

DRAFT STREAMLINING INITIATIVE RESULTS

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
1	Bonds	Sign off on bonds takes too long	<p>Allow County Attorney to sign off on bond form rather than each bond. Requires amendment of 49-37(c)</p> <p><i>This occurs presently for standard forms but is a code clean-up item.</i></p>	Days to week	DPS staff concurs	90 days following introduction
2	Bonds	Sediment Control Permits - some would like contractor to be able to post bond		Commenter felt this would be a benefit for non-profit entities	Agency staff does not concur -owner may change contractors. Recommend not changing process.	NA
3	Bonds	Takes too long to get bond released at MNCPPC and DPS (forest conservation; swm/sc and ROW)	DPS and MNCPPC need to look at business processes to simplify and expedite eligible release	would save developers money in bond premiums and free up financial capacity	DPS and MNCPPC staff agree to look at process and staffing	3/31/2012 (MNCPPC modified Bond approval process resulting in elimination of 2+

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
						weeks of lag time)
4	Building Permit	Takes too long to get all sign offs - MNCPPC and DPS both perform reviews (MNCPPC looks at subdivision/preliminary and site plan; DPS looks at zoning issues)	Reduce reviews through elimination of P&P review of projects not involving subdivision, preliminary or site plan: e.g., sf residential permits/rebuilds on a recorded lot (n.b., for lots greater than 40000sf applicants are advised at sc that they need to submit to MNCPPC for forest conservation)	Days to week of review time will be saved; money savings for applicant; time savings form MNCPPC staff will be available for other permits	DPS and MNCPPC have consensus DPS to add a recorded lot review to its zoning review to ensure that permit is for a recorded lot	9/30/2012
5	Building Permit	Staffing is insufficient for timely plans review	MNCPPC has increased staff allocation by $\frac{1}{2}$ workyear DPS is filling vacancies for plans reviews and reviewing its staffing needs	Added cost to departments but for well-prepared plans will result in	DPS and MNCPPC concur	Ongoing
6	Building Permit	Establish timeline for permit review	Performance measures for review for MNCPPC,	Customer knows what to expect;	DPS and MNCPPC Concur	DPS and MNCPPC have developed

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
			Building Construction, and Land Development (DPS)	for properly prepared plans this will result in a several days reduction in review time (plans with deficiencies will take longer)	MNCPPC	attached metrics which are to be in effect by 12/31/2012
7	Building Permit	Sign off on Historic Area Work Permits - comes into DPS and then must be sent to HPC before HPC can process	Have HPC receive and process permit application and forward to DPS for building permit	1-2 weeks	DPS and MNCPPC staff concur	Details to be worked out by 12/31/2012
8	Building Permit	Quality of plan submittal is poor which results in multiple resubmissions lengthening the permit issuance time	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Periodically educate applicants on plan submittal 2) enable applicant to see reviewer's comments on line 3) Create and update list of most common design mistakes 	<p>Cost savings to applicant with need for fewer revisions</p> <p>Efficiencies for plans reviewers with fewer submissions to review</p>	<p>1 and 3) DPS provides periodic training and will create list of most common design/permit mistakes.</p> <p>2) DPS will create ability for comments</p>	<p>1) Currently occurs and plans submittal guide is on website. DPS is to develop video information capsules for broader outreach by 6/30/2013 ;</p> <p>2) by 6/30/2013</p>

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
				Time savings for applicant --Saves numerous trips to DPS office	to be accessed on-line	<p>3) list of most common design/permit mistakes - initial list will be posted on-line by Feb.1 and updated annually</p> <p>Park and Planning will do the same for its applications</p> <p>WSSC will as well</p>
9	Building Permit - Expedited/Green Tape Permits	MNCPPC and Land Development at DPS do not know when permit is expedited or green taped.	establish process so MNCPPC, WSSC and Land Development know when a permit is expedited or green taped (N.B. - MNCPPC and WSSC do not have a process for expedited/greetape building permit reviews but will try to be cognizant		DPS, MNCPPC and WSSC concur	Created a weekly report of expedited/green tape applications which is now provided weekly to Land Development, MNCPPC and WSSC

