Council Meeting Date: July 10, 2006 **Agenda Item: 9(a)**

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Request to Hire an Additional Development Review Engineer and Amend the Budget to Include a Contract for Engineering Services
DEPARTMENT:	Planning and Development Services
PRESENTED BY:	Joseph W. Tovar, FAICP Director

I. PROBLEM/ISSUE STATEMENT:

Over the past six months, staff has become acutely aware that the Department lacks sufficient staff capacity to perform the timely and thorough civil review required for development permits. This is due to a variety of reasons such as an increased level of applications, the complexity of infill development, and an increased need to thoroughly review all applications. This has led to a ballooning of the backlog of project applications awaiting review, approval, and issuance by the City and resulted in dramatic increases in the length of time it takes for us to process new permit applications. The burgeoning backlog and lengthening review time has resulted in high stress and needless cost for customers (e.g., permit applicants and the homebuyers who purchase their products). This in turn has resulted in escalating complaints reaching the City administration and even Council.

This problem should be addressed quickly because the unacceptable delays in permit processing will only get worse with the passage of time. To further exacerbate the situation, the only Development Review Engineer on staff resigned and the position is currently vacant leaving us with no onsite engineer to perform permit reviews or to provide "face to face" service for permit customers. We are left with no option but to contract with an engineering consulting firm. Our present inability to keep up with the permit volume compounds the problem since it means we also lack the capacity to address other factors. For example, PADS efforts to perform an overhaul of the Engineering Development Guide and the program to assist in the City's adoption of the 2005 King County Surface Water Manual must be put on hold until we have the in-house ability not only to process present permit volumes, but to make system improvements.

The difficulty that PADS has in doing the civil review for single family redevelopment and short plat applications is complicated by infrastructure deficiencies in Shoreline and the fact that most of our new residential development is in scattered relatively small "infill" sites. The street grid and most of the road/drainage/walkway infrastructure to serve our residential neighborhoods was developed (or not developed) in the 50's and 60's. Many of the parcels that were passed over for development were the more problematic ones with drainage challenges, steep slopes or wetlands. As developers now propose further subdivision and the placement of new housing on these remaining

"infill" sites, we are faced with more difficult and labor-intensive civil review of appropriate frontage improvements and on-site grading and drainage systems. Also, when the City adopted the 1998 King County Stormwater Design Manual, we locally amended the threshold for triggering drainage review from 5,000 sq. ft. of new impervious surface to 1,500 sq. ft. In doing this, we dramatically increased the number of projects that require civil review.

II. BACKGROUND

The Development Review Engineer (DRE) position was moved from Public Works to PADS in September of 2005. This organizational shift was made in order to improve the capacity of the City's permit-review department to simultaneously address the on-site and street frontage civil engineering requirements of City code. Prior to the shift, the DRE's time was also assigned to other tasks within Public Works, and communication and coordination with permit review by PADS was less direct and efficient. To better understand the work performed by the Development Review Engineer, Attachment A contains an outline of the typical steps employed to complete the review of civil plans and Attachment B contains the Development Review Engineer Job Description.

At the time of the position shifting to PADS, there was no quantification of the actual workload that had been performed previously by the DRE, and thus no way to know if one FTE was sufficient capacity to perform the required civil review. Since the position was filled in late summer of 2005, we have had an opportunity to clearly see the fit, or lack of fit, between actual need and available capacity.

As was outlined on May 12 in a memo to the City Manager (Attachment C), our one existing FTE engineer must perform a minimum of 500 civil plan reviews in 220 work days annually, or about two per day. In actual practice, the Development Review Engineer must also spend time daily to deal with resubmitted corrected plans, pre-application meetings with applicants, field inspections and problem solving on permitted projects, and request from citizens for public information. We estimate that we have about half of the DRE resource we need to perform both the civil review and all these other ancillary tasks.

When comparing our community, our department, and our workload to other jurisdictions in the region, it becomes readily apparent that Shoreline is under-resourced for the job of civil review of development permit applications. The table in Attachment E illustrates the basic staffing for engineering review of development permits and permitting levels found at comparably sized cities in the region.

A review of the admittedly cursory data suggests that all of the comparable jurisdictions devote more than one person to perform engineering reviews. The number of permits per civil engineering reviewer varies, but in general it appears that the annual number of permits per civil engineering reviewer is less than 100 permits. This compares with 360 permits per year that we have been attempting to review with just one FTE. Even if we look at the information in Attachment E conservatively (i.e., assume that the average in comparable jurisdictions is twice that, or 200 permits per year per FTE) we are still

dramatically under-staffed to perform this function. The order of magnitude of shortfall is easily 1.0 FTE.

III. ALTERNATIVES ANALYZED

New Full Time Employee (FTE) - hire second Development Review Engineer

There appears to be no question that we require at least one additional FTE for development review engineering in PADS. The only alternative that we have considered, and rejected, was spending the available permit revenues (See Attachment F) on contracted engineering services. This approach is, in fact, what the City did for much of 2005, and even now has resorted to in view of our backlog and recent vacancy in the existing Development Review Engineer position. While the use of outside consultant services does help, it has limitations and can even contribute to other problems.

During the period of 2005 when the City relied on outside engineering services to perform civil review on permit applications, we experienced a number of problems. We found that an off-site consulting engineer has a much more difficult time communicating and coordinating with in-house staff. The portion of the civil review that is technical and prescriptive can usually be handled off-site by a consultant, but virtually every plan review also requires the exercise of engineering judgment, a judgment that definitely benefits from in-house consultation with a manager or peers in PADS or Public Works. Another downside of excessive reliance on contracted outside engineers is the risk that inconsistent reviews will crop up from reviewer to reviewer and even from project to project.

