

Office of Legislative Oversight Report 2014-10

REVIEW AND APPROVAL TIMES FOR PRELIMINARY PLANS, SITE PLANS, AND RECORD PLATS

APPENDICES

Document	Begins on:
Montgomery County Planning Department, <i>Record Plat Application</i>	©1
Montgomery County Planning Department, <i>Record Plat Submission Requirements</i>	©6
Montgomery County Department of Environmental Protection, <i>Record Plat Information Form</i>	©13
Montgomery County Department of Permitting Services, <i>Subdivision Record Plat Application</i>	©15
Montgomery County Department of Permitting Services, <i>Record Plat Review Checklist</i>	©16
City of Raleigh, <i>Plan Review Performance Report, 7/1/2013-9/30/2013</i>	©20
Clark County Building Department, <i>Plan Review Timeliness Report, April 2014</i>	©25
Updated Streamlining Initiative Results Table, July 23, 2014	©26



Montgomery County Planning Department
Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission

Effective: June 1, 2012

8787 Georgia Avenue
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910-3760

www.montgomeryplanning.org

Phone 301-495-4550
Fax 301-495-1306

RECORD PLAT APPLICATION

Minor Subdivision

Multiple Plat Applications

M-NCPPC Staff Use Only

File Number	2 _____	Fee (attach worksheet)	_____
Date Application Received	_____	Fee Received by	_____
		Application Completed by	_____

An application will not be accepted for review unless all required information and fees are provided.

Record Plat Name: _____ **Acres:** _____ (Acres=square feet/43,560)

Location: (Complete either A or B)

A. On _____, _____ feet _____ of _____
Street Name (N,S,E,W etc.) Nearest Intersecting Street

B. _____ quadrant, intersection of _____ and _____
(N,S,E,W etc.) Street Name Street Name

C. If Minor Subdivision box is checked, enter tax account number (8 digits): (a) _____ (b) _____

Applicant Information:

Applicant (Owner, Owner's Representative, or Contract Purchaser – check applicable; written verification required if not the owner.)

Name Contact Person

Street Address

City State Zip Code

Telephone Number ext. Fax Number E-mail

Surveyor/Engineer

Name Contact Person

Street Address

City State Zip Code

Telephone Number ext. Fax Number E-mail

Pre-Preliminary, Preliminary and Site Plan Information:

Pre-Preliminary Plan File Number 7 _____

Preliminary Plan File Number 1 _____

Site Plan File Number 8 _____

Plat Information:

Existing Zoning: _____, _____, _____, _____

Area of Dedication _____ Square Feet (SF=Acreage x 43,560) Plat is for ROW Dedication Only.
 Plat is for Reservation of Public Land Only.

Development Type	Number of Lots or Parcels	Number of DUs	Square Footage	MPDUs	TDRs	BLTs
RESIDENTIAL						
NON-RESIDENTIAL						

Attach Separate Sheet with TDR and BLT serial numbers (example 10-6222)

No. of non-development Parcels (e.g. open space) shown on plat _____ No. of Outlots shown on plat _____

Are there any legal restrictions (i.e. covenants or easements) other than shown on plat? Yes No

(If yes, describe in a separate document and submit)

Is this Application being filed under the Minor Subdivision Process (see Section 5)? Yes No

If yes, identify the sub-section of Sec. 50-35A that applies to your Minor Subdivision application. Sec 50-35A(a) [_____]

Sanitary Facilities Information:

Public Water Public Sewer Well Septic Date of Septic Approval ____/____/____

Signature of Applicant (Owner or Contract Purchaser)

Applicant hereby certifies that he/she is the sole owner of the subject property, is otherwise legally authorized to represent the owner(s) (written verification provided), or is a contract purchaser authorized to submit this application by the property owner (written verification provided).

Signature

Date

Name (Type or Print)

Checklist

See Submission Requirements for more details about the items below:

1. General Information

- 1.1 Completed application form and checklist.....
- 1.2 Completed fee schedule and worksheet with fee.....