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
			of them)			
10	Pre-DRC ¹ , DRC ² and Site Plan	<p>1. Applicants feel that they do not get the input that they need at DRC.</p> <p>2. Not all agencies and utility companies participate and many come unprepared</p> <p>3. DRC representatives are not available to meet with applicants to resolve site design issues and which need to be resolved before</p>	<p>1. Several process changes will be implemented to improve Pre-DRC and DRC - (i) MNCPPC to include in package the checklist of what was submitted as part of application;</p> <p>(ii) Agencies must promptly check transmittal packages to notify MNCPPC of missing information before Pre-DRC</p> <p>(iii) Agency comments are to be submitted on the Friday before Pre-DRC</p> <p>a. MNCPPC must send</p>	<p>Positive but unable to quantify. Could save weeks to months of time.</p> <p>Earlier consultations with applicants will save months as will resolution at DRC</p> <p>Note that this requires resources for proper staffing</p>	<p>MNCPPC, DOT and DPS staffs concur;</p> <p>WSSC indicates it will come to Pre-DRC and DRC as a pilot program to determine if new process results in more effective resolution of plans but does not have sufficient resources for process as it currently occurs.</p>	<p>New processes will be put in place by December 1, 2012</p>

¹ This is the initial point at which agencies identify issues/conflicts.

² Traditionally, DRC is the point at which applicants receive agency comments.

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
		project gets to DRC.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> agency initial review comments to each agency on Monday b. Pre-DRC on Wednesday - Send applicants and agencies comments and notes of pre-DRC by Wednesday following Pre-DRC: Set DRC agenda at Pre-DRC and schedule more time for complicated projects c. Applicants should attend DRC prepared to discuss items in comments and notes of Pre-DRC; MNCPPC to provide Planning Board date for projects that are ready for PB review 			

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
			<p>2.MNCPPC to provide quarterly report on agency participation to participating agency Department Heads and CAO</p> <p>3. For issues not resolved at DRC, establish issue follow-up timelines and identify agency issue manager (following lead agency model) responsible for coordination of resolution with applicant and agency</p> <p>4. All agencies should participate through entire Pre-DRC and DRC and need wet and dry utilities at pre-DRC and DRC</p>			
11	Pre-DRC, DRC and Site Plan	DRC process doesn't result in timely	Same as #3 in preceding row.	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
		resolution of agency issues	<p>Conflict resolution process with agencies and utilities must be employed where necessary. Identification of agency lead at DRC and ownership of issue (proactive v. reactive).</p> <p>Following DRC and included with DRC minutes, MNCPPC to identify need for additional meetings for lead agencies to work out specific remaining issues</p>			
12	Pre-DRC, DRC and Site Plan	DRC process doesn't result in timely resolution of agency issues	Include applicants in agency meetings that are held between Pre-DRC and DRC to resolve conflicts.	None identified	Depends on issue. Agencies concur with meetings to resolve issues but cannot say that applicants are to be in every meeting. In some instances staffs are concerned about chilling effect	NA

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
					on discussion of resolutions and issues.	
13	Pre-DRC, DRC and Site Plan	Planning Board Hearing dates can't be scheduled because agency comments have not been received	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establish hearing dates at the end of DRC meeting, (see above for projects ready for PB review). 2. Allow cases to go to the Planning Board even if agency recommendations have not been received (currently not allowed by law). 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. None identified 2. This would not result in savings as projects may be approved at Planning Board but not be able to receive permits because of code issues 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. MNCPPC staff, DOT and DPS do not agree that hearing dates should be set at DRC other than for projects ready for PB review. Slots would be reserved for projects not ready for Board review at expense of projects that are ready. 2. MNCPPC staff has concerns about this approach. DPS and DOT do not 	NA