By meeting the need for additional civil review with a second PADS development review engineer, as opposed to contracting for engineering services, we would reap efficiencies of scale and improved communication and coordination with PADS project managers as well as technical staff in Public Works. By having the same engineer reviewing multiple applications over time, we would achieve a greater depth of understanding and a more consistent application of adopted policies and procedures.

A second in-house PADS engineer would also increase our ability to devote informed in-house engineering expertise to improving adopted standards and procedures (e.g., adopting and administering the 2005 surface water manual). A second FTE would also give us valuable depth in the position for when staff turnover occurs, to say nothing of having coverage when sick-leave or vacation is taken by the other PADS engineer. In our present situation, there is no engineer backup in PADS if our engineer is gone for whatever reason.

Another alternative that staff reviewed was the availability of other positions that might be vacant or could be eliminated to create funding for a new DRE position. However, given the current number of major capital projects, upcoming park projects, and PADS role in implementation of the upcoming Council goals 2, 5, 6, and 8 we do not see any current or foreseeable excess staff time that could be reallocated to this need.

Revenue Neutral Contract for Development Review Engineering Services

The Development Review Engineer position is tasked with reviewing all developments that include drainage improvements, frontage improvements and geotechnical analysis. This is a vital part of the City's permitting service. We have only one position, which is currently vacant with the expertise and time allotted to these tasks. In the event that this person's workload becomes too large, the employee is out sick or on vacation, or even leaves employment as is currently the case – these tasks must still be performed.

Therefore, in an effort to anticipate a variety of potential scenarios that would jeopardize the City's ability to efficiently process permits, staff recommends that the budget be amended to include a revenue neutral contract (the City will collect fees from the applicant to cover the review hours) for on call services with an engineering firm. The purpose of this contract would be three-fold. Initially the expanded contract would provide the necessary resources for plan review until the current and proposed positions are filled. Additionally, the contract would allow for us to call upon outside services for fill in when work load surges. Finally, the contract would provide additional capacity for backfilling vacations and possible vacancies.

Applications that require engineering review will be required to submit a fee deposit for engineering services. The amount of the fee will be determined based on the average number of hours it has historically taken to review the civil plans multiplied by the City's hourly service rate of $127 (for 2006). If the review takes fewer hours than estimated, the applicant will receive a refund. If the review takes more time than the hours estimated the customer will be alerted as soon as possible and given the choice to pay for the additional hours or withdraw and/or refine the permit application. In addition, the City's fee ordinance already allows us to charge applicants for actual hours worked beyond the hours included in the fee schedule. Please see Attachment D: Administrative Order clarifying initial fee deposits for projects that require civil plans review.

As noted, PADS did have a firm perform the engineering reviews for development projects during the seven months in 2005 when the Development Review Engineer position was vacant. We currently have a contract with an engineering firm to assist the PADS Development Review Engineer with the backlog of permit reviews. However, the contract is currently being funded from salary savings and other non renewable sources that will be depleted as soon as the end of July. We have also reached the $50,000 maximum for administrative approval for contracts thus requiring Council approval to increase the contract amount to continue receiving engineering services.

IV. Budget Request

Staff requests that the budget be amended to include one additional FTE in Planning and Development Services to provide for the hiring of a second Development Review Engineer at a cost of $94,380.

Additionally, a revenue neutral contract in the amount of $100,000 is being requested. This is nearly the amount of money that was spent to employ an engineering firm for seven months in 2005 to provide engineering review services to the City during the time

the Development Review Engineer position was vacant. By identifying this revenue in the budget, we will be allowed to expend up to $100,000 for engineering services.

It is important to note, that if we do not receive approval to increase the budget (i.e. the $100,000) for the purposes of extending a contract for engineering services for review of permit applications, we will not be able to provide civil engineering review until the current vacancy is filled. This would mean any permit requiring civil review would not be issued.

Council's approval of these budget requests will allow us to: address the immediate need for engineering services to perform the required review of civil engineering plans submitted with permit applications; better address the current back log of permit reviews; process new permits that are submitted; and have a back up resource for the Development Review Engineer. Again, the contract would be revenue neutral – meaning the funds would only be expended when revenue is received from the customer to cover the cost of the services provided.

V. FINANCIAL IMPACT

The proposal to add a second FTE of Development Review Engineer in PADS will have negligible, if any, financial impact on the City. The position can be funded entirely by more accurately charging applicants for the hours expended on the review of civil plans utilizing the existing hourly rate(s). An analysis of the projected revenue from permits for civil engineering review appears in Attachment F.

The contract for engineering services is proposed to be revenue neutral and will have negligible, if any, financial impact on the City's budget.

Effect on Fees

Currently the revenue to offset the costs of performing civil plan review has been assumed to have been met by the submittal fees and supplemental fees paid by the applicant. These fees are based on hourly charges of $127 per hour. Historically, there has not been an accurate tracking/accounting of the cumulative review time spent on each permit. By more accurately accounting for the hours spent reviewing civil plans associated with permit applications and charging our customers accordingly, some customers will likely see an increase in the total permit cost. In order to perform civil reviews expediently and to adequately safeguard the public infrastructure additional resources are required. Over the years the cost of doing these reviews has been subsidized by the Development Review Engineer working extra hours (Note: this is an exempt position and is not eligible for overtime); or the comprehensiveness of the review was reduced in order to issue permits within an acceptable time frame; or (as is currently the case) we are doing comprehensive reviews with the existing resources and the permit turn around time is unacceptable (4+ months turnaround).

Staff looked at the permitting fees charged by neighboring jurisdictions. The way permitting fees and other fees associated with development and redevelopment are charged varies greatly between jurisdictions making it difficult to create a direct correlation for comparison purposes. For example, some jurisdictions: charge impact fees for stormwater and transportation in addition to the building or land use permit;

charge a separate engineering fee; or have a general clause in the fee schedule allowing for the charge of additional hours for permit reviews that go beyond the scope of the time allotted for the initial review. Another point to consider is economies of scale. We are a smaller and newer jurisdiction trying to provide the same level of service as larger and older jurisdictions that have honed their resources and processes and through increased permitting volumes and associated revenue may be able to offer their permitting services at a lower cost.

