



To: Budget Office, County Manager and County Council
From: Maya Bunch, Department Director
Date: August 11, 2025
Subject: 2025 Fall Supplemental Budget Process – Executive Summary of General Fund Needs

Issue or Issues that Need to be Considered by Council

Community Development is requesting Council approval for a one-time increase in General Fund support for the Land Use Review and Wetland and Habitat Review programs.

State law and Clark County Code dictate that fees charged by Community Development should be set at a level necessary to recover the costs of processing the applications or providing the services. However, the Land Use Review and Wetland and Habitat Review programs have still historically received General Fund support for a few reasons. Previous councils have opted to subsidize program costs, and there are some necessary program tasks performed by staff which cannot be tied to a fee and must be covered by an alternate funding source.

With the goal of decreasing reliance on the General Fund and to set fees to recover 100% of the current costs of providing the services, fee studies for both programs were completed in 2024 and approved by Council to go into effect in January 2025. While the updated fees are already having a significant impact, General Fund support will still be necessary for both programs.

Rule

RCW 82.02.020 states, in part:

Nothing in this section prohibits cities, towns, counties, or other municipal corporations from collecting reasonable fees from an applicant for a permit or other governmental approval to cover the cost to the city, town, county, or other municipal corporation of processing applications, inspecting and reviewing plans, or preparing detailed statements required by chapter 43.21C RCW, including reasonable fees that are consistent with RCW 43.21C.420(6), 43.21C.428, and beginning July 1, 2014, RCW 35.91.020.

CCC 6.100.020 (Application and service fee policy):

*It is the general policy of Clark County that the departments of community development, public works and community planning adopt application and service fees at the level necessary to cover the costs of conducting the review or providing the service. Fees for applications or services should generally be collected by the county as close as possible to the time the expenses are incurred. **General fund support for key activities will be identified where necessary.***

**Analysis**

If not approved, both the Land Use Review and Wetland and Habitat Review programs will face budget deficits which would need to be resolved through cuts, alternative funding sources, or a combination of both. Fee and permit revenues collected in Fund 1011 for other programs are restricted for use in those programs only, and could not be used to resolve any potential budget deficits in the Land Use Review or Wetland and Habitat Review programs.

The information below summarizes the projected General Fund request for 2025, actual request for 2024, and the decrease year over year of approximately 27% combined.

			LUR	WHR
		Projected deficit	(935,920)	(193,393)
		Current Budget	472,500	137,990
		Fall Supp request	463,420	55,403
Total projected GF subsidy (2025)			935,920	193,393
Total actual GF subsidy (2024)			1,225,472	327,101
Projected Increase (Decrease)			(289,552)	(133,708)
			-23.63%	-40.88%

Conclusion

The Department of Community Development has one budget request involving General Fund for the 2025 fall supplemental budget session, with analysis provided above. Fees charged for services in these programs cover the current costs of providing those services as state law and county code allow. However, program staff perform some necessary functions that cannot be tied to fees, like customer service to applicants.

There is ample historical data demonstrating the need of both programs for General Fund support for the reasons stated.



To: Budget Office, County Manager and County Council
From: Maya Bunch, Interim Director
Date: August 11, 2025
Subject: 2026 Annual Budget Process – Executive Summary of General Fund Needs

Issue or Issues that Need to be Considered by Council

The Department of Community Development is submitting three change requests for the 2026 annual budget process that involve the General Fund.

1. POSSE 8 upgrade:

Community Development's permitting system, CC-LMS, is scheduled for a software update to the POSSE 8 platform from an earlier version. The annual support agreement for CC-LMS was approved by Council in 2021 for a 5-year term, and requires that the County upgrade to the most recent release of the POSSE platform to receive future software updates and patches. The agreement also dictates that the County has 18 months to accept a software version update, or else support will come at an additional cost, to be negotiated between Computronix and Clark County. The 18 month deadline from the County's current version of CC-LMS will come at the end of 2025. However, Computronix has agreed to extend it to June 2026.

The software version upgrade will cost approximately \$150,000, which will be allocated to each fund and cost center that benefits from CC-LMS based on their usage of the system.

An alternative to CC-LMS called MyBuildingPermit.com has been explored, with Council approving the capital budget request in 2024. However, that project has been put on hold indefinitely due to staff turnover and funding issues with other partner cities and counties.

2. CC-LMS CIC (Continuous Improvement and Configuration) service agreement:

Each year, shortly after the implementation of the County's permitting system, CC-LMS, the department has requested additional budget authority for urgent enhancements, customizations, and support not included in the annual hosting and support agreements with the vendor Computronix.

The total budget authority to be requested in 2026 is \$50,000, and this will be allocated to each fund and cost center that benefits from CC-LMS based on their usage of the system.

3. CC-LMS annual hosting and support agreement contractual increases:

In 2021, two contracts were approved by the County Manager for hosting and annual support and maintenance services from Computronix, the county's vendor for the CC LMS permitting system. Each contract was for 5 years (2021-2026), with programmed contractual cost increases each year. No evidence has been found that the annual increases were properly budgeted for, and they were



most likely absorbed by baseline budget. In an effort to rectify this, additional expenditure budget authority for these contractual increases is being requested for 2026.

The total budget authority to be requested in 2026 is \$7,826, and this will be allocated to each fund and cost center that benefits from CC-LMS based on their usage of the system.

Rule

The change requests outlined above all relate to the County's permitting system, CC-LMS.

Washington State does not mandate the use of permitting software for cities and counties under the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) or the Washington Administrative Code (WAC). However, the state does require jurisdictions to establish and implement time periods for processing project permits and ensuring timely and predictable procedures. While not mandated, many jurisdictions utilize permitting software to streamline these processes and meet state requirements for timely and efficient permit review.

Also, RCW 43.09.210 establishes that one fund cannot benefit another. In this case, a portion of the costs aggregated in the Planning and Code Fund (1011) are necessarily being allocated to those General Fund cost centers which make use of the permitting system.

Sources:

- RCW 36.70B.080: mandates that development regulations must establish time periods for local government actions on project permit applications.
- RCW 36.70B.020(4): requires cities and counties to adopt procedures for fair and timely review of project permits.
- RCW 43.09.210: describes local government accounting and maintaining separate accounts for each fund.

Analysis

Following is a summary of the General Fund dollars being requested:

POSSE 8 upgrade: \$9,500

CC-LMS CIC agreement: \$3,166

Computronix (CC-LMS) contractual increases: \$496

Conclusion

Each of the above requests must be approved because they are costs borne by one fund (Fund 1011) allocated to other funds (General Fund, Road Fund) using a standard cost allocation methodology. As noted above, one fund cannot benefit from another, therefore General Fund must be allocated its proportionate share of costs for these items.