2. Subdivision

- 2.1 Copy of approved and signed Pre-Preliminary or Preliminary Plan and the Resolution.....
- 2.2 Copy of approved and signed Site Plan and the Site Plan Resolution (if required).....
- 2.3 Copy of approved Forest Conservation Plan or approved FCP Exemption
- 2.4 Identification of all Agreement and Easement documents that must be approved and recorded with the Record Plat.....

3. TDR/BLT Requirements (submit prior to recordation)

- 3.1 Copy of TDR/BLT Easements.....
- 3.2 Copy of TDR/BLT Transfer.....

4. Child Lot Affidavit

5. Minor Subdivision

- 5.1 Previously approved record Plat.....
- 5.2 Approved sketch plan or approved Pre-Application Plan, if required.....
- 5.3 Approved Forest Conservation Plan, Approved Forest Conservation Exemption, or an approved Natural Resources Inventory/Forest Stand Delineation plus a Preliminary Forest Conservation Plan, if required (see section 5.3 for further information)
- 5.4 Agreements, covenants, easement documents, or other restrictions.....
- 5.5 Appropriate Deed of Transfer, Abandonment Resolution, or Other Necessary Documents (see section 5.5 for further information)
- 5.6 MCDEP record plat information form.....

6. Record Plat (folded prints)

- 6.1 Title Block.....
- 6.2 Subdivision Plan Drawing.....
- 6.3 Surveyor/Engineer Certificate.....
- 6.4 Owner(s) Certificate.....
- 6.5 Approval Box.....

7. List of Proposed Street Names

- 7.1 This list and the information specified in 8 below may also be submitted for approval before the record plat application to DARC at mcp-addresses@montgomeryplanning.org. If street names have been previously approved, submit the list of approved names with the plat.

8. Information in Digital Form for an Address Plan

- 8.1 CAD file of the approved subdivision in format specified in submission requirements.
- 8.2 EXCEL spreadsheet of properties to have assigned addresses

No. Copies	Engineer/ Surveyor	M-NCPPC Staff
	Submitted or Waived By	Accepted or Not Accepted
1		
1		
1		
1		
1		
1		
1		
1		
1		
1		
1		
2		
1		
1		
1		
1		
1		
10		
2		
1		
1		

Please note that the record plat in digital form and the mylar original of the plat should not be submitted with the application. These items should be submitted after completion of staff review.

Signature of Surveyor /Engineer

The surveyor or engineer or has read and understands the record plat submission requirements and hereby certifies that all required information for the submission of a record plat has been included in this application

Signature

Date

Name (Type or Print)



MONTGOMERY COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT
THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

I do hereby certify, to the best of my knowledge, information, and reasonable belief, that all of the information and data provided with this application is accurate, and all of the features and elements provided on the plans is consistent with the standards of the applicable zone. The certification includes, but is not limited to boundary information, property information and ownership, topography, historic resources, etc. I agree that the submitted plans may be rejected or returned by the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission if the plans are found to be inaccurate, false or misleading.

Applicant or Applicant's Representative Date

Print Name: _____

Print Company: _____

Print Title: _____

Plan Name: _____

Plan Number: _____



RECORD PLAT SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

1 of 7

The Subdivision Regulations require that within thirty-seven (37) months of the Planning Board's approval of a preliminary plan of subdivision, a record plat must be recorded. The following provides a description of the information that must be submitted to have a complete record plat application. A checklist has also been prepared that must be filled out by the applicant's surveyor /engineer, who must sign the checklist certifying that the application and checklist are complete and ready for processing. The checklist must be submitted with the application form. **Only complete applications will be accepted for review.**

For properties that will be recorded by multiple plats, a separate application form will be required for each plat. Copies of a master application are acceptable provided that the appropriate information for each plat is supplied (i.e. number of lots, units, and area of each plat). One check for the total fee for a multiple plat submission is acceptable.

Prior to submitting the record plat application, the applicant must contact the Development Applications and Regulatory Coordination Division (DARC) for approval of the proposed subdivision name, lot and block designation and street name assignment.