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
					concur that cases go to PB even if agency comments are not received	
14	Pre-DRC, DRC and Site Plan	Traffic Impact Studies are not distributed to DOT and SHA with other materials because P&P has not accepted study.	Traffic Studies based upon MNCPPC approved scope should be deemed completed for acceptance of application so that the 30 day review clock for other agencies begins with the DRC distribution. MNCPPC staff to determine completeness of application within 30 days of application submission	Could avoid weeks of discussions about transportation issues Will help avoid late appearing transportation concerns after other issues have been resolved	MNCPPC, DOT and DPS staff concur	Process to be in place by 12/31/2012
15	Pre-DRC, DRC and Site Plan	Guidelines and policies are treated like regulations or laws and applied in a manner that delays completion of reviews (but see row	All non-codified guidelines and policies need to be published Distinguish between policy and precedent	Clarity will result in an unquantified time savings;	MNCPPC and DOT staffs concur that guidelines and policies should be published but does not concur that as applied they	Most guidelines are published; Landscape and lighting guidelines are to be published by 6/30/13

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
		17)	Have more policy discussions with Board		are a problem	
16	Pre-DRC, DRC and Site Plan	Agency comments and other information related to reviews are not universally available to all.	<p>Improve use of technology to keep better records and meeting notes that can be easily accessed by all.</p> <p>Note -- ProjectDox will enable better access to agency comments; process described in row 10 will help to address this issue</p>	unquantified	MNCPPC, staff, DOT and DPS concur	ProjectDox is to begin 9/2012
17	Pre-DRC, DRC and Site Plan	Applicant requests to deviate from standards cause review delays that are too lengthy.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hold pre-submission meetings that include reviewers from agencies to work out possible solutions prior to submission. 2. Modify standards, if necessary, to address different development 	Following published guidelines, regulations and standards will help greatly to streamline process	1. Pre-submission meetings are difficult to staff— increased staffing will be needed to support Pre-DRC, DRC and post-DRC issue resolution;	NA

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
			situations (e.g. infill vs. non-infill)		<p>Applicants are encouraged to adhere to standards which will inherently result in savings of time and money</p> <p>2. MNCPPC staff, DOT and DPS concur</p>	
18	Pre-DRC, DRC and Site Plan	Not enough information is provided at pre-submission community meetings about issues that may arise or how residents can participate in the review process.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Community would like applicants to be more open about issues with a plan 2. Park and Planning should attend these meetings to give more information 	Unidentified, but could be benefit if community concerns are resolved upfront	MNCPPC staff have concerns because i) staff would be asked to comment upon a plan that is not yet before it; ii) there could be a misconception about Park and Planning position on plan, and iii) inadequate staffing to implement	NA

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
19	Pre-DRC, DRC and Site Plan	Board's resolutions take too long to be adopted and may contain mistakes that result in more time to allow revisions to be made.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Adopt resolutions on the same day that a case is decided by the Board. 2. Allow applicants to prepare or review draft resolutions before Board adoption to reduce the number of mistakes and need for subsequent revisions - 	Can save 1-2 months	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. MNCPPC has already implemented process changes so this is happening in the majority of cases. 2. IF PB concurs, draft resolutions can be posted on line one week before board action so everyone (applicant and public) sees the draft resolution 	If PB concurs, preposting of resolutions can be implemented by 12/31/2012
20	Pre-DRC, DRC and Site Plan	Projects require several levels of review and issues are often revisited at each review	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Limit issues reviewed at each level to those that are relevant to that 	expect several weeks savings	MNCPPC has revised processes to have a single reviewer for all plan types to minimize	Plans review templates to be adopted by 6/30/2013

