

PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE

JANUARY 25, 2008

GROUND RULES

1. One speaker at a time.
2. Strive for a balance of listen/talk ratio.
3. Attack the problem, not the person.
4. Stay on point.
5. No whining.

AGENDA

- I. REVIEW RESULTS FROM LAST PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE
- II. FIX 6-MONTH PRELIMINARY PLAT EXPIRATION PROBLEM
- III. DESIGN EXCEPTION PROCESS
- IV. SIGNING & SEALING PLANS

PROCESS REVIEW MEETING

January 25, 2008, 1 PM

Introduction of staff, attendee survey (consultant, developer, homebuilder).

Purpose: Make the site and subdivision process quicker and more efficient. When Peter accepted position given the task to make Pat Bean's phone stop ringing. There are multiple problems, working on solutions to make a win-win situation. Need to make compromises – all of us. Going through processes, started with Building Services – getting permits out the door in 10 days. Difficult task with multiple environmental issues. Still working on finalizing processes in this area.

We are now moving on to site and sub. Before starting, apologized for not consulting with industry on agenda. As today's meeting progresses, will write down ideas for future agendas.

Introduced Bob to go over action items from previous process meetings:

- Checklists – submittal items – Part A and B – approved list and in operation today.
- Engineering compliance certifications – worked with industry – signing and sealing meets requirement – dropped with approval of ACA.
- Review construction plans while concurrency being resolved – Pelham has legislature pending, waiting on this decision. This issue needs further discussion, problem for PGM. Once construction approval is received – developer will be ready to go. Unable to govern concurrency once construction begins. Concurrency needs to be resolved early in the process. Developers want construction plan review to proceed before concurrency worked out – PGM can hold approval until resolution is reached, which is the same as the NR permit. Peter is willing to consider this, however, he knows that the development community would start wanting to begin construction without working out concurrency and would be going to administration and the BOCC and complaining. We agreed to hold a separate meeting to discuss concurrency negotiations and construction plan review before the next process meeting. Part of the problem with concurrency negotiations is that developers agree to improvements then realize that the improvement cannot be done. Also, issues with decisions being made – need to have a decision maker appointed. Lastly, master plans receive concurrency approval but outparcels are being reviewed for concurrency separately. Delaying the process. Will be discussed.
- Emailing review sheets taking place. Also, review sheets are available electronically. By February 1 we will begin our test run of electronic submittals. By summer, the test run should be complete and we will begin a full electronic submittal. Also, a new access database will be installed and should be fully operational by summer. The database will be available to customers who come into the office. The database will be fully automated and able to generate our letters for us.
- Developers indicated that our scanning is behind – back to October. Unable to review comment sheets in Optix because of this. Once automated this will not be an issue. Both the database and optix will be updated automatically once we enter the electronic submittal phase.
- DRC meeting is handling whether comments are a major or minor revision. Developers ask that we put a box on the comment sheet so this information can be entered on the comment sheet and save them the time of coming and sitting through DRC. Also, DRC meeting minutes need to reflect the revision information for each project.
- Mike Allgire's position did not turn out as expected – the developers thought they would have an engineer with authority in this position. Peter indicated that he is empowering staff to make decisions and take responsibility – if multiple mistakes are being made, he will meet with staff

and correct. Mike reiterated that they can call him with any issues/concerns and if he cannot respond he will get with the appropriate staff and get it resolved.

