



KITSAP COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

614 DIVISION STREET MS-36, PORT ORCHARD WASHINGTON 98366-4682
(360) 337-7181 FAX (360) 337-4925 HOME PAGE - www.kitsapgov.com/dcd/

Larry Keeton, Director

February 2, 2009

TO: Board of Commissioners
County Administrator

FM: Director, Community Development

RE: Department of Community Development 2008 Annual Report

In April, 2008, the Department submitted to the Board of Commissioners an annual report of its 2007 performance. In that report, accomplishments and performance measures were highlighted. Over the course of 2008, additional performance measures were development to increase the department's accountability to the citizens, the Board, stakeholders, and to itself. Therefore, what follows is the 2008 Annual Report.

Purpose: Provide Citizens, the Board of County Commissioners, Stakeholders and Interested Parties an annual report on the activities of Kitsap County's Department of Community Development for the year 2008.

Department's Mission: Enable the development of quality, affordable, structurally safe, and environmentally sound communities.

2008 Major Accomplishments:

- Significant reduction in processing times of permits: building, fire marshal, land use, environment, and development engineering.
- Implemented Subject to Field Inspection, a program designed to issue over the counter permits, i.e. decks, fences, and relies on field inspectors to ensure the project is compliant with appropriate code.
- Creating and implementing fee policies governing fee setting, collection, and uses.
- Implementation of the Department's Advisory Council that advises on business practices and operational issues.
- Revision of Title 17 Use Tables (Commercial and Industrial) within 120 days, designed to meet comprehensive plan goals and policies and reduce the processing time for permit/land use applications.
- Revised the Shoreline Master Plan in 120 days that allows the Seabeck Marina project move forward.
- Constructed Phase I of the Chico Creek restoration project after it languished for several years.
- Implementation of post card notification resulting in more efficient use of staff time and reducing associated mailing costs.
- Completed 2008 Commissioner's planning docket that included successful adoption of the Illahee Community Plan, updated Silverdale Design Standards, updated Kingston Sub-area Plan, and update of Capital Facilities Plan as a part of the County's Comprehensive Plan.

- Completed the Buildable Lands Report which shows increased development occurring in incorporated/urban growth areas versus rural areas which reverses the previous trend. This reversal is consistent with the Growth Management Act and the County Comprehensive Plan.
- Maintained a reasonable level of service despite a staff reduction of 23%.
- Moved to Kitsap One Call Center concept; reduced administrative staff time answering the phones, thereby increasing their productivity and established a tracking mechanism to ensure responses to citizen/client issues are being addressed in a timely manner.

Permit/Land Use Application Statistics

Submitted to Approved/Issue Ratio

The following table shows the ratio between the numbers of permits submitted during a calendar year compared to the number of permits approved/issued during the same calendar year. The Department's objective is to achieve a minimum of 85% ratio between submitted to issue within a given year. Approved permits are those that have finished department processing and ready for pick up by the application, while issued are those permits in the client's possession.

Submitted to Issued Ratio	2006	2007	2008
Permit Division			
Building	86%	91%	96%
Fire Marshal	90%	93%	104%
Engineering	85%	90%	86%
Environmental Review	62%	60%	55%
Land Use	42%	42%	57%
Total Permits Submitted	4858	4772	3794
Total Permits Issued	4017	4151	3205
Total Submitted to Issued Ratio	83%	87%	89%

Permit/Land Use Application Meeting Objective Processing Times

The Department has identified eight permit types to track performance: automatic fire extinguisher systems, fire alarm and detection systems, commercial tenant improvements, conditional use permits requiring hearing examiner approval, single family residences with garage, preliminary plat approvals, site development activity permit – commercial, and site development activity permit – residence. Appendix A is a detailed breakdown of these permit types identifying the number issued, the average processing days as compared to their objective processing times, and the percentage of permits that met the processing times. The table below demonstrates that progress has been made over 2007.