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
			<p>plan type and don't revisit issues decided at prior points.</p> <p>2. MNCPPC to develop standard templates for the review of each plan type that clarify what needs to be decided at each stage</p>		<p>inconsistencies and new issues; DOT concurs for separate plan-type reviews</p> <p>MNCPPC staff concurs in the recommendation to develop standard templates</p>	
21	Pre-DRC, DRC and Site Plan	In practice Planning Board requires projects to comply with Master Plans which may be difficult or even undesirable if plans are older and out of date	<p>Clarify that requirement is that projects must substantially comply with master plans; and develop an interpretation that allows for finding of substantial compliance</p> <p>Make clear what the burden of proof for master plan compliance should be</p>	Could facilitate projects and eliminate lengthy processes	<p>Law already calls for substantial compliance. The solution is to update master plans which is a substantive law change</p> <p>Limited master plan amendments help but are still time consuming</p>	NA
22	Env't., SWM and SC	Totally impervious properties, such as	1. Need to better get the word out that	Would save weeks - month and	MNCPPC staff concurs	MNCPPC, with assistance from DPS,

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
		parking lots require the submission and approval of a NRI/FSD	<p>applicants can submit an "Existing Conditions Plan" --</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Applicants can have a pre-submission NRI meeting up front 3. MNCPPC staff to develop a fact sheet as to NRI/FSD requirements (post on MNCPPC and DPS websites) 	corresponding costs		<p>will develop a fact sheet and post by 12/31/2012</p> <p>Staff training to be developed and implemented by 12/31/12</p>
23	Env't., SWM and SC	Environmental Guidelines are not administered consistently	Additional training of staff	May be savings but they are not tangible	MNCPPC staff concurs	12/31/2012

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
24	Env't., SWM and SC	Environmental Guidelines don't work for urban areas	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create an urban area amendment to the Environmental Guidelines 2. provide staff training to ensure guidelines are followed without creating new requirements 3. Applicants can request pre-submission meetings prior to preparing an NRI/FSD to facilitate the review of submitted plans. 	Several weeks to months	<p>MNCPPC staff and DEP agree</p> <p>Option without regulatory action - have Planning Board acknowledge that there is flexibility in the existing environmental guidelines that should be exercised to address context sensitivities such as greenfields or suburban development vs. urban redevelopment</p>	<p>If regulatory action is required this will take 6-9 months following putting on the PB workplan</p> <p>If PB concurs, option without regulatory action can be done by 12/31/2012</p>
25	Env't., SWM and SC	ESD - lack of clarity as to what is acceptable and new products take too long	<p>State needs to publish guidelines and amend from time to time</p> <p>DPS to develop guidelines</p>	Several weeks to months	DPS concurs; DEP concurs	3/1/2013

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
			for proprietary approved ESD and other stormwater measures and post on DPS website			
26	Env't., SWM and SC	It is difficult to get SWM approval in the ROW	DPS will coordinate with DOT, DEP, WSSC and MNCPPC to develop guidelines for tentatively approved SWM methods for implementing Environmentally Sensitive Design under different scenarios (open vs closed section roads, urban/suburban/rural locations, etc.)		DPS, DEP, MNCPPC staff, WSSC staff and DOT concur	7/31/2013 NB - Guidelines should be reviewed annually and updated as appropriate to reflect newly approved ESD that can be applied to public ROWs (workgroup to stay in place for reviews)
27	Env't., SWM and SC	Minimize review of simple projects by combining stages 1 and 2 SWM reviews	Already permitted. DPS and MNCPPC to develop information to post on website	Approx. 90% of reviews are combined already so material savings are not expected.	NA	12/31/2012
28	Env't., SWM and SC	preliminary and final forest conservation	Minimize reviews by combining into one plan for	This could save weeks to months of	MNCPPC staff and DPS concur	Can be implemented 10/31/2012 to allow