The question then becomes, who is going to pay for the service or are we willing to reduce our level of service to match up with our existing fees? We know time is money to many of our customers. Based on prior experience, as well as comments we have heard from a number of our permit applicants over the past six months, staff believes that developers would be willing to pay more to have a more predictable and shorter permitting process.

VI. RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that Council adopted Ordinance No. 433 (Attachment G):

1. Approve an amendment to the 2006 Budget of $94,380 in expenditures to create a new Full Time Employee (FTE) to hire a second Development Review Engineer for Planning and Development Services; and
2. Approve an amendment to the 2006 Budget to include $100,000 expenditure for an engineering review services contract and an addition of $100,000 revenue from fees for services rendered.

Approved By: City Manager City Attorney

ATTACHMENTS

A. Scope of Review and Services Provided by Development Review Engineer
B. Development Review Engineer Job Description
C. Email Memo from Tovar to Olander, dated May 12, 2006
D. Administrative Order: Clarifying fee deposit for civil plan review
E. Table of Comparable Staff and Permitting Levels
F. Projected Revenue for Civil Review
G. Ordinance No. 433

Attachment A

Development Review Engineer
Scope of review and services provided

Preliminary Approval Reviews

- Review of legal description, recorded plat conditions, survey control & project information.
- Site Visit – assess existing conditions and anticipated conflicts.
- Access – alignment, location, easement/tract, pavement width, setbacks, etc.
- Frontage Improvements – alignment, configuration, transitioning, etc.
- ROW dedication – required for improvements/sight distance/grading/etc. as a condition of approval.
- Drainage – See Preliminary Review below
- Easements, setbacks & covenants – access, maintenance, storm, franchise, construction, slopes/walls, etc.
- Undergrounding of power – review of power location, undergrounding/crossing requirements, provision of easement, etc.
- Review of certificate of availability conditions for franchise utilities - conflicts and requirements for easements.
- Other reports/studies needed (i.e. soils reports, traffic impact analysis, etc.)
- Fee-in-lieu of improvement review – Location, Adjacent improvements, connections, schools/businesses, planned improvements, CIP's, etc.
- Comprehensive Plan Review – planned pedestrian/sidewalk/CIP locations/bus-stops/truck routes, etc.
- Maintenance review – Existing and planned overlay routes
- Conditions of Approval – Required submittal information, site-specific conditions, drainage improvements required prior to final plat, etc.
- Recommendations of other permits required (i.e. Site Development or ROW)

Frontage Improvements & typical ROW Use Permits

Note: Dev. Review Engineer is project manager for Right-of-Way Use Permits

- Review Conditions of Approval (typical for plats)
- ROW dedication/public easements – if not in conditions
- Coordination with CIP/Planned improvements – Aurora, Interurban, North City, etc.
- Streets - cross-section, widening, paving, curb location, connectivity, etc.
- Utilities – conflicts, relocations, easements, setbacks, adjustments, etc.
- Striping – restoration, provision, location, details, etc.
- Trenching/Restoration – location, sawcutting, patching, restoration, details, etc.
- Overlays – extents, location, section, details, notes, etc.
- Driveways – location, alignment, landings, conflicts, details, sections, notes
- Sidewalks – connectivity, locations, conflicts, details, etc.
- Curb – elevations, flow direction, details, location, etc.
- Curb returns – radius, location, etc.
- Curb ramps – placement, details, ADA conformance, etc.
- Temporary asphalt transition ramps – details, ADA conformance, etc.

- Intersections – geometric design, grades, transitioning, etc.
- Amenity Zones – provision, location, etc.
- Street Trees – spacing, species, root guard, staking, soil amendments, sight distance conflicts, utility conflicts
- Location/relocation of mailboxes
- Strom drainage improvements & connection to public system
- Sight Distance – driveways, intersections and obstructions
- Grading, Walls, easements (construction/slope)
- Restoration – landscaping, shoulder, seeding, soil amendments, etc.
- Relocations of obstructions – fencing, walls, and other ROW encroachments
- Erosion & Sediment Control – offsite protection
- Traffic Control Plans – sign setup, spacing, tapers, offsets, detours, etc.
- Schools/Bus Routes/Truck Routes – traffic impacts due to construction/limits on activity
- Haul Routes – as needed
- Certificate of Liability Insurance
- License, bonded & insured
- Performance Bonding – Review of amounts, assure posting prior to issuance
- Determine conditions of approval for ROW Permit
- Hansen tracking
- File/record keeping
- Comment letters – ROW permits routed to applicant/other permits to planner

Drainage Review – Preliminary

- Review storm drainage infrastructure mapping to determine known flooding, erosion and conveyance system nuisance problems.
- Review proposed improvements to determine threshold criteria and drainage review triggers
    - Note: adopted threshold for review reduced from 5,000 sq. ft. to 1,500 sq. ft. means that most projects will trigger drainage review
- Research sensitive areas (streams, wetlands, closed depressions, lakes, LHDA, steep slope hazard area, erosion hazard areas, etc.)
- Review hydrology (existing & proposed), existing conveyance and control of stormwater desired by basin/drainage features adjacent to project.
- Identification of type of drainage review required and submittals needed to perform review.
- Identify any project specific concerns or requirements to be addressed during review.