Permit Type	Objective Processing Time	2006	2007	2008
Auto Fire Extinguish System	10/30 Days	0%/39%	19%/84%	49%/97%
Fire Alarm & Detect System	10/30 Days	10%/59%	13%/54%	70%/96%
Comm Tenant Improvement	30 Days	64%	62%	79%
Conditional Use Permit	106 Days	0%	0%	8%
Single Family Residence	14/20 Days	30%/57%	45%/69%	49%/77%
Preliminary Plats	106 Days	0%	24%	0%
Site Development Activity Permit – Commercial	106 Days	11%	0%	5%
Site Development Activity Permit SFR	106 Days	23%	14%	44%

Submitted to Notice of Decision/Approval Processing Time

The Department began tracking land use, environmental, and engineering applications based on submitted to notice of decision/approval. This analysis shows the average amount of time it took for an application submitted in a given year to receive either a hearing examiner decision or departmental approval. The time reflects the total time the application took, meaning that it includes the time within the Department and the time that the application was returned to the applicant for corrections, submitting additional information, etc. Appendix A gives a detailed breakdown of these application types. The table below is a sample of key applications and their processing times.

Application Type	Objective Processing Time	2006	2007	2008
Administrative Conditional Use Permit	78 Days	453	271	135
Conditional Use Permit	106 Days	251	234	173
Preliminary Plat	106 Days	489	356	145
Commercial Shoreline Substantial Develop Permit	106 Days	177	205	93
Residential Shoreline Substantial Development Permit	106 Days	263	334	236
Critical Area Buffer Reduction	106 Days	144	159	101
Site Development Activity Permit – Commercial	106 Days	281	292	119
Site Development Activity Permit – Grading	106 Days	173	179	64
Site Development Activity Permit – Land Use Subdivision	106 Days	421	333	197

Inspections

Critical to the Department’s mission is the role of building/site inspections. These are the actual eyes-on individuals who ensure that the building and site plans are actually constructed per the approved plans and the building/fire and site development codes. As the table shows, 21,247 inspections were conducted in 2008, for a daily average of 85.67. This is down from previous years due to the loss of three inspectors in September as a result of budget shortfalls. However, new procedures were implemented to maintain a reasonable level of service to the construction industry. Significantly, there was a 50% reduction in rollovers, an inspection scheduled but not conducted until the next available business day.

Inspection Activity	2006	2007	2008
Number of Building Inspections Conducted	25,059	24,913	21,247
Average Number of Daily Inspections	101.04	100.46	85.67
Daily Roll Over Average	Not Measured	8	4

Code Compliance

In 2008, the focus of code compliance shifted from “enforcement” to obtaining citizen compliance. Staff training was conducted to teach them how to deal with “hostile” situations in a manner such that people realized the Department was not out to punish them, but rather, wanted them to come into compliance with code.

As the following table demonstrates, new cases are declining. However, closure remains the same from the previous year due to the loss of one employee and not refilling the position.

	2006	2007	2008
New Cases	1454	1247	985
% Cases Close within 1 year	57%	68%	68%
Average Days to Close a Case	27	19	20

Department Budget

The Department in its first year as a Special Revenue Fund faced significant financial challenges due to the economic conditions. Overall, permit/land use application activity dropped by 21% in 2008, with the Department’s major source of fee income, single family residences, declining 43%. As a result of revenue shortfalls, a reduction in force of 14 positions was conducted in September, 2009. An additional 10 positions that saw turn over were left unfilled at the end of the year. Thus, the organization started with 87 full time equivalents (FTE) and by the end of the year this number had dropped to 63 FTEs.

Revenues: \$7,515,590
 Expenditures: \$8,458,838
 Shortfall: \$943,248

The revenue shortfall was covered by using the \$798,525 fund balance established at the beginning of 2008 and a loan of \$144,723 from the General Fund.

Director’s Assessment

Staff has been aggressive in continuing to improve processing times, efficiency, and accountability, as the above tables describe. Given this momentum, the department will continue its efforts such that the department is viewed as a facilitator rather than an impediment to development that is consistent with the Board’s directions and County codes.

