**Section 1: Proposal Descriptors**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Proposal Title:** Development Services – Review Services | **Proposal Number:** 110.03PA |
| **Outcome:** Economic Growth and Competitiveness | **Proposal** **Type:** Existing Service |
| **Staff Contact:** Gregg Schrader, DSD; Laurie Gromala, Transp | **One-Time/On-Going:** On-Going |
| **Fund:**  | **Attachments:** Yes | **Enter CIP Plan #: n/a** |
| **List Parent/Dependent Proposal(s):** None |

**Section 2: Executive Summary**

This proposal provides for Development Services (DS) review of designs and applications for private and public development projects. We issue 10,000-14,000 permits and approvals per year that contribute to the economic prosperity of the city. The goal of development review is to ensure that buildings are safe, that land uses and project designs are appropriate, that traffic impacts are managed, and that utilities and other infrastructure that are built as part of a development meet the city’s standards for quality and achieve the Community Vision.

**Section 3: Required Resources**

**Section 4: Cost Savings/Innovation/Partnerships/Collaboration**

Cost Savings: Providing predictable and effective review services reduces project delays for customers and associated costs, and allows for the most efficient use of staff time. According to the 2009 Customer Survey, 75% of the responders felt that staff were knowledgeable about codes and regulations affecting their property. Collaboration with regional cities creates consistency, predictable customer experience, and builds a better customer who is familiar with similar requirements and procedures. Also, review consultant costs have been reduced by $275,000.

Innovation: In 2009, Development Services (DS) developed the Development Services High Performance Ideals as part of the DS Forward initiative to further on-going improvement efforts (See 110.03PA\_Attach 1). DS delivers quality services that are fast, predictable, and understandable. Customer service has been increased by new initiatives such as the Quick Attack review team.

Partnerships: MyBuildingPermit.com, Bellevue School District, Puget Sound Energy, Department of Ecology, WA State Department of Transportation, Sound Transit, King County, WA Association of Building Officials, Structural Engineers Association of WA, King Co Emergency Management Division

Collaboration: Development Services, Fire, Transportation, and Utilities Departments

**Section 5: Budget Proposal Description**

This proposal funds cross-department (DS) staff positions in four departments (Development Services, Utilities, Transportation, and Fire) for review of a wide range of development projects such as commercial development, residential construction, infrastructure projects, use of the right of way, city parks, and schools. Many applications are highly complex and/or controversial, with technical, legal, and political issues. Staff are called upon to represent the City in public forums, including preapplication meetings, public meetings, and hearings.

**Section 6: Mandates and Contractual Agreements**

* All WA Cities and Counties are mandated to verify compliance with the following state and federal laws.
	+ Growth Management Act; Local Project Review; State Environmental Policy Act; FEMA National Flood Insurance Program; WA State Building Code (RCW 19.27) International Building Code; International Fire Code; National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) clean water acts (RCW 90.48 & Title 33 US Code, Section 1251`et seq – Federal Water Pollution Control Act); Plats, RCW 58.17; Water Resources Act; Shoreline Management Act; National Environmental Policy Act; Endangered Species Act; The Telecommunications Act of 1996; Americans with Disabilities Act (Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act); Water purveyor cross-connection control program (WAC 246-290-490).

**Section 7: Proposal Justification/Evidence (may insert charts, graphs, tables, etc.)**

**A. Factors/Purchasing strategies addressed by this proposal - for the PRIMARY outcome**

This proposal supports City-wide purchasing strategies to provide the *best value for meeting community needs* by *leveraging cross department collaborations* to provide efficient and predictable review services to *ensure sound management of resources and business practices*. Over the last development cycle, Building, Utilities, and Land Use have used outside consultants to maintain review timelines when workload has required additional resources. Review work provided by consultants ranges from $80 to $200 per hour. Review services provided by DS staff are at a lower cost and with greater efficiency and effectiveness as DS staff are most familiar with city codes and standards. In general, twice the project review production is achieved per unit cost by DS staff versus outside consultants, and customers repeatedly express a preference for in-house review of projects. Level of service would be maintained by using the cross departmental expertise of DS staff to provide the technical expertise needed to support development review functions.

People & Partnerships: Approximately 75% of respondents to the 2009 Customer Survey felt that reviewers dealt with them with a positive, “here’s what needs to be done to get your permit approved” approach, rather than a negative “you can’t do that” approach. Staff maintain relationships with long-time citizen activists and new residents in order to facilitate communication between developers, franchise utilities, and residents who may potentially be affected by proposed projects. Staff is currently working with telecommunication providers to review current regulations in light of the latest 3G technology and its deployment. DS plays a significant partner role in eGovAlliance, promoting consistency and ease in permitting amongst local agencies. Review staff are often the first point of contact with citizens and developers and are key in establishing a collaborative partnership to promote quality development and community vision.

Community Policy, Planning & Development: DS is committed to continuing examination of review policies and procedures to support the implementation of Bellevue’s Comprehensive Plan. The Plan reflects citizen involvement, technical analysis, and the judgment of decision-makers such as the city council. DS staff is tasked with ensuring that land uses and infrastructure development meet codes and standards and that future development remains consistent with the Plan. Having a strategic comprehensive plan supported by an efficient and predictable review process helps Bellevue attract businesses, developers, and entrepreneurs who seek an attractive and business friendly environment. Businesses that locate in Bellevue benefit from the quality and stability of development that results from the DS review process. Eighty-six percent of respondents to the survey felt that overall, Bellevue does a good job inspecting projects and reviewing permit applications.