The record plat may be submitted using mylar; however, black ink or an ink applied process must be used. Any other process, including photography, photochemical, emulsified mylar, sepia, typewriter-applied ink, paste-ons, etc., will not be accepted. Also, **a digital submittal of the record plat is required** (see section 10).

The Planning Board will not accept plats for consideration until the Planning Board takes final action on the preliminary plan application and site plan application, if a site plan is required. In addition, a copy of the preliminary plan containing the Planning Board's conditions of approval and the Planning Board's resolution on the preliminary plan must be submitted with the record plat application. A copy of the approved site plan and site plan resolution must be submitted for properties subject to site plan approval.

Any material or information submitted to the M-NCPPC, DARC Division, as part of a record plat application, must be accompanied by a transmittal memorandum or cover sheet that identifies what is being submitted and why. **If the material relates to a plan that has already been submitted, the memo or cover sheet must refer to the M-NCPPC file number.**

Please note: There are additional submittal requirements that need to be made directly to DEP and DPS. After receiving a M-NCPPC file number, contact DEP and DPS about these requirements (refer to the Montgomery County Record Plat Approval Process chart).

1. REQUIRED GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1 Complete Application Form

The application must be submitted with all required information provided on the form. The owner or owner's legal agent, and the engineer/surveyor who prepared the plat must sign the application.

1.2 Complete fee schedule and worksheet

The applicant is required to calculate the fee using the Fee Schedule on the worksheet. Submit the fee payment and worksheet with the application.

2. REGULAR SUBDIVISION

2.1 Copy of Approved and Signed Preliminary Plan and the Preliminary Plan Resolution

A copy of the **approved** preliminary plan of subdivision must be submitted with the record plat application. The plan must contain the signature of the M-NCPPC Subdivision Master Planner/Supervisor or his/her designee. A copy of the Planning Board's resolution for the preliminary plan must also be provided with the application.

2.2 Copy of Approved Site Plan and the Site Plan Resolution

If a Division 59-D-3 site plan is required for the property, a copy of the **Certified Site Plan** and the Planning Board's site plan resolution must be submitted with the record plat application. If the Planning Board resolution has not been released, then a plat application will be accepted with prior approval of the Subdivision Supervisor.

2.3 Copy of the Approved Forest Conservation Plan or FCP Exemption Letter

In accordance with State and County law, a copy of the approved forest conservation plan must be submitted with a record plat application where required. If the application is exempt from forest conservation, an approved forest conservation exemption letter must be submitted with the record plat application.

2.4 Identification of All Agreements and Easement Documents that must be Approved and Recorded with the Record Plat

The applicant must identify the agreements and easement documents that are required based on the Planning Board conditions of approval associated with the approved preliminary plan.

Most Planning Board actions on record plats result in an approval subject to the conditions applicable to the approved preliminary plan of subdivision. Those conditions may include adequate public facilities agreements to be entered into with the Planning Board, open space or conservation easement documents being recorded in the land records of the County, specific public improvements to be included in a public improvements agreement, traffic mitigation agreements, grading and tree preservation agreements and others that may be particular to the proposed development.

Most of the above conditional agreements and easement documents can be accomplished concurrently with agency reviews, but must be completed prior to the actual recording of the record plat. It is important that the required agreements be identified at the time that the application is submitted. This requires the submission of a statement identifying all of the required agreements and easement documents that must be finalized prior to recordation of the plat.

3. TDR AND BLT REQUIREMENTS

All preliminary plans using TDRs and BLTs are approved with the condition that ownership of the TDRs or BLTs must be shown at the time of record plat approval. Furthermore, a note must be placed on the plat identifying the serial numbers of the TDRs and BLTs that are being used. For areas designated in sewer category 3 based upon an approved preliminary plan utilizing TDRs, a new subdivision not utilizing the requisite number of TDRs must have the sewer category condition changed prior to subdivision approval.

