

CBPA Public Meeting, March 3, 2010										Pg 1 of 2
Incllosure to e-mail from Bill Baker to the Planning Commission										
Representing the Ag Summit Working Group										
Rebutttal to Staff Comments to the Planning Commission on February 24, 2010										
<u>AG Summit Working Group Impact Analysis 1/28/10</u>										<u>Staff' Response 2/24/10</u>
a.	Permit fee:	\$766.22								\$721.22
b.	Topo survey and drawing	\$1,400.00								N/A
c.	Land disturber	\$650.00								\$115.00
d.	engineering - 3 sheets for permit pkg	\$1,800.00	See STPR 2009-0052 sheets C-5,6&7 for typical content							\$50.00 (1)
e.	Bond Fee - base fee	\$4,149.14								\$3,000.00 (2)
f.	Bond fee contingency & inflation	\$995.79								incl.above
g.	bond release fee	\$414.91								\$300.00 (2)
h.	Construction entrance	\$4,540.00	Source: average of bids for 4 projects built in 2009							N/A
	TOTAL COST:	\$14,716.06								\$4,186.22
	Less bond return:	\$4,149.14								\$3,000.00
	Net cost for Grading Permit:	\$10,566.92	None of these cost would be incurred under current regs.							\$1,186.22
<p>(1) A topo survey and drawing is only required for disturbances within 300-feet of of the RPA or where staff determines the potential for RPA features to be present. The estimated cost for an RPA delineation/engineered plan is \$2,500.00.</p> <p>(2) Proposed amendments to chapter 1220 allow the bond fee to be waived at the discretion of the director of Building and Development for land disturbances less than 5,000sf (would remove the \$3000.00 bond and the \$300.00 bond release fee).</p>										
<u>AG Summit Working Group Response 03/03/10</u>										
a.	The permit fee was reduced by reducing the LF of silt fence assuming it would only be required on one side of the site. Staff has altered the assumption of a representative project with 6,200 SF disturbed. Had we wanted to skew the results we would have used a 9,900 SF disturbed area. Further, our ag structures are sited for water to run away from the buildings on all 4 sides and roads are placed on the high ground wherever possible, hence the use of silt fence on all sides was a reasonable assumption. The reduction is not valid.									
b.	The "Checklist" (pg 13) in the grading permit package requires "existing contours of the site" and "final contours" of the site. This cannot be provided without a site survey. Extracting data from the County mapping system and developing a drawing is not a skill we possess even if a computer and connection was available. The reduction is not valid.									
c.	Staff has reduced the land disturber fee by assuming the farmer will obtain a "Land Disturber" license which costs \$115.00. This is done by the farmer getting on line, downloading the study materials, studying the contents of 143 pages and then taking the test, only available on line. These assumptions are not valid in the Ag community we know and the reduction is rejected.									