Drainage – Small Site

- Written Drainage Assessments
- Soils reports
- Erosion and Sediment Control Plans
- Small Site Improvement Plan (drainage design)
- Review of Engineering Plans required for portion of Small Site Drainage Reviews

Drainage – Targeted Drainage Review & Full Drainage Review

- Technical Information Reports (TIR) – Generally includes information pertaining to drainage basins, sub-basins, site characteristics, topography, discharge points, existing stormwater deposition, downstream hydraulic structures, surface water travel, background flows, soils mapping & reports, conditions of approval, resource review, field inspection reports, existing site hydrology, developed site hydrology, performance standards, flow control system, water quality system, conveyance system analysis & design, other required permits, ESC analysis & design, bond quantities, facility summaries, declaration of covenant, easements, and operation and maintenance manual.
- Engineering Plans – Components of review
    - Plan format and project information - property areas, legal description, property boundaries, location & alignment, survey information, sensitive areas identification and setbacks, clearing limits, plan notes, details,

Technical Information Reports

Note: Amendments to KCSWDM require review of all Core and Special requirements outlined in the manual.

- Natural Discharge Location (Basin Flows & Offsite Impacts)
- Offsite/Downstream Analysis
    - Engineering has to research and identify offsite drainage problems due to lack of information available to the public
- Flow Control Design
    - Flow control determination needs to be made on case-by-case basis due to lack of applications mapping.
- Conveyance System Design
- Erosion & Sediment Control
- Maintenance & Operations Requirements
- Financial Guarantees & Liability Review
- Water Quality
    - Water Quality determination made by engineering due to lack of application mapping.
- Sensitive Areas, Critical Drainage Areas
- Source Control & Oil Control

Engineered Plans

- Project Information
- Plan format
- Existing conditions – ROW conditions, structures, driveways, utilities, drainage, signing, mailboxes, sensitive areas, sidewalks, curbs, trees, easements, ROW encroachments, walls, etc.
- Survey control, datum, legal description, encumbrances, etc.

- Existing & proposed contours – intervals, slopes, ditches, streams, conveyance system elements, background flows, discharge points, existing hydrology, proposed changes to hydrology, cut/fills, drainage to adjacent properties, setback issues, etc.
- Critical & Sensitive Areas/buffers – setbacks, conflicts with improvements, drainage requirements, etc.
- Traffic Mitigation Improvements – design, details, implementation, location, coordination, etc.
- Soils considerations – proposed improvements don't conflict with soils report findings.
- Removal/Demolition requirements – utilities, existing improvements, etc.
- Conveyance of existing and natural drainage systems – bypassing, diversions, connectivity, recharge, conveyance, dispersion, etc.
- Review of storm conveyance system – Conformance to TIR, inlets, pipe sizing, materials, pipe joints, pipe alignment, max/min slopes and velocities, changes in size, structures, pipe cover, pipe design between structures, clearances/utility conflicts, compaction/backfill, system connections, anchoring, spill control, debris barriers, outfalls, profiles, details, numbering, depth of structures, other details, etc.
- Review of flow control BMP's – Conformance to TIR, function, design elements, design criteria, sizing & geometry, access/maintenance, setbacks/easements, materials, structural/stability, details, etc.
- Review of water quality BMP's – Conformance to TIR, function, sequencing, setbacks/easements, design elements and geometry, etc.
- Additional requirements – oil/water separation, spill control, groundwater protection, sensitive areas recharge (i.e. maintain hydrology), etc.
- Details – conformance with design criteria, dimensioning and operational requirements.
- Roadway – Horizontal Alignment/curves, Vertical curves/transitioning/grades, alignment, superelevation, turn-arounds/street end design, connectivity, section/width, striping, channelization, signalization (traffic control signing), intersections, appurtenances/obstructions, etc.
- Driveways & Intersections - curb radii, sight distance, width, alignment, grades, landings, drainage, curb ramps/returns, crosswalks, details, etc.
- Sidewalks & Curbs – location, section, conflicts, routing, transitioning, flowlines, expansion joints, slopes (of and adjacent), details, etc.
- Amenity Zone – width, street trees, appurtenances/obstructions, mailbox locations, utilities, etc.
- Commercial/Multifamily – review of circulation (drive-isle widths, turning radii, drive-thru queuing, etc.), local deliveries, trash pick-up, source controls, high-use provisions (access/traffic calming/mitigation/signalization/etc),
- Notes – review of plan notes (standard notes needed).

Stormwater Adjustment Procedures (Variance review)

- Evaluate proposed BMP's & stormwater designs that request deviation from the manual (covered in the manual).

Engineering Variances

- Evaluate proposed variance and make recommendation regarding acceptance.

Clearing & Grading

- Erosion and Sediment Control – Plans, details, notes, construction sequence, wet-season dry-season requirements, slope stabilization, etc.
- Clearing Limits Delineated & Protected
- Sensitive Areas delineation, setbacks & protection
- Conflict of improvements, grading, etc. with tree retention/sensitive areas requirements.
- Slopes/walls – grading problems/conflicts, slopes design, walls, surcharging/undermining, mass-excavations, foundation/wall drain connections, building permit review coordination, etc.

<u>Customer Service</u>

- Customer walk-ins - public, engineers, developers, contractors regarding code, standards, drainage, frontage improvements, field problems, design issues, etc.

- Scheduled meetings – project/proposal related pre-design, post-submittal, review revisions, etc.

- Code Interpretation Requests/Requests for Information – Research and provide information primarily to developers and engineers regarding drainage review and assessment, engineering design of storm drainage systems and frontage improvements. Not typical questions as they require time for research, preparation and provision of requested information. Site visits sometimes required.

- Pre-application meetings and preparation (1 to 2 hours preparation time + 1-2 hours preapplication meeting time)

- Internal Support – in order of time spent:
  Planning & Development Services – Drainage, Engineering Standards, Reports, Submittals, site development questions, code & land use, review process issues, interpret code/standards, etc.
  ROW Inspectors – ROW permit review, field problems/design revisions, questions, etc.
  Drainage Engineer – questions, drainage manual adoption and

Building Department – Weekly meetings, review coordination, inspector questions.
Traffic Engineer – Coordinate traffic review of proposals, determine frontage improvement configuration, ADA compliance, sidewalks, traffic mitigation reports and features, details.
Public Works (City Engineer/CIP Project Managers/Maintenance) – Questions, coordination

- Phone Calls/Email

- Other administrative requirements -
  Staff Meetings – City/Dept./Section, Development Review, Building, Project Specific Internal, Training, etc.
  Assist with the development of code revisions, review process issues, engineering standards revisions, etc.
  Develop checklists, submittal requirements, review procedures, etc.

