

**Development and Engineering Advisory Board Meeting**  
**March 4, 2021**  
**2:30pm – 4:30pm**  
**Public Service Center**  
**Meeting held by Microsoft Teams**

**Board members in attendance:** Nick Flagg, Eric Golemo, Andrew Gunther, Jaime Howley, Mike Odren, Terry Wollam and Jeff Wriston

**Board members not in attendance:** Don Russo, Dan Wisner, Nelson Holmberg

**County Staff:** Max Booth, Susan, Ellinger, Deanna Hovenkotter, Jim Muir, Mitch Nickolds, Dianna Nutt, Jennifer Reynolds, Ali Safayi, Greg Shafer, Melissa Tracy, and Dan Young

**Public:** Ryan Makinster

**Call to Order:** 2:33 pm

**Administrative Actions:**

- Introductions
- DEAB meeting is being recorded and the audio will be posted on the DEAB website.
- Review / adopt last month's minutes (adopted)
- Review upcoming events: COUNTY COUNCIL Work Sessions every Wednesday; COUNTY COUNCIL hearings first and third Tuesdays
  - Shafer: Council Hearings on the 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Tuesdays are continuing to be virtual.
  - Shafer: Planning Commission Hearings on the 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Thursdays are continuing to be virtual.
- DEAB member announcement:
  - Shafer: Vacancy for DEAB closed on 16<sup>th</sup> – staff reviewed and passed to County Manager who is in the process of making decision; hope to have new member join in April.
  - Shafer: Annual Report invite (March 24<sup>th</sup>) from Rebecca Messinger should be going out.
  - Howsley: Buildable Lands – two work sessions held in past weeks, suggest listening to work sessions.
  - Wriston: Ridgefield is re-writing residential code – will forward information.

**Fully Complete Process/Updates**

*Presentation: Ellinger*

- Meeting with subcommittee for aspects of process:
  - Sheet to be added to pre-app report packet to notify applicant of additional process after, with fees.
  - Preapplication conference specified comments with answer in pre-app.
  - “Soft” approvals for road modifications.
  - Combine FSR and ENG process, worked on handouts.
  - Discussed interpretation of SEPA threshold exempt projects.
  - Worked on consolidated application form (internal meeting to come).

- Submittal checklist changes have been made.
- Worked on process to zip files to LMS instead of individual files.
- Working on process on how to notify all these changes when all complete.

#### SFR/Stormwater Review Checklist

*Presentation: Booth, Golemo, Reynolds*

- In process of “revising” checklist:
  - Main change is after distilling comments staff not comfortable using checklist for MR 1 -9; basically, reducing it to MR 1 – 5, changes the scope.
    - Basically, the objective is to come up with a cursory review of 1 – 5, getting rid of third party and in-house engineer review.
    - Next step is a draft of checklist and get with staff doing the review and those submitting plans.
    - Review of MR 1 – 5; Submittals of WHMMM calculation and incomplete submittals are the struggles Permit Services currently have. It’s not the submittals of WHMMM but the lack of training of how to read the information.

#### Concurrent Review/Building Permits and Final Engineering

*Presentation: Odren, Gunther, Young*

- Odren providing some background:
- John Meier, Travis Johnson, and Andrew (Gunther) - then reached out to Dan - to get understanding of County policy on this. In the past were told by Planning staff at pre-app, for instance that bldg. permit can be submitted as soon as you submitted your prelim site plan application and they would not be approved until your engineering plans are approved which made complete sense; it then morphed into the other extreme to where we couldn’t even submit, County would not even accept the bldg. permit, until your engineering plans were approved.
- Reached out to Jim and Dan for reasoning behind the policy and secondly if there is any sort of financial impact; some of the answers we got back:
  - Did not want to address any changes that took place during final engineering process that might affect final site plan or bldg. placement vis-a-vie the bldg. permit review.
  - Did not want to have open cases for lengths of time
    - Is there a financial impact to staff? Because there is to the applicant.
- Odren: Bldg. has been willing to accepted foundation only when mylars have been in final stages.
- Young:
  - In talking to staff
    - Before I started this been policy.
    - Projects that were in second review worked with applicants on an individual basis to minimize implications.
    - Not opposed to looking forward to changing policy.
    - Possibility of forming a sub-committee to look at options.
      - Next steps...
        - Give staff brief time to gather information and get back to group with findings.

- Odren challenges of why the policy exists and how do you explain to applicants?
  - Does anyone have a good understand of why and what the policy is?
- Howsley: is there a jurisdiction that does this well?
- Golemo: Camas, Washougal, Ridgefield, Battle Ground and COV
  - Inconsistent with industry standard
  - Losing business and employment opportunities
  - Willing to assist, if needed
- Shafer: All agree that we can't operate in either extreme
  - Subcommittee to define the criteria / understanding
    - Staff would need to minimize the risk
- Safayi: Jim's staff should contact jurisdictions to see what is working (or not); probably does not need subcommittee.
- Wollam: Why was the change made first; changes like these come to DEAB prior.
- Flagg: prelim design submittals are better "sooner than later".
- Gunther: With PSA extension; SBA and HUD funding and sellers - delaying the bldg. permit process can cause a deal to fail.
- Shafer: Next steps
  - Set up meeting with staff (Ali, Jim, Dan, and Susan)
  - City of Vancouver information / contact

#### Public Comments

- Wollam: July 1<sup>st</sup> - Projects that are not final engineered that have stormwater that outflow in wetland (dependent on classification) that need a wet season review - how is staff looking at this?
  - Difficulties for staff.
  - Procedural for staff (this is coming from State, County will have to comply with) - Swanson and / or Davis to meeting?
    - Safayi - Minimum Requirement 8 requires ... "that wetland if there is water going there you don't want to hold it; you want to let as much water that use to go there go there for the life and longevity of the wetland if there is more water going there the water level in the wetland rises and causes some issue with the vegetation and what-not so MR #8 comes to the picture when you have overflow into the wetland so you have to do hydro-period analysis as part of that you have to look at the wet season and see what type of hydro period you have whether you keep the wetland as is or not ; maybe Brent can talk about the wetland science I don't know enough about of it; this is the stormwater perspective..."

**Meeting adjourned:** 4:13 pm

Meeting minutes prepared by Melissa Tracy

Reviewed by Greg Shafer