

✧ **b) Concepts for Updating Development Review Fees – Direction Requested** ✧

Mr. Boling reviewed his Memorandum dated June 21, 2018, entitled "Concepts for Updating Development Review Fees", with Attachments 1 through 3, a copy is on file in the Commission Office. Highlights included:

- Revised "averaging" methodology with fees set for complete/responsive applications and additional fees charged for extraordinary repeat reviews; and,
- Establishing fees for construction in progress and completeness/certification activities performed by Public Works.

Mr. Boling referenced the methodology/historically used was each application type with staff time reviewing an "average" application and costs related to each application. He mentioned an approach to updating fees to include a default calculated fee for a completed application with responsive and successful resubmittals. He continued if an application required additional resubmittals; more time needed, additional re-review fees would be added.

Mr. Boling explained this approach would more closely reflect staff time on projects, as well as provide incentive (less expense and faster process) for a complete and responsive application.

Mr. Szpyrka presented and discussed two (2) PowerPoint slides entitled "Public Works Development Fee Analysis", a copy is on file in the Commission Office. He discussed a possible approach to collecting fees for staff review time involved in projects during the construction phase, or closing out construction (Certificate of Completion), covering Public Works' coordination and inspection time costs.

Chairperson Robinson commented she would like to see a list of the inspections Public Works was currently responsible for; what the inspections were for, and estimated time frames for the inspections. She stated she felt the need to recognize the builders/developers were not responsible for the developing community to subsidize the entire engineering process.

Mr. Szpyrka reminded the Committee he did not set policy; however, in his experience, development paid for itself, it was not subsidized by taxpayers.

Vice Chairman Paladin mentioned the possibility of developers recouping costs of additional inspection fees by charging the hired engineer of record for the project.

Mr. Carter Taylor, District 2 Representative, inquired whether Public Works personnel submit timesheets to indicate how much time, activity or cost deployed on each project. Mr. Szpyrka responded Daily Logs were maintained on road projects and would confirm whether logs are maintained for subdivision projects.

Mr. Chuck Mechling, District 5 Representative, asked if a checklist was available for the as-built process. Mr. Szpyrka responded in the affirmative; however, the checklist was rarely utilized by applicants.

Mr. Greg Burke, Member-at-Large Representative asked if the County has completed inspections in the past and not charged for them; was the County being hurt financially by not charging re-inspection fees. Mr. Jason Brown, County Administrator replied in the affirmative, the fees the County collected are not covering the costs of operations of the current employees.

Mr. Burke stated he was in favor of establishing base fees for inspections; however, the individual charges may be subject to conflict.

Mr. Jason Brown suggested contemplating the initial inspections be included in the original fee and then any re-review, only if there was additional re-inspections required, additional fees.

Mr. Taylor recommended prior to restructuring fees, to develop better information by requiring timesheets to be analyzed to know better where the costs were coming from.

Mr. Burke suggested to review timesheets to ensure overlap between the departments; i.e., inspecting handicapped parking were conducted by two departments; to spell out the two separated items being inspected.

Mr. Mechling stated there was a need to have a vision of where the County was going and the cost factor attached to that direction. Chairperson Robinson agreed there was a need for a cost benefit overview of the choice being made in all areas of government.

Mr. Bill DeBaal, Deputy County Attorney asked if it was possible to have a pass/fail mechanism with public works inspections. Chairperson Robinson responded it was partially possible, but not with all inspections; explaining typically on storm water, it would be a final inspection at the end of the project.

Discussion ensued regarding reviewing engineer logs in conjunction with inspections and certifications. Chairperson Robinson said it was necessary to hold engineers accountable.

Vice Chairman Paladin shared his thought the County should penalize the failures without including the successful inspections.

Mr. Boling summarized discussions included a review of a base package of inspections fees (subdivisions separate from site plan) with basic or streamlined costs for complete/responsive applications and additional costs for incomplete/unresponsive applications spelled out. He opined there were more inspections currently than there had been in the past due to bigger scaled projects and with workforce not from the area, who are responsible for the construction.

Vice Chairman Paladin opined one of the problems being realized now was when a development project from 15 years past, experienced a new development being built next to the old development, changed the old development; i.e., drainage.

Chairperson Robinson asked for staff to bring back more data for clearer justification on costs for inspections.

(c) Date for September and October Meetings – Action Required

Mr. Boling confirmed this committee would not be meeting in the months of July and August. It was the consensus of the Committee members to continue regular schedule meetings beginning in September, and October; the third Wednesday morning at 9:00 a.m.

Mr. Boling stated October, 2018 was the 12 month sunset date for this committee's work, unless the Board of County Commissioners extended the date. He shared the Committee had two remaining matters to focus on in the remaining two meetings: development review fees and any final process items.

Other Matters

(a) Littoral Shelf and Lake Shape Regulations – Chuck Mechling

Mr. Mechling reported he met with John McCoy and Roland Deblois in Community Development to discuss the level of difficulty or practicality for an engineer, when planning a small 10-acre project with a storm retention concept, with the lake being required to be regular shaped, having several steps to incorporate, as well as the financial costs for those requirements.

Mr. John McCoy confirmed the LDRs required a 10-to-1 slope; wherein the comprehensive plan required a 6-to-1 slope; two variant slopes depending upon what was being reviewed. Mr. Mechling stated it appeared the County had flexibility in case-by-case projects, depending upon the size, shape and justification.

Mr. McCoy said from an LDR perspective, evaluating whether some objective language criteria could be included for lake shape, such as "including, but not limited to" would eliminate some of the back and forth reviews and provide guidance within the LDRs for design professionals.