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
		reviews are separate and final occurs late in the process adding time to reviews and approvals which results in delay in release of SC permits	review at DRC. This is only happening approx. 10% of time Education; website;	time		for public education and vetting
29	Env't., SWM and SC	SPAs are a continuing problem; ongoing post completion BMP monitoring interferes with permit closeout and is expensive	Create a fee-in-lieu of post-completion monitoring to pay for DEP to provide BMP monitoring (better consistency and eliminates oversight conflict)	Savings to developers by not having on-going monitoring and bonds; Will also save time by eliminating proposals and reviews between Developers and DEP over monitoring plan approval Permits can close-out;	DEP and DPS concur	Requires a law change and adoption of regulations. DEP to prepare draft by 3/1/2013

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
				<p>Better consistency and eliminates oversight conflict;</p> <p>Help fund DEP monitoring; saves DPS permit tracking and enforcement resources; frees up developer capital</p>		
30	Env't., SWM and SC	Need to look at SPA law - are individual plans still needed;	<p>Amend SPA law to correspond to current development requirements and standards</p> <p>SPA law should also include steps to eliminate processes that have been found to be of little value</p>		Premature to determine if there is agency consensus. Recommend DEP, in collaboration with DPS and MNCPPC, convene a stakeholders work group to review SPA law under context of new state and federal requirements and make more specific	7/31/2013 publish recommendation

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
					recommendations	
31	Env't., SWM and SC	Processing SWM as-builts takes too long and large bonds are kept open too long	New requirements will help, but DPS is willing to allow application for substitution of reduced bond at 50% completion provided that certifications that certain criteria are satisfied As-builts need to be of better quality - DPS will process within 3-4 weeks	Reduced carry costs, but there would be additional work on the part of DPS	DPS concurs; Procedure is on website but needs to be updated to reflect current devices	12/31/2012
32	Env't., SWM and SC	DEP is ultimately responsible for BMPs and developers have to carry risk of loss on completed BMPs and other facilities pending completion of entire project - can there be a mechanism for partial releases?	Change law to allow for early turn-over of BMPs and SWM facilities for completed phases of a multi-phase project	This would result in cost savings and avoided costs to developers	DPS and DEP do not have a position at this time. There would need to be greater understanding of at what point risk of loss would transfer and what remains to be done on a project that may create a risk that is greater than if the transfer is at	NA

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
					project completion	
33	Env't., SWM and SC	SWM inspections may result in delays in the field because they are too prescriptive	Hire field supervisor DPS will develop plan modifications policy to allow for minor changes in the field	This will avoid construction delays DPS staff efficiencies by not having to await plans for in-office plans reviews	DPS concurs	Draft policy to be completed by 12/31/2012 and will require MDE approval
34	Env't., SWM and SC	SWM facilities are not allowed in stream buffers	Develop a tool kit that shows the types of ESD that, under appropriate circumstances, can be allowed in stream buffers.	This will help reduce conflicts and could result in measurable time savings	DPS and MNCPPC staff think there are circumstances under which this is appropriate and can be done under existing environmental guidelines	DPS in collaboration with MNCPPC and DEP will develop draft toolkit by 12/31/2012 for review and final by 3/31/2013
35	Env't., SWM and SC	Documents to be recorded take too long	Delegate signature authority of standard development documents (covenants, easements and M&L agreements) running	2+ weeks	DPS concurs	Immediate if authorized by CAO

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
			to benefit of County to Director			
36	Record Plat	<p>Takes too long</p> <p>MNCPPC (reviews for compliance with Ch. 50 requirements/resolution and forest conservation):</p> <p>1st review - 6 weeks</p> <p>2nd - 2 weeks</p> <p>DPS (review for road code, well and septic, water and sewer)</p> <p>1st review - 8 weeks (at same time as MNCPPC -</p> <p>2nd review - 8 weeks</p> <p>Signature - 2 weeks</p>	<p>MNCPPC added an additional reviewer (1 $\frac{3}{4}$ WYs); DPS is reviewing staff assignments;</p> <p>performance metrics: -</p> <p>simple/well prepared (2 weeks from complete application for 1st review);</p> <p>complex (4 weeks from complete application to assemble comments for 1st review; n.b. where there is an issue could take longer)</p> <p>resubmission - 2 weeks</p> <p>simplify plats per comment below on common notes - this will save review time</p>	<p>Performance Metrics should reduce review times by approximately 1 - 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ months on average</p>	<p>DPS and Planning Staff concur in the metrics</p>	<p>10/31/2012</p>