4. CHILD LOT AFFIDAVIT

If a lot was approved under the child lot provisions, pursuant to section 59-C-1.32, 59-C-9.73 (b) or 59-C-9.74 (b) of the Zoning Ordinance, an affidavit must be signed, notarized, and submitted with the plat application. Furthermore, a note must be placed on the plat identifying the lot(s), which are restricted by the child lot provision.

5. MINOR SUBDIVISION

5.1 Previously Approved Record Plat

All minor subdivisions involving previously platted properties must include two copies of the previous record plat.

5.2 Approved sketch plan, Approved Pre-Application (Pre-Preliminary) Plan

For minor lot line adjustments, the approved sketch plan as required by the Subdivision Regulations must be submitted with the record plat application. For applications submitted pursuant to section 50-35A(a)(8), one copy of the **approved** Pre-Application (Pre-Preliminary) Plan must be submitted with the record plat application

5.3 Approved Forest Conservation Exemption or Natural Resource Inventory/Forest Stand Delineation and Preliminary Forest Conservation Plan or a previously approved Forest Conservation Plan

Applications for certain minor subdivisions must include: submittal of an approved NRI/FSD with a Preliminary Forest Conservation (PFCP) plan; verification that the minor subdivision qualifies for a forest conservation exemption; or a previously approved Forest Conservation Plan. **The PFCP, where applicable, must be submitted with the record plat for minor subdivision and will be reviewed and approved as part of the record plat process.**

The following table outlines the applicability of these requirements to specific minor subdivisions:

<u>Code Section 50-35A(a)()</u>	<u>Minor Subdivision Category</u>	<u>Submission Requirements*</u>
1	Minor Lot Line Adjustment	An NRI/FSD or FC Exemption is not required. If a prior approved Forest Conservation Plan for the property exists, a copy must be submitted.
2	Outlot Conversion to a Lot	An NRI/FSD or FC Exemption is not required. If a prior approved Forest Conservation Plan for the property exists, a copy must be submitted.
3	Consolidation of Lots or Parts of Lots	An NRI/FSD or FC Exemption is not required. If a prior approved Forest Conservation Plan for the property exists, a copy must be submitted.
4	Further Subdivision of Commercial/Industrial/Multi-family Residential	An NRI/FSD or FC Exemption is not required. If a prior approved Forest Conservation Plan for the property exists, a copy must be submitted.
5	Plat of Correction	An NRI/FSD or FC Exemption is not required, unless the plat of correction is to correct a Forest Conservation Easement, then an approved Forest Conservation Plan is required.*
6	Residential Property Deed-Created Prior to 1958	NRI/FSD or FC Exemption is not required. If a prior approved Forest Conservation Plan for the property exists, a copy must be submitted.*
7	Existing Places of Worship, Private Schools, Country Clubs, Private Institutions, or similar, on Unplatted Parcels	NRI/FSD, FC Exemption, PFCP or approved FCP must be submitted.
8	Residential Lots in RDT Zone	NRI/FSD, FC Exemption, PFCP or approved FCP must be submitted
9	Deed parcels containing existing one-family residential dwellings	An NRI/FSD or FC Exemption is not required. If a prior approved Forest Conservation Plan for the property exists, a copy must be submitted.
10	Combining a lot and adjoin property	An NRI/FSD or FC Exemption is not required. If a prior approved Forest Conservation Plan for the property exists, a copy must be submitted.
11	Parts of Lots containing existing one-family residential dwellings	An NRI/FSD or FC Exemption is not required. If a prior approved Forest Conservation Plan for the property exists, a copy must be submitted.

* This is a guideline for the submittal requirements at the time of a record plat application, M-NCPPC staff reserves the right to require an NRI/FSD and/or FCP following review of the scope of the minor subdivision application.

NOTE: Application for the NRI/FSD must be separately made to the DARC Division by appointment. Application forms and submittal requirements are available. The NRI/FSD and forest conservation exemption must be approved prior to submitting them with the record plat for minor subdivision. As part of the NRI/FSD review, staff will make a determination on the need for submission of a Preliminary FCP. See the NRI/FSD–Forest Conservation Exemption application form for guidance on the appropriate type of NRI/FSD submittal.