- Case worker proposal was discussed. Developers seemed to approve of the idea – will open up more appointment times for submittals once staff is fully trained. Also, they would be working with one person on each project from start to finish, which should make it easier to track. It was stated that they would not receive the same case worker each time they come in – it will be on a rotation basis.
- Cross-training is progressing. Also, it was advised that staff from other sections have been included in the cross training so nothing should fall behind.
- Four month projects are still being reviewed and set up for meetings. The weekly review meetings are occurring every Tuesday at 3 pm. The 3 day process is occurring 90 percent – once automated, this will be handled the same day.
- Phone policy was discussed. Phone calls and emails should be returned within 24 hours. If developers would like to provide comments they can utilize the comment cards. Also, if there seems to be something remiss, notify supervisors and it will be investigated. If there are issues with delays in processing, once automated, downloads will be date stamped at intake.
- Agreed to provide optix setup at next meeting
- One change made in DRPM, working on more for the next update. We will work with industry on the language.
- Offsite improvements are reviewed by Public Works. Some reviews are occurring by Public Works on projects that are not offsite improvements and the PW ROW comments are coming back with denials, which should not be happening – possibly put a box on application so industry can check whether it is offsite improvement or not. We are working on this issue now.
- Everything that is not single family is to be treated as a commercial review – this is not occurring. Will talk to reviewers and reminded of this.
- We are working on getting comment sheets turned in by deadline – one review agency is under our control and will be spoken with, the other is not but we are working with them to update their technology. Also, we will allow the industry to reschedule their DRC appointment by 1 week, at their request.
- PW is not attending DRC and not providing their comments in a timely manner. A conversation will take place to see if comments can be provided by deadline.
- Design Exception process. Waiting for PGM to hire staff to work on taking this responsibility over from PW. Staff has been hired and is in the training process. Staff will review, provide recommendation and Bob will sign. Should be a 5 day turn around time. Will not be a unilateral decision – several PEs will review. Also, PW will be reviewing these exceptions in a quarterly time frame. Design exception appeal process – needs to be taken up with Peter.
- There was a discussion held regarding the 30 foot setback – is this NR or EPC review? There are policies in place in the LDC but EPC not following this.
- Decisions made at zoning are influencing design exceptions. Working on separating site plan from zoning stage – this will take time. At this time, there is no tracking mechanism for design exceptions.
- Prelim plat extensions are being granted as long as the industry is showing a good faith effort in continuing to work on resolving issues. A request needs to be submitted on company letterhead explaining circumstances.
- Signing and sealing of plans. Once automated we will require two paper sets and the electronic version to be signed and sealed. At this time, Bob will check with regulatory agencies to see which agency requires original signature and get back with you to advise on how many originals we need.
- Next meeting we will go over the unfinished business from this meeting. Also, please email Peter with your suggestions for agenda items.

FLIP CHART NOTES

Review but do not approve
Short form DA for concurrency
Reasonableness of item being negotiated
How we pay for roads
PGM to do design exceptions

Plans Process Improvement Action Plan

Based on work of the
2006 Process Review Committee
Status Update January, 2008

#	Action	Status
1	Introduce Plans Submittal Checklist for Engineers	• Completed
2	Engineer Compliance Certification	• Completed
3	Procedure to permit construction plans review while concurrency being resolved	• DCA working on changing concurrency law. Awaiting legislative consideration.
4	Email Review Comments	• Completed
5	Internet access to review comments and review tracking	• Completed via Optix System.
6	Common database for review tracking and comments	• Completed
7	Revise comment form to include designation as major or minor comment and a response column to each comment; Responses signed and sealed by EOR; Revise DRPM to provide that all comments must be responded to process re-submittals	• Completed
8	Public Kiosk	• Completed
9	Communications with Developers/Owners	• Completed
10	Add Ombudsman to In-Take Section Staff to handle minor revisions, review tracking, status reports	• Added staff person, however, changing to new process
11	Add two staff to In-Take Section to handle volume of work and provide backup for current staff	• Completed
12	Special Review Meeting for all Plans in Process More than Four Months	• Completed
13	Weekly plans review status report	• Completed
14	Three Day Plans Distribution and Two Day Completeness Reviews	• Changing process
15	Policy on PWD review of collectors; Issue policy direction; Issue guidelines to engineers; Revise DRPM	• Completed
16	All multi-family developments to be reviewed as commercial developments	• Completed
17	DRC Meetings must include Section Managers and Decision Makers	• Completed
18	DRC comments to engineer no later than Friday before scheduled meeting	• Completed (90% performance)
19	PWD to delegate certain exception approvals to PGMD for stormwater	• Completed
20	Issue comments to engineer in absence of outside agency comments	• Completed