesday, March 20, 2012 6:18 PM

To: Mulder, Deana - DTD

Subject: RE: fees

Deana-

I have reviewed the fee chart and made observations below. Generally I am in agreement but have concerns as noted. Specific concerns include:

- Please be clear that the 8.83% for \$10,000 or more in construction costs for a Development Permit always excludes sanitary, water and dry utilities, as well as storm when inside OLSD or WES districts.
- Design Review Fee: It appears that the fee for small projects may need to be increased on the low end and the
 large projects are paying too much. Would like to see the historical data before next year's fee adjustments and
 have a graduated fee that is equitable to the incurred county costs to process the application.
- Land Use Partition Fee: If tracking costs now, would like to see an equitable fee distribution between the sizes of the development. Currently the fees are not equitable between a 2 or 3 lot partition and the 4 lot subdivision. Would like to see the historical data collected and evaluated before next year's fee adjustment.
- Land Use Subdivision Fee: Look at this fee as well before next year's fee adjustment. There should be some graduation of the fee related to county incurred costs to process the application and equity per lot created.
- Time Extension Fee: Isn't this basically a notice that is mailed? Shouldn't the fee be minimal? Why so much? (\$650)
- Claim for Just Compensation for Land Use Regulation: Need historical data to figure out what this fee should be.
- Road Naming Application Fee: Seems low, should look at costs here too before next year's fee adjustments.
- Dog Services Adoption Fee: Why is there a difference between over and under the age of 6 years?

thanks Bruce

Bruce D. Goldson, PE Theta,llc. 503-481-8822