CITY OF SHORELINE

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW ENGINEER

*Class specifications are intended to present a descriptive list of the range of duties performed by employees in the class. Specifications are **not** intended to reflect all duties performed within the job.*

DEFINITION

To provide responsible professional engineering assistance in the review of private development projects, including inspection and approval, in coordination with the Planning and Development Services Department; to oversee and coordinate the permitting and inspection of projects and activities in the City right-of-way; and to perform various office and field duties as required.

SUPERVISION RECEIVED AND EXERCISED

Receives direction from the Permit Services Manager or other assigned manager.
May supervise the work of assigned technical staff.

ESSENTIAL AND MARGINAL FUNCTION STATEMENTS *Essential and other important responsibilities and duties may include, but are not limited to, the following:*

Essential Functions:

1. Review private development engineering specifications, estimates, and other documents for completeness and accuracy.

2. Conduct inspections of work-in-progress; ensure projects are completed in compliance with applicable codes, regulations and standards.

3. Respond to questions and inquiries from the public regarding street and drainage issues, standards and permits; attend meetings and make presentations to citizen advisory groups and in other public settings.

4. Coordinate assigned engineering projects with outside contractors, government agencies and organizations and the public; provide assistance to project managers and City Engineer.

5. Plan, direct, coordinate and review the work plan for staff; assign work activities, projects and programs; review and evaluate work products, methods and procedures; meet with staff to identify and resolve problems.

6. Prepare and maintain records of work completion; coordinate work in progress to assure projects are completed in compliance with codes, specifications, standards and time schedules.

7. Select, train, motivate and evaluate personnel; provide or coordinate staff training; work with employees to correct deficiencies; implement discipline and termination procedures.

8. Attend and participate in professional group meetings; stay abreast of new trends and innovations in the field of development and permitting.

9. Provide information to the public, contractors and developers regarding right-of-way development issues; interpret construction codes, ordinances and zoning regulations.

Marginal Functions:

1. Perform a variety of office and field support duties as required.

2. Perform related duties and responsibilities as required.

QUALIFICATIONS

Knowledge of:
Principles and practices of civil engineering.
Principles and practices of project management.
Principles, practices, materials and terminology related to right-of-way construction.
Principles and practices of permit processing and plan review.
Methods and techniques used in engineering plan review.
Methods and techniques used to conduct on-site engineering and right-of-way field inspections.
Modern office procedures, methods and equipment including computers.
Principles of supervision, training and performance evaluation.
Pertinent Federal, State and local codes, laws and regulations.

Ability to:
Review engineering plans and specifications.
Inspect permitted engineering work and projects in the City's right-of-way for completeness, proper work methods and compliance with applicable regulations and ordinances.
Respond to requests and inquiries from the general public
Oversee, direct and coordinate the work of lower level staff.
Select, supervise, train and evaluate staff.
Manage and coordinate projects as assigned.
Assure work projects are completed according to code specifications and timelines.
Interpret and apply Federal, State and local policies, laws and regulations.
Communicate clearly and concisely, both orally and in writing.
Establish and maintain effective working relationships with those contacted in the course of work.
Maintain physical condition appropriate to the performance of assigned duties and responsibilities.
Provide excellent customer service.

Experience and Training Guidelines
Any combination of experience and training that would likely provide the required knowledge and abilities is qualifying. A typical way to obtain the knowledge and abilities would be:

Experience:
Three years of increasingly responsible development services/engineering experience including some planning or development experience.

Training:
Equivalent to a bachelor's degree from an accredited college or university with major course work in civil engineering or an applicable field. Prefer Professional Engineer's License.

WORKING CONDITIONS
Environmental Conditions:
Office and field environment; travel from site to site; extensive public contact.

Physical Conditions:
Essential and marginal functions may require maintaining physical condition necessary for walking, standing or sitting for prolonged periods of time, and for conducting work-in-progress inspections; near visual acuity for the review of technical engineering plans and specifications; communication with the public.

Note:

1. Any combination of education and experience may be substituted, so long as it provides the desired skills, knowledge and abilities to perform the essential functions of the job.

2. All requirements are subject to possible modification to reasonably accommodate individuals with disabilities. However, some requirements may exclude individuals who pose a direct threat or significant risk to the health

Joe Tovar

From: Joe Tovar
Sent: Friday, May 12, 2006 2:25 PM
To: Robert Olander
Subject: Heads up about the PADS permit review process

I wanted to give you a heads up that the City Council may soon be getting feedback from a number of unhappy permit applicants, either individually, or collectively via letter or appearance(s) at Council meetings. Mr. Crosby, the gentleman you heard from yesterday, is just one of an increasing number of permit applicants who have been expressing strong displeasure with the City's permit processes. He indicated that there may also be a letter forthcoming from the Master Builders Association. In my experience, customer complaints about timeliness are not unusual – what is unusual is the number and frequency of complaints that have been coming directly to me. I have heard from a dozen different permit applicants over the past month, all complaining bitterly that it takes too long to get a permit processed in Shoreline. Frankly, I have to agree with them.

As our Permit Services Manager Jeff Forry and I briefly discussed with you a few weeks ago, our permit backlog is ballooning. There are many reasons that contribute to and compound this situation, and I have been directing serious efforts at attacking the various pieces of this problem. As you know, we contracted with Roth-Hill Engineers for some near-term help in development engineering review, the key choke-point in our review process. I have also issued several administrative orders to achieve greater clarity and consistency in code administration, initiated a number of code amendments that will go to hearing this summer, and held ongoing meetings with Public Works to improve internal coordination and communication.

