

Development and Engineering Advisory Board Meeting
April 1, 2021
2:30pm - 4:30pm
Public Service Center
Meeting held by Microsoft Teams

Board members in attendance: Eric Golemo, Seth Halling, Jaime Howley, Mike Odren, Don Russo, Dan Wisner, Terry Wollam and Jeff Wriston

Board members not in attendance: Andrew Gunther, Nick Flagg, and Nelson Holmberg

County Staff: Brent Davis, Susan, Ellinger, Ravi Mahajan, Jim Muir, Mitch Nickolds, Dianna Nutt, Oliver Orijako, Ali Safayi, Greg Shafer, Rod Swanson, Melissa Tracy, and Dan Young

Public: Jihun Han, Travis Johnson, Gary Vance, 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 1st and 3rd Tuesdays are continuing to be virtual.
 - Shafer: Planning Commission, no scheduled April meetings
- DEAB member announcement:
 - Shafer: Upcoming events – verify website information
 - Shafer: Final land review moving from Land Use to Development Engineering on May 1st
 - Ellinger and Nutt: move of FLR to DE transition is moving with internal training
 - Shafer: New Permit Center Manager, April Furth has been hired; will reach out for May meeting. Kudos to Max Booth as interim

Equestrian Facility Code Amendments

Presentation: Nickolds

- Setting criteria for stakeholders' group – looking for participants and to be as inclusive as possible
- Find and identify gaps in places where we can revise both equestrian facilities and include interested parties and those living around to ensure all are well considered as best as possible
- Announcements should be forthcoming within a week or two; should be on web and in paper
- What are the thoughts for fire protections on these – built of noncombustible materials; volunteer fire departments; and bldg. design (example exterior door)

Wetland and Habitat Timelines

Presentation: Davis

- Minimum Requirement Number 8 - Appendix H:
- Guidelines only apply if discharge directly or indirectly to wetland
- Better tie to rating system of wetlands
- Move to hierarchy for general protection, to retain area
- Pollution protection – if you are meeting the manual you should be meeting the requirement
- Wetland hydroperiod period – assumes that you have legal access and need to monitor for at least one year, however there is an “out” if you don’t have legal access; rating system could make this challenging unless applicant can get category “nailed down” early in the process
- Method Two (aka “old method”) - further explains criteria
- Method One – further explains criteria and challenges
- Odren: Guidelines coming from DOE?
- Wriston: When is the effective date?
- Swanson: Needs to be done July 1st
- Davis: will require more expertise for staff

Annual Review Follow-Up

Presentation: Golemo, Wisner, and Shafer

- Golemo: Positive feedback from presentation
- Would like to look at: arterials and corridors; SFR’s; permitting process [white oaks and biodiversity area – is there a good guidance]; accepting engineering stamp; and combined review
- Wollam: streamline processes; identify where we have gone above code – things taking too long – can we move things along (i.e. put some new eyes on it)
- Odren: education forwarded onto Councilors (LUR and ENG 101); conversation with developers about doing business in Beaverton, Gresham, or Portland (explain to staff and Councilors)

CONCURRENT REVIEW

- Vance: with current review able to go through process and break ground approx. six months earlier
- Odren: have there been discussions with other judications
- Shafer: Yes, COV. Chad Eiken was able to provide insight and direction; no noteworthy issues, proceed with “eyes wide open” there will be challenges but they can be overcome. Revisit process in six months to assess how things are going, what’s working or not
- Plan review only (bldg. and engineering), not permit issue. Fees have been paid for reviews plans deemed fully complete; for review, not talking about getting anything in the ground.
- Young: some concerns are: active application by code; permits don’t sit because another department is not done with review or application is not fully complete; issue bldg. and final site plan doing vertical concern without water available (fire hazard)
- Odren: still detects some apprehension from staff, could be because this is something new (change); but this is “good change”
- Vance: carry cost can be \$100,000 / month if no permit; bldg. is insured while construction
- Muir: “Phased review” -- foundation only phased review; then site review to ensure that all decisions have been worked out this may be a middle ground approach for some
- Odren: hopeful of the “trial” timeframe and approach

- Shafer: will revise memo -- fees need to be paid and applications need to be fully complete; foundation only phased permits still available, but to avoid confusion will not be co-mingled with the memo addressing concurrent reviews (of building and final engineering plans)
- Odren: sequencing of submittals (?); can I submit for final engineering / site plan prior to bldg. permit submittal?
- Shafer: Update email; forward to Furth (Permit Center) and copy all attendees of DEAB meeting; if there are additional changes will continue to email information
- Golemo: Someone from staff should reach out to Councilor; Young will take care of

Public Comments

- Halling: upcoming agenda items (vision clearance on plats and street classifications)

Meeting adjourned: 4:13 pm

Meeting minutes prepared by Melissa Tracy

Reviewed by Greg Shafer