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
38	Record Plat	Sign off on covenants and easements takes too long	Let DPS Director sign covenants and easements that burden private property and benefit county	2 + weeks		Immediate if authorized by CAO
39	Record Plat	Public Improvement Easement is recorded with every plat	Record one PIE and have plat refer to recorded easement and incorporate by reference (ex. Open space easement is recorded document that contains conditions and is referenced on plat)	Save 2-4 weeks of review/processing time Will add better consistency and plats will refer to LF of recorded PIE	DPS concurs	3/01/2013
40	Record Plat	General notes need updating; For multi-page plats don't want to repeat notes on each page;	Plat group to agree on notes by 12/1/2012 and implement changes by 12/31/2012 For multi-page plat develop cover sheet with general notes within six months from receipt of content recommendation from industry	Industry estimates that this will save approximately 30% of drafting time with a corresponding reduction in cost of plat preparation	MNCPPC staff and DPS conditionally concur with cover sheet for multipage plats - need to see what is proposed and know if this will be a problem for title companies or surveyors -	3/01/2013

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
			representatives			
41	Record Plat	Chapter 50 needs to be reviewed due to some "out of date" requirements	Review subdivision regs following zoning rewrite	undetermined	MNCPPC staff concurs that it needs to be done	NA
42	ROW permits	ROW permits expire before sediment control permits and SWM permits	Change from 18 months to 24 months to coincide with sediment control permit life	<p>* Avoided expense of applying for extension (10% of original fee)</p> <p>* savings of time and money by not having to extend for those projects that can be completed within the additional six months and makes the permits coterminous with the SWM/SC</p>	DPS has no objection and needs to coordinate with the Office of the County Attorney	12/31/2012

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
				Fewer extensions to process resulting in improved work management		
43	Special Exceptions	The resolutions on compatibility requirements are often reviewed and changed at subsequent stages in the development process. Site plan review sometimes changes previously made decisions	Consolidate and shift consideration of special exceptions at Planning Board level - increase the opportunity for residents to be heard at the Planning Board	<p>The number of hearings on the same site would be reduced and duplications eliminated</p> <p>Opportunity for public comment would be reduced.</p> <p>Change Planning Board hearings to quasi-judicial vs. informational and delay other matters currently handled by Planning Board.</p>	None	NA

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
				This would add to the Planning Board's work load because most special exceptions do not require site plan approval		
44	Special Exceptions	Same as above.	Standard answers to compatibility issues (i.e., buffer distance) in the Zoning Ordinance.		This is a substantive solution that is being looked at in the zoning rewrite	Scheduled to go to Council by end of 2012
45	Special Exceptions	Same as preceding	Increase the number of uses that require special exception but make special exceptions more efficient		This is a substantive issue that is contrary to the approach being looked at in the zoning rewrite	NA
46	Special Exceptions	Unlimited hearing times for rezoning. Irrelevant testimony is offered by parties because they are uncertain of the	Annual training clinic for attorneys and residents by the Hearing Examiner's Office Power point to be posted	Approx. 40 hours initial time investment to prepare Anticipate time	OZAH believes this is of limited value Website is being updated to clarify helpful filing	By June 30, 2013