Unfortunately, even with these system improvements, our civil review backlog has continued to increase – it now takes 4 months to get applicants a first review in some cases. Our statutory timeline is 90 days or less, and an ideal target would be more on the order of 45 to 60 days. I have reached the conclusion that we won't be able to appreciably reduce the permit review backlog to acceptable levels, much less implement other system improvements (for example, adoption and implementation of the 2005 surface water manual) until we address the underlying resource issue – we simply don't have enough engineering capacity within PADS to review on-site storm drainage and right-of-way frontage improvements. Our one FTE of engineer must perform a minimum of 500 civil plan reviews in 220 work days annually, or about two per day. In actual practice, with added reviews done of resubmitted corrected plans, pre-application meetings with applicants, and public information, this is about half the resource needed for the task.

I had intended to make the case as part of the 2007 budget for a second engineer in PADS to enable us to continue with the reform and streamlining of civil plan review, accelerate the adoption of the 2005 King County surface water manual, and design a better fit between the scale and nature of residential infill in Shoreline and the City's requirements for road/walkway/drainage improvements in the right of way. In view of Council's recent discussions on these topics, including housing affordability (delays in permit processing inflate the cost of housing), I would like to review with you the prospects for moving forward with a mid-year budget adjustment that would both address our immediate predicament and increase our capacity to address these upcoming priorities.

This page intentionally left blank.

ATTACHMENT D

Shoreline Policy and Procedure

CIVIL PLAN REVIEW FEES – PDS 06-03

Subject: **Policy Establishing Minimum Fees for Review of Civil Drawings**	**Code and Statutory Authority:** SMC Chapter 3.01 IBC IRC
Effective Date: July 1, 2006	**Approved By:**
Prior Versions and Related Policies None	Director, PADS

1.0 PURPOSE

Authority is granted to the Director under the City of Shoreline Municipal Code (SMC), section 20.10.050 to promulgate procedures and rules to administer the provisions of chapter 20 of the SMC. Section 104.1 of the IBC and IRC provide for the adoption of policies and procedures in order to clarify the provisions of the code. To effectively administer the codes, methods must be employed that provide for timely and predictable review of plans including civil engineering provisions. To fund the review services appropriate fees must be collected to offset the direct cost of providing this service. This policy clarifies the Supplemental Fees that Planning and Development Services may assess for civil plan review of engineering plans and associated documents submitted for review in conjunction with development permits.

2.0 DEPARTMENTS AFFECTED

Planning and Development Services.

3.0 SCOPE

Attachment A provides a sample breakdown of time distribution for a short plat. This distribution appears to be consistent for most land use permits. A minimum fee is paid to cover these initial costs. An initial plan review fee is paid for building permits. This fee is intended to offset building plan review costs. The Director has determined that the minimum submittal fees do not adequately cover the level of civil plan review necessary as indicted in section 6. Accordingly the Director has established additional minimum supplemental fees (submittal fees) that must accompany the applications enumerated in this policy. These fees are based on the estimated hours necessary to perform preliminary civil review of the following permit types:

- **New Construction** Commercial/Residential
- **Addition / Remodel** Commercial/Residential (those that trigger review)
- **Clearing and Grading**
- **Conditional Use**
- **Right-of-way w/ Frontage**
- **Site Development**
- **Short Plat** Preliminary/Final
- **Subdivision** Preliminary/Final

4.0 PROCEDURE

Preliminary review fees identified in section 6 will be assessed at the time of application.

The time spent for additional review or review of revisions in excess of the minimum submittal fee will be based on the published hourly rate.

5.0 REFUNDS

For those projects where the minimum review time is not reached the balance will be remitted to the applicant.

6.0 PRELIMINARY REVIEW HOURS

Permit Activity	Minimum Civil Review Hours
New Construction	
Commercial	5
Residential	3
Addition / Remodel*	
Commercial	3
Residential	2
Clearing and Grading	3
Conditional Use	2
Site Development	5
Short Plat	
Preliminary	5
Final	1
Subdivision	
Preliminary	8
Final	1

*** Only those projects that exceed defined thresholds will be subject to these fees**

Short Plat Review Allocation of Hours

	Project Manager
Pre-application meeting	3
Determination of Completeness (application review)	1
Notice of Application	2
Field visits	2
Staff report	5
Agency coordination	2
Customer contacts	3
Decision	2
Subtotal	**20**

	Technical/Administrative Support
Application processing	1
Noticing	3
Document processing	2
Subtotal	**6**

Total	**26**
Available civil review fee hours	**4**
Total Hours charged (from schedule)	**30**

This page intentionally left blank.

Development Review Services Employed by Comparable Jurisdictions

Comparable Jurisdiction	# of staff devoted to development review engineering tasks	Utilizing Contract Engineering Services yes/no	Population of Jurisdiction
Auburn	(3) Development Review Engineers; (1) Development Review Assistant	No	47,470
Bellevue	(6) Non-licensed Development Review Professionals + (4) transportation Engineers (Note: future hires to be licensed engineers)	Yes – for overflow, residential structural review and a few commercial projects	115,500
Edmonds	(2) - Engineering Technician IIs; (1) - Engineering Technician III; (1) Licensed Engineer; (1) Program Comment: could use another Dev. Review engineering professional	Yes – civil structural reviews	39,860
Everett	(1) Engineer for commercial review; (1) architect for commercial review; (1) non licensed plans examiner for residential review; (1) licensed engineer for drainage of large projects; (3) non licensed engineers to review drainage, frontage & utilities.	No	97,500
Federal Way	(4) Development Review Engineers	Yes	85,800
Kent	9 total staff persons: (2) Engineers devoted to frontage and utilities review; 2 Engineering technicians; (2) design engineers; (1) project manager; (1) administrative staff & (1) Development Review Manager – licensed Engineer	Yes	84,920
Kirkland	(3) Development Review Engineers + (2) Office Assistants	No	45,740
Lakewood	(1) Associate Civil Engineer; (1) Assistant Civil Engineer (part time Development Review part Traffic)	No	58,850
Renton	(4) Civil Plans reviewers	Yes – structural engineering reviews	56,840
Shoreline	(1) Development Review Engineer	No	52,500

This page intentionally left blank.