Critical to process improvement is reducing the number of applications that require land use approval in order to meet the Comprehensive Plan’s goals and policies. For example, neighborhood village commercial zone describes a place where retail shops and commercial services serve a local community, i.e. barber shops, beauty saloons, and small retail drug stores. After reviewing workload data and hearing examiner decisions, it was discovered that the process was not necessarily adding value to the effort. Therefore, the code changes adopted by the Board in December, 2008 reflect an attitude and policy direction regarding reasonable regulation that is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan’s Goals and Policies. Significantly, the entire revision process took 120 days versus the traditional methodology of 12 to 24 months.

As the statistics indicate, processing times are decreasing, but much still remains to be done. Land use and environmental permits submitted to approved/issue ratios will bear closer scrutiny in 2009. While complexity of projects, use of critical areas in development, and stringent storm water requirements are ready-made answers to justify performance. However, the Department is committed to examining these areas in detail to determine what’s causing the ration to be 30-40 points below objective.

Staff ownership of process improvement was demonstrated in numerous instances in over the past year. One staff member suggested, and it was quickly adopted, to stop making and mailing paper copies of

Hearing Examiner decisions, a long standing practice. These decisions are sent electronically to various individuals, other the applicants, who want to be notified. As a result, we've been able to improve staff productivity in more critical areas.

The Department implemented post-card noticing to replace the traditional method consisting of reproducing a great deal of paper, mailing it out to individuals, who may or may not have read it. Now, the notification points people to the Department's website where they can peruse the material at a fraction of the cost to the public coffers. In the last quarter of 2008, the program saved the citizens over \$7,000 in operational costs.

Department morale continues to remain relatively high, though concerns regarding employment status plague everyone. Despite these concerns, staff continues strive to find new and better methods to improve service delivery. The building inspectors developed and implemented a program that saw minimal slippage in the inspection program after losing 3 of their peers. This equates to a lost of 43% of their workforce, yet, they've managed to maintain an inspection schedule that is within 48 hours of request.

Finally, the Department recognizes its role as being citizens in the county. During 2008, staff were involved in shoreline cleanup efforts conducted one Saturday in April; contributing to the United Way; donating to the Food Bank, as well as sponsoring several families during the holiday season.

Appendix A: Performance Measures

Performance Measures - As of 12/31/2008

2008 Data is from January 1 - December 31, 2008

Submitted to Approved/Issued Ratio	2006	2007	2008
Permit Division			
Building	86%	91%	96%
Fire Marshal	90%	93%	104%
Engineering	85%	90%	86%
Environmental Review	62%	60%	55%
Land Use	42%	42%	57%
Total Permits Submitted	4858	4772	3794
Total Permits Issued	4017	4151	3205
Total Submitted to Issued Ratio	83%	87%	84%

Note: 148 permits were approved but not picked up in 2008

Permit Type	Automatic Fire Extinguishing System		
Objective Processing Time	10/30 Days		
Year	2006	2007	2008
Issued	47	43	49
Average Processing Time-Days	38.8	17.7	13.1
% Met Objective Target	0%/39%	19%/84%	49%/97%

Permit Type	Fire Alarm and Detection System		
Objective Processing Time	10/30 Days		
Year	2006	2007	2008
Issued	60	52	64
Average Processing Time-Days	34	54	9
% Met Objective Target	10%/59%	13%/54%	70%/96%

Permit Type	Commercial Tenant Improvements		
Objective Processing Time	30 Days		
Year/Quarter	2006	2007	2008
Issued	74	104	129
Average Processing Time-Days	27.5	33.1	25
% Met Objective Target	64%	62%	79%

Permit Type	Conditional Use Permits (Hearing Examiner)		
Objective Processing Time	106 Days		
Year/Quarter	2006	2007	2008
Issued	8	13	13
Average Processing Time-Days	Insuff Data	329.6	315
% Met Objective Target	0%	0%	8%