Infrastructure: DS staff analyzes development to determine the need for mitigation of impacts on the transportation and utilities systems. Mitigation includes not only improvements to pedestrian and street facilities, but also monetary contributions to capital improvement projects. All improvements and contributions are previously documented in adopted plans and codes, providing predictability to the business community as to the cost of doing business in Bellevue. The maintenance and safe installation of reliable public and private utilities in the public right of way is vital for future growth.

Quality of Community: DS staff administers codes and standards that create attractive commercial districts, neighborhoods, and community facilities. Staff insures public safety and mobility during construction related activities. Staff partners with city departments that are responsible for road, utility, and park construction to improve delivery of quality facilities.

City Brand: DS staff is responsible for implementing codes and regulations that protect the natural environment within an increasingly urban city. The successful integration of the natural and built environment is one of the many elements that identifies Bellevue as a desirable place to live and work.

**B. Factors/Purchasing strategies addressed by this proposal - for the OTHER outcome(s)**

Safe Community – Planning & Preparation: DS staff implement design standards that support quick and reliable access and facilities for emergency response. Staff are able to issue permits quickly following a disaster. Staff enforces codes that protect health and safety, such as building venting and exiting, and fire fighting and prevention. Special procedures to require coordination with BP Olympic Pipe Lines mitigate the threat of damage to these liquid fuel lines running through the city.

Improved Mobility – Built Environment: The review services proposal provides infrastructure improvements and impact fee contributions by tying development approval to provision of adequate facilities. Through the review process, DS staff requires participation by new development in alternative travel modes through Transportation Demand Management strategies.

Innovative, Vibrant & Caring Community: DS staff impose requirements for amenities such as play areas and open spaces. This supports community values by ensuring compliance with the Comprehensive Plan.

Quality Neighborhoods: Many city codes deal with protecting and promoting quality neighborhoods. Neighborhood character includes natural attributes such as trees, lakes, and streams as well as the built form and land use context. Codes and standards that require new public facilities such as utilities, roads, and community spaces contribute to quality neighborhoods.

Healthy & Sustainable Environment: The city’s critical areas regulations, shoreline master program, clearing and grading codes, and storm and surface water codes promote a developed environment that is sustainable and healthy. The Right of Way (ROW) section assures that work performed in the ROW meets or exceeds required BMPs for erosion control, runoff, and dust.

Responsive Government: DS staff provide exceptional customer service, timeliness, and predictability.

**C. Short- and long-term benefits of this proposal:**

Short Term: Customers receive fast and predictable review services delivered by a highly qualified and engaged staff which helps to ensure that projects are completed on time and in compliance with codes, regulations, and standards. Developers are attracted to Bellevue due to the predictability of the permitting process and the vibrant and growing community.

Long Term: Developers and citizens of Bellevue are the beneficiaries of high quality development that protects their health, safety, property, environment, and investment.

**D. Performance metrics/benchmarks and targets for this proposal:**

DS compares current year-to-date timeline performance to target timeline and past years’ performance. Specific measures include: total number of completed applications, percentage of applications meeting timeline targets, number of days in which 80% of applications are completed, median number of days it takes to complete an application, and percentage of applications with no revisions.

**E. Describe why the level of service being proposed is the appropriate level:**

This level of service includes core staffing to retain expertise and meet timelines for the current mix of work, which involves more single-family remodels and reinvestment in older commercial properties. This generates review demand, but does not generate much revenue. In 2009, the DS organization was right-sized in response to reduced demand and a total of 19.5 positions were cut or not filled in review and inspection. As development recovers, additional positions will be needed to respond to the workload accompanied by increased revenue.

**Section 8: Provide Description of Supporting Revenue**

The $3.0 million (2011) of supporting revenue identified in Section 3 reflects review fees paid by our clients. Fees paid by an applicant for review and/or inspection services are considered a restricted funding source per RCW 82.02.020. In 2003 the City Council endorsed a set of financial management principles and cost recovery objectives established for Development Services. Those cost recovery objectives dictate that the cost of review services performed by Development Services staff (e.g. Building, Fire, Transportation, and Utilities) is recovered through fees. Land Use review services are 50% recovered through fees and 50% borne by the City. As a result, approximately $425,000 of supporting revenue reflects general tax collections for Land Use review services. Other revenue includes $72,000 of Surface Cut fees and $584,000 of Right-of-Way lease fees, which supports the cost of review related to franchise utility and development work.

**Section 9: Consequences of Not Funding the Proposal**

1. **Consequence of not funding the proposal at all**

1. Legal: An increased potential for lawsuits, project delays, inconsistent code application, and harm to existing residents and businesses. Exposure for not complying with State and Federal mandates, and a danger of unsafe development components being missed.

2. Customer Impact: Less guidance provided in meeting codes and standards on projects, delays in obtaining permits, and a greater potential for developments permanently impacting the environment and neighborhoods.

3. Investment/Costs already incurred: A major investment in staff training and experience and in permit software, including Amanda, MyBuildingPermit.com, IVR, and the internet site.

4. Other: Inability to qualify for state and federal grant funding for city projects due to failure to follow mandates, increased threat to public/private infrastructure leading to life-safety issues and unrepaired infrastructure damage, and no coordination between system users increasing traffic congestion and delay.

1. **Consequence of funding at a lower level**

Refer to the DS Review alternate level of service proposal. The consequences are delayed permits, increased costs, reduced customer service, and unsafe construction.