TOTAL ESTIMATED REVENUE
FOR CIVIL REVIEW
(Based on 2005 Permit Activity)

Permit Types	A Average Number of Hours Required for Civil Review Including Revisions per Permit	B Average Number of Hours Charged for Civil Review per Permit [1]	C Average Underbilled Civil Review Hours per Permit (A – B)	D Number of Permits Issued in 2005 that Required Civil Review	E Estimated Unbilled Hours in 2005 (C * D)	F Potential New Revenue (E* $127)	G Existing Revenue
New Construction							
Commercial	8	3	5	23	115	$14,605	$8,763
Residential	6	1	5	66	330	$41,910	$8,382
Addition / Remodel							
Commercial	5	1	4	19	76	$9,652	$2,413
Residential	3	1	2	90	180	$22,860	$11,430
Clearing and Grading	5	0	5	22	110	$13,970	$0
Conditional Use	3	3	0	1	0	0	$508
Site Development	8	2	6	11	66	$8,382	$2,794
Short Plat							
Preliminary	7	4	3	26	78	$9,906	$13,208
Final	2	1	1	26	26	$3,302	$3,302
Subdivision							
Preliminary	10	5	5	1	5	$635	$635
Final	4	4	0	1	0	0	$13,208
Subtotals				**248**	**986**	**$125,222**	**$64,643**
Total Estimated Revenue Available to fund (2) Dev. Review Engineers	**$189,865**						

Attachment F

This page intentionally left blank.

2006 City of Shoreline Budgeted Positions and FTE's

Department	Job Title	Position Count	FTE Count
City Council	Mayor	1	1.0
City Council	Deputy Mayor	1	1.0
City Council	Councilmember	5	5.0
	Department Total	7	7.0
City Manager	City Manager	1	1.0
City Manager	Assistant City Manager	1	1.0
City Manager	Management Analyst	2	2.0
City Manager	Executive Asst. to the City Manager	1	1.0
City Manager	Administrative Assistant III	1	1.0
	Department Total	6	6.0
City Clerk	City Clerk	1	1.0
City Clerk	Deputy City Clerk	1	1.0
City Clerk	Records & Information Manager	1	0.8
City Clerk	Administrative Assistant II	1	1.0
	Department Total	4	3.8
Communications & Intergovt. Relations	Communications & Intergovt. Relations Director	1	1.0
Communications & Intergovt. Relations	Neighborhoods Coordinator	1	1.0
Communications & Intergovt. Relations	Communications Specialist	1	1.0
Communications & Intergovt. Relations	Administrative Assistant I	1	0.5
	Department Total	4	3.5
Human Services	Human Services Manager	1	1.0
Human Services	Grants Specialist	0	0.3
Human Services	Human Services Planner (Planner II)	1	0.5
	Department Total	2	1.8
City Attorney	City Attorney	1	1.0
City Attorney	Assistant City Attorney	1	1.0
City Attorney	Administrative Assistant II	1	1.0
	Department Total	3	3.0
Finance & Information Services	Finance Director	1	1.0
Finance & Information Services	Finance Manager	1	1.0
Finance & Information Services	Purchasing Officer	1	1.0
Finance & Information Services	Finance Technician	3	2.1
Finance & Information Services	Staff Accountant	1	1.0
Finance & Information Services	Payroll Officer	1	1.0
Finance & Information Services	Senior Accountant	1	1.0
Finance & Information Services	Budget Analyst	1	1.0
Finance & Information Services	Grants Specialist	1	0.7
Finance & Information Services	Administrative Assistant III	1	1.0
Finance & Information Services	Information Services Manager	1	1.0
Finance & Information Services	Database Administrator	1	1.0
Finance & Information Services	GIS Specialist	1	1.0

2006 City of Shoreline Budgeted Positions and FTE's

Department	Job Title	Position Count	FTE Count
Finance & Information Services	Network Administrator	1	1.0
Finance & Information Services	Web Developer	1	1.0
Finance & Information Services	Computer/Network Specialist	2	2.0
	Department Total	19	17.8
Human Resources	Human Resource Director	1	1.0
Human Resources	Human Resources Analyst	1	1.0
Human Resources	Administrative Assistant III	1	1.0
	Department Total	3	3.0
Customer Response Team	Administrative Assistant II	1	1.0
Customer Response Team	Customer Response Team Supervisor	1	1.0
Customer Response Team	Lead CRT Representative	1	1.0
Customer Response Team	CRT Representative	2	2.0
	Department Total	5	5.0
Police	Administrative Assistant II	1	1.0
Police	Emergency Management Coordinator	1	1.0
	Department Total	2	2.0
Parks & Recreation	Parks Director	1	1.0
Parks & Recreation	Recreation Superintendent	1	1.0
Parks & Recreation	Recreation Coordinator II	1	1.0
Parks & Recreation	Recreation Coordinator I	2	2.0
Parks & Recreation	Project Coordinator	1	1.0
Parks & Recreation	Administrative Assistant I	1	0.5
Parks & Recreation	Administrative Assistant II	2	2.0
Parks & Recreation	Recreation Assistant III	1	1.0
Parks & Recreation	Recreation Assistant II	3	2.4
Parks & Recreation	Parks Superintendent	1	1.0
Parks & Recreation	Parks Maintenance Worker II	3	3.0
Parks & Recreation	Parks Maintenance Worker I	2	2.0
Parks & Recreation	Administrative Asst. III	1	1.0
Parks & Recreation	Teen Program Supervisor	1	1.0
Parks & Recreation	Teen Program Assistant	3	2.7
Parks & Recreation	Senior Lifeguard	3	2.4
Parks & Recreation	Lifeguard 2	1	0.9
	Department Total	28	25.8
Planning & Development Services	Planning & Development Services Director	1	1.0
Planning & Development Services	Assistant Director, PADS	1	1.0
Planning & Development Services	Management Analyst	1	1.0
Planning & Development Services	Permit Services Manager	1	1.0
Planning & Development Services	Planner III	2	2.0
Planning & Development Services	Planner II	4	4.0
Planning & Development Services	Planner I	2	2.0
Planning & Development Services	Planner III (Aurora Corridor Project)	1	1.0
Planning & Development Services	Building Official	1	1.0
Planning & Development Services	Plans Examiner III	2	2.0