Permit Type	Single Family Residence with Garage		
Objective Processing Time	14/30 Days		
Year/Quarter	2006	2007	2008
Issued	601	677	401
Average Processing Time-Days	38.2	35.4	25.5
% Met Objective Target	30%/57%	45%/69%	49%/77%

Permit Type	Preliminary Plats		
Objective Processing Time	106 Days		
Year/Quarter	2006	2007	2008
Issued	6	17	9
Average Processing Time-Days	Insuff Data	443.8	502
% Met Objective Target	0%	24%	0%

Permit Type	Site Development Activity Permit - Commercial		
	106 Days		
Objective Processing Time	2006	2007	2008
Year/Quarter	2006	2007	2008
Issued	19	14	17
Average Processing Time-Days	221.3	190.3	283
% Met Objective Target	11%	0%	5%

Permit Type	Site Development Activity Permit Single Family Residence		
	106 Days		
Objective Processing Time	2006	2007	2008
Year/Quarter	2006	2007	2008
Issued	47	56	36
Average Processing Time-Days	93.2	186.8	151.2
% Met Objective Target	23%	13%	44%

Inspection Activity

Number of Conducted Building Inspections	25,059	24,913	21,247	
Average Daily Inspections	101.04	100.46	85.67	Loss 3 Inspectors in September
Daily Roll Over average	Not Measured	8	4	

Land Use Review Times (Submitted to Notice of Decision)

Permit Type	Processing Time Objective	2006 (# Submitted)	2007	2008	% Change from 2007 to 2008
Administrative Conditional Use Permit	78 Days	453	271	135	50%
Condition Use Permit	106 Days	251	234	173	26%
Zoning Variance (HE Variance)	106 Days	144	246	207	16%
Home Business	78 Days	173	165	128	22%
Large Lot Plat	106 Days	364	280	159	43%
Short Plat	106 Days	341	232	163	30%
Preliminary Plat	106 Days	489	356	145	59%
Performance Based Development	106 Days		246	193	22%
				Average % Change	34%

Notes:

- 1 - Data is total time from submittal to notice of decision; clock stop (time in applicant's hands) not subtracted.
- 2 - Title 17 "Use Table" processes and permit types changed in Dec 2006 with adoption of Comprehensive Plan.
- 3 - HE Variances (HE) have been filtered to exclude Critical Area Variances (CVAR).

Environmental Review Times (Submitted to Notice of Decision)

Permit Type	Processing Time			2008	% Change from 2007 to 2008
	Objective	2006	2007		
Commercial Shoreline Substantial Development Permit	106 Days	177	205	93	55%
Residential Shoreline Substantial Development Permit	106 Days	263	334	236	29%
Critical Area Buffer Reduction	106 Days	144	159	101	36%
Hearing Examiner Variance	106 Days	184	214	140	35%
Director's Variance	106 Days	368	133	None Submitted	
Shoreline Conditional Permit	106 Days	370	218	92	58%
Forest Practice Application Conversion	106 Days	94	82	53	35%
Forest Practice Application Conversion - Open Harvest Plan	106 Days	77	76	None Submitted	
				Average % Change	41%

Notes:

- 1 - Data is total time from submittal to notice of decision; clock stop (time in applicant's hands) not subtracted.
- 2 - HE Variances (HE) have been filtered to exclude Zoning Variances.

Development Engineering Review Times (Submitted to Notice of Approval)

Permit Type	Processing Time			2008	% Change from 2007 to 2008
	Objective	2006	2007		
Site Development Activity Permit - Commercial	106 Days	281	292	119	59%
Site Development Activity Permit - Grading	78 Days	173	179	64	64%
Site Development Activity Permit - Land Use Subdivision	106 Days	421	333	197	41%
Site Development Activity Permit - Right of Way Use/Improvement	106 Days	265	291	112	62%
Site Development Activity Permit - Single Family Residence	106 Days	207	202	95	53%
				Average % Change	56%

Notes:

- 1 - Data is total time from submittal to notice of decision; clock stop (time in applicant's hands) not subtracted.