5.4 Agreements, Covenants, Easement Documents, and Other Restrictions

One copy of agreements (including those for public improvements, adequate public facilities, etc.), covenants, easement documents, or other restrictions that are applicable to the property should be submitted with the record plat application in order to allow expedited review of the record plat. No minor subdivision plat will be recorded without staff review of such documents and without including appropriate reference notations on the plat drawing.

5.5 Appropriate Deed of Transfer, Abandonment Resolution, or Other Necessary Documents

For Minor Subdivisions submitted pursuant to Sections 50-35A(a)(3) and 50-35A(a)(6), one copy of the deed of transfer which substantiates compliance with the specified section of the subdivision regulations must be submitted with the record plat application. For Minor Subdivisions which involve the abandonment of a public right-of-way, one copy of the corresponding abandonment resolution must be submitted, additionally, any other documents that are necessary to substantiate compliance with Section 50-35A of the Subdivision Regulations, should also be submitted with the record plat application. No record plat will be approved by the Planning Board until all such documents have been submitted and reviewed by staff.

5.6 MCDEP Record Plat Information Form

One copy of the MCDEP record plat information form included with the plat application.

6. RECORD PLAT

The applicant must submit **1 PDF image** (see 1.7) as well as **10 paper copies** of the record plat drawing for distribution to staff involved in the review process. **The copies must be 18" by 24" and must be folded.** The record plat must be accurately drawn to scale and must include the following information:

6.1 Title Block

The title must be located in the lower right hand corner of the drawing and shall include the approved name of the subdivision; the election district, County and State, or name of municipality instead of election district, if applicable; scale of the drawing and date completed; and the name of the registered engineer/land surveyor who prepared the plat.

6.2 Subdivision Plan Drawing

The record plat must show all boundaries, street lines, lot lines and other appropriate lines with sufficient information to locate each line and property corner, and to reproduce them on the ground. In accordance with the Subdivision Regulations, the following information must be shown on a record plat, as applicable in each case.

- a. All property boundary lines necessary to identify the subdivision with the conveyance (liber, folio) by which the owner of the property, included on the plat, acquired the property.
- b. Exact locations, widths and names of all streets, alleys and crosswalks within the subdivision.
- c. All easements and rights-of-way provided for public services or utilities in the subdivision with recordation references.
- d. Accurate outlines of common areas with the purpose for such areas indicated on the plat.

- e. Accurate bearings and the length of all block and lot lines, together with the length of radii, arcs, and tangents with chord bearings and central angles for all curves in the layout. A curve table shall be included containing these data and referenced to the curves shown in the plat drawing.
- f. All bearings must be referred in the Maryland State Plane Coordinate system in feet. Resubdivisions may refer to the "plat meridian", and subdivisions comprised of two lots or less may refer to "deed meridian", as provided in the Subdivision Regulations.
- g. Coordinate values (to 4 decimal places) for at least 4 property line monuments shown on the plat.
- h. Accurate location of all monuments is required.
- i. A north arrow must be included to accurately depict the record plat's true orientation.
- j. All lots must be numbered in numerical order and all blocks must be lettered in alphabetical order. Resubdivided lots must be numbered and original lots shown as specified in the Subdivision Regulations.
- k. The area of each lot, outlot, parcel or other unit must be shown on the plat.
- l. Front building lines, shown graphically with dimensions, where such exceed the required minimum specified in the Zoning Ordinance, and any other building restriction lines which may apply in a particular case.
- m. Accurate bearings and lengths of tie connections between all adjacent blocks and other subdivisions.
- n. The names and locations of adjoining subdivisions with their lot and block numbers, together with plat references.
- o. Location and ownership (as shown on tax records) of adjoining unsubdivided properties with appropriate references.
- p. Appropriate key maps should be provided as specified in the Subdivision Regulations.
- q. Show accurate outlines of all individual water systems and sewage disposal system and associated easements.
- r. A statement of the number of dwelling units proposed, the zoning classification of the property, the number of development rights transferred, and reference of any conveyance required by Section 59-C-1.393(f) of the Zoning Ordinance.
- s. A plat number box in the top right quadrant, sized to accommodate a 1/2" x 2 1/4" stamp.