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
		criteria for decision making.	on-line	savings offset during hearing process	instructions	
47	Special Exceptions	Time it takes from intake to the hearing Hearings are currently set not earlier than 4 ½ months from receipt to allow for PB position; but there is a class like accessory apts. that do not go to PB first	PB look for other uses that it does not need to review Pre-OZAH (such as small home occupations) PB staff to establish tracking system and performance metrics for its staff review and recommendations	Would save at least one month as posting and public hearing at PB session would be avoided	OZAH and PB staff concur	Seek Board approved list by 12/31/2012
48	Special Exceptions	Same as above	Mandatory Pre-filing meetings	Could have net time savings; already occurs in some cases Requires legislative act to require	BOA and OZAH concur	
49	Special Exceptions	Same as above	Require application notices to provide specific information on the proposal, location, required findings, relevant	Could be savings by helping to focus the hearings	OZAH believes this will not work and could be potentially misleading. Notices already contain	

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
			resources to the application (master plan and zoning), any prior or subsequent approvals that apply		extensive information see attached sample.	
50	Special Exceptions	Too many levels of review takes too long	Increase the number of proceedings that can be finally determined by the OZAH	Unquantified	OZAH concurs, Board of Appeals does not concur	
51	Special Exceptions	Residents don't know the process, are disorganized and out-gunned at hearings. By the time citizens show up, many decisions have already been made. The approval process is too complicated and it is unrealistic to expect resident to know the process	Reinstitute People's Counsel People's Counsel for more efficient case processing	Position costs \$200,000 While cases may proceed more efficiently, may be more cases and more appeals	BOA and OZAH supports; PB staff does not object	If there is a desire to fund this position would either need to be supplemental appropriation or in FY14 budget
52	Special Exceptions	extensive time delay to commencement of a	Develop a case management approach for	Minor/uncontested cases could	OZAH concurs	

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
		project	minor or uncontested and other types of special exception	proceed eliminating potentially months of delay; work has to be done anyway, but other work would take longer to accommodate preferential timing		
53	Special Exceptions	extensive time delay to commencement of a project	<p>Allow construction to proceed at owner's risk where BOA has approved special exception</p> <p>(consider allowing but acknowledge that Circuit Court has power to issue injunction)</p>	Eliminate months to year of delay for a BOA approval that has been appealed; could still provide process to request stay by court	Planning Staff concurs; BOA opposes	Requires a law change. With a sponsor could be done by 12/1/2012
54	Special Exceptions	different submission requirements for each zone (ex. Need, distance from other similar uses, etc.)	<p>Create standardized, uniform application for submissions</p> <p>This should be discussed at zoning rewrite</p>	Labor intensive to Identify and compare the submission requirements for all special exceptions, but could simplify	None	NA

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
				submission process and create more focused hearing		
55	Special Exceptions	best product is not the goal of the process	PB staff should be more involved in promoting communication and have an attitude of openness to resolve disagreements	Would reduce appeals	none	NA
56	Special Exceptions	Takes too long to get to a hearing	Impose review times for related agency review either legislatively or through MOU	Will speed up process provided that applicant has provided all necessary information	PB staff concurs; DPS concurs; DOT concurs	6/30/13
57	Special Exceptions	Inadequate enforcement of special exceptions	Add staff to conduct additional required inspections rather than rely on complaint based inspections and council approved priorities for <i>DPS's current 1, 2 and 3 year SE schedule (depending on the type of SE)</i>	Additional cost for up to 2 DPS staff and up to 3 DHCA staff would cost up to an approximately \$500,000 for staff plus cost of equipping with computers and	DPS and DHCA concur that additional staff would allow for more inspections ; DPS and DHCA will review staffing needs.	90 days after FY14 commencement if approved in budget