2006 City of Shoreline Budgeted Positions and FTE's

Department	Job Title	Position Count	FTE Count
Planning & Development Services	Plans Examiner I	1	1.0
Planning & Development Services	Project Inspector II	2	2.0
Planning & Development Services	***Development Review Engineer***	***2***	***2.0***
Planning & Development Services	Code Enforcement Officer	1	1.0
Planning & Development Services	Technical Assistant	4	3.5
Planning & Development Services	Administrative Assistant II	2	2.0
Planning & Development Services	Administrative Assistant III	1	1.0
	Department Total	29	28.5
Economic Development	Economic Development Program Manager	1	1.0
		1	1.0
Public Works	Public Works Director	1	1.0
Public Works	Public Works Administrative Manager	1	1.0
Public Works	Management Analyst	1	1.0
Public Works	City Engineer	1	1.0
Public Works	Aurora Corridor Project Manager	1	1.0
Public Works	Capital Projects Manager I	1	1.0
Public Works	Capital Projects Manager II		4.0
Public Works	Capital Project Technician	1	1.0
Public Works	Public Works Operations Manager	1	1.0
Public Works	Public Works Maintenance Supervisor	1	1.0
Public Works	Public Works Senior Maintenance Worker	1	1.0
Public Works	Public Works Maintenance Worker II	6	6.0
Public Works	Public Works Maintenance Worker I	1	1.0
Public Works	Surface Water & Env. Svcs. Manager	1	1.0
Public Works	Facility Maintenance Supervisor	1	1.0
Public Works	Facilities Maint. Worker II	1	1.0
Public Works	Administrative Assistant II	2	2.0
Public Works	Administrative Assistant III	1	1.0
Public Works	Engineering Technician (Traffic)	1	1.0
Public Works	Engineering Technician (Surface Water)	1	1.0
Public Works	Administrative Assistant II (Aurora/Interurban)	1	1.0
Public Works	Traffic Engineer	1	1.0
Public Works	Associate Traffic Engineer	1	1.0
Public Works	Engineering Technician	1	1.0
Public Works	Environmental Educator	1	1.0
Public Works	Surface Water Quality Specialist	1	1.0
Public Works	Right-of-Way Inspector	2	2.0
	Department Total	33	37.0
	Total City Personnel	144	145.3

This page intentionally left blank.

ORDINANCE NO. 433

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON, INCREASING THE APPROPRIATION IN THE GENERAL FUND IN THE 2006 BUDGET TO ADD A NEW DEVELOPMENT REVIEW ENGINEER POSITION AND AN ON CALL CONTRACT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES TO PERFORM PERMIT REVIEW; AND AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 404, ORDINANCE NO. 414 AND ORDINANCE NO. 420

WHEREAS, the 2006 Budget was adopted in Ordinance 404 and amended by Ordinances No. 414 and 420; and

WHEREAS, the 2006 Exempt Salary Schedule was included in the 2006 Budget; and

WHEREAS, the City has adopted target timelines for the review of development permits; and

WHEREAS, the City's permit services include the review of engineering plans associated with permit applications for compliance with adopted Codes; and

WHEREAS, sufficient additional revenue from permit fees will offset the increased cost;

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON DO ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Amendment. The City hereby amends Section 1 of Ordinance No. 420 and the 2006 Annual Budget, by increasing the appropriation from the General Fund by $135,000 for a General Fund appropriation of $29,398,165 and by increasing the Total Funds appropriation to $92,858,906 as follows:

General Fund	~~$29,263,165~~	$29,398,165
Street Fund	2,559,651	
Arterial Street Fund	0	
Surface Water Management Fund	5,162,967	
General Reserve Fund	0	
Code Abatement Fund	100,000	
Asset Seizure Fund	23,000	
Public Arts Fund	115,775	
General Capital Fund	18,951,460	
City Facility-Major Maintenance Fund	60,000	
Roads Capital Fund	34,488,919	
Surface Water Capital Fund	1,762,072	
Vehicle Operations/Maintenance Fund	88,717	
Equipment Replacement Fund	138,180	
Unemployment Fund	10,000	
Total Funds	~~$92,723,906~~	$92,858,906

Section 2. Amendment. The City of Shoreline 2006 Budgeted Positions and FTE, adopted by Ordinance 404 as amended, is amended to read as set forth in Exhibit B, which is attached hereto.

Section 3. Effective Date. A summary of this ordinance consisting of its title shall be published in the official newspaper of the City. The ordinance shall take effect and be in full force five days after passage and publication.

Approved by the City Council this _____ day of July, 2006.

_____
Robert L. Ransom, Mayor

ATTEST:

_____
Scott Passey, CMC
City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

_____
Ian Sievers
City Attorney

Date of Publication: July ____, 2006
Effective Date: July ____, 2006