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
				vehicles		
58	Transportation & Utilities	Many conflicting law and industry practices (and newly adopted master plans) have resulted in a large number of exceptions to road design standards (many of which are the same or similar) which take a long time to process	DOT, DPS, MNCPPC, DEP and WSSC to review commonly approved exceptions to incorporate as standards, policies and procedures for what can be approved within the public right-of-way (see also rows 25 and 26)	could save months	DOT, DPS, MNCPPC staff concur; WSSC is open to discuss	September, 2013
59	Transportation & Utilities	Limited staffing at MNCPPC and MCDOT to efficiently process applications/projects	DOT -- Fund 2 unfunded positions MNCPPC -- Fund 2 unfunded positions	\$200,000 for MCDOT/DTEO (fee based and would cover costs) \$200,000 for MNCPPC Would enable more efficient and effective problem resolution and allow for pre-meet	DOT and MNCPPC staff concur	6-12 months post funding

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
				to eliminate problems post-filing		
60	Transportation & Utilities	Uncertainty because Context Sensitive Road Design Standards have not been fully published	DOT to publish engineering drawings of Context Sensitive road cross sections	Weeks - months Design cost savings		DOT published August, 2012
61	Transportation & Utilities	Need to address outstanding "parking lot" issues from the original effort ³	Hire a consultant, convene a new workgroup of stakeholder engineers to prioritize issues, and develop typical solutions	Will cost approximately \$750,000 but there will be cost savings for development community but unable to quantify	yes	24 months after necessary funding secured and consultant hired
62	Transportation & Utilities	Time it takes to negotiate, finalize, manage and enforce traffic mitigation agreements	Parties to discuss alternative solutions	If solution identified, months of negotiations		Will be addressed in final report

³ A copy of the list is attached. Please note that some of the items on this list are also addressed as streamlining items elsewhere in this interim report.

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
63	Transportation & Utilities	Development plans get hung up due to unanticipated staging impacts and lack of detail in master plan	<p>Master plans need enough detail to know what ROW is needed and enough study to know what can be implemented</p> <p>For example, include horizontal and vertical alignment and interchange foot print studies at the time staff drafts of master plans are prepared</p>	<p>Months of review, discussion and redesign can be saved</p> <p>This would require additional staff or consulting services</p>	DOT, DPS and MNCPPC staff	NA
64	Transportation & Utilities	Redundancy between M-NCPPC and MCDOT transportation reviews produces conflicting comments	MCDOT, MCDPS, M-NCPPC, & ROCOCO to convene a workgroup to revisit the Lead Agency tables and clarify each agency's role in transportation-related reviews	Positive but not able to quantify.	DOT, DPS and MNCPPC staff	3/1/2013
65	Transportation & Utilities	Need for urban guidelines/standard practices to fit utilities and other amenities within constrained	Hire a consultant to convene an inter-agency workgroup - with utilities and development community members - to	Estimated consultant cost \$200,000 for MCDOT/DTE;	DOT, DPS, MNCPPC staff and WSSC staff concur	12 -- 24 months after the necessary funding has been secured and consultant services

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
		rights-of-way	identify best practices for policies & procedures; develop sustainable solutions, and quantify costs.	Estimated time savings in entitlement process - months of time with corresponding staff efficiencies		have been procured
66	Transportation & Utilities	Disconnect between master plans and developers desire to make public roads private roads - WSSC needs same right to put utilities in ROW as if public	Easement to be required with any private ROW Do not allow substitution of master planned public roads with private roads allowing for public access (other than internal subdivision road). Can, in limited circumstances allow for private maintenance and liability for some roads per a uniform agreement	Months of negotiation would be eliminated; recent trend creating disconnects for WSSC under state law will be avoided	All agency staff concur	
67	WSSC	Developer cannot release more than 50% of project for	Allow up to 75% partial releases	Will have some positive impact to the tax base	WSSC will allow as a pilot program and will evaluate workload	WSSC has begun a pilot. If change is made permanent it

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
		settlement until fully designed water and sewer for the entire project is completed, even though service may be in place for more than 50% of the overall project.	This will require a change to WSSC Development Services Group processes	Will save developers some carrying costs	impacts for funding requests during	will be addressed in the FY2015 budget cycle.

DRAFT