6.3 Surveyor /Engineer Certificate

A certificate by the registered surveyor/engineer that certifies the accuracy of the plat is required.

6.4 Owner(s) Certificate

A certificate by the owner and all parties of interest adopting the plan of subdivision is required. The certificate must establish certain easements, minimum building restriction lines and dedications as specified in the Subdivision Regulations.

6.5 Approval Box

Provide an approval box on the plat with space for signatures by all agency representatives who have signature authority for record plats.

7. LIST OF PROPOSED STREET NAMES

List of proposed names for new streets that are part of the approved subdivision should be submitted with the record plat application. The list may also be submitted electronically to DARC before the record plat application at mcp-addresses@montgomeryplanning.org. if the approved subdivision name and preliminary plan number are included in the list. Guidelines that apply to new street names include:

- a. A name should not be used if it is identical or phonetically similar to an existing street in the county or the cities of Gaithersurg, Poolesville, Rockville, or Takoma Park, or the Town of Kensington.
- b. A name that includes numbers should not be used (e.g., Tenbrook or Seventh Avenue).
- c. Directional prefixes (i.e., north, south, east, west) should not be used.

8. INFORMATION IN DIGITAL FORM FOR AN ADDRESS PLAN

The two required digital files should be submitted on a CD.

8.1 CAD file of the approved subdivision

CAD file must have the elements listed below --

- CAD file must be saved as a .dxf file compatible with AutoCAD 2000.
- Correct coordinate system (**NAD STATE PLANE 1983 Feet**)
- The following CAD layers, with the following **NAME**, **COLOR**, and **LINETYPE**:

NAME	COLOR	LINETYPE	CONTENT
ADD_BLDG	ACI 250	continuous polyline	Buildings in the approved subdivision
ADD_EXDOOR	ACI 3	continuous polyline	For buildings that are not single-family residences, show exterior doors
ADD_ADJBLDG	ACI 3	continuous polyline	Existing Buildings on properties adjacent to the approved subdivision
ADD_SUB_BO	ACI 3	continuous polyline	Boundary of subdivision
ADD_PROP	ACI 252	closed polygon	Property lines- Lots, Parcels
ADD_ROW	ACI 251	continuous polyline	Road right-of-way within and adjacent to subdivision
ADD_DW	ACI 251	continuous polyline	Driveways
ADD_ST	ACI 3	anno	Proposed or approved road names within subdivision
ADD_ADJ_ST	ACI 3	anno	Names of existing roads adjacent to subdivision
ADD_NO	ACI 5	anno	Proposed or approved lot, parcel, and/or block numbers

Please do not include other layers (e.g., topography, easements, non-road ROWs) in the CAD file.

8.2 EXCEL spreadsheet of properties to have assigned addresses

The spreadsheet must list all properties within the subdivision that are to be assigned addresses. Properties must be listed by lot and block or parcel number. Lots should be grouped by block number.

9. RESTRICTIONS

The plat must identify any restrictions applicable to the site such as denial of access, conservation easements and other limitations that are required by the approved preliminary plan.

10. DIGITAL SUBDIVISION RECORD PLAT *(Submit with mylar)*

The purpose of the digital record plat submittal is to maintain the integrity of Montgomery County's GIS property base map. Digital submittals will be accepted **only** if they adhere to the following criteria:

- a. The record plat base drawing is a DXF file (a standard digital exchange format).
- b. Plats **must** be in Maryland State Plane Coordinate System Datum (NAD83/91) at a 1:1 drawing scale in US survey feet; and
- c. All polygons **must** close.

The following chart indicates the **ONLY** layers that Montgomery County requires for its digital plat submittals. (Please do not include any other digital information from the record plat.) This naming convention, color and line style **must** be followed. A sample/template of this structure CD is available.

Description of Layers	Layer Names	Color	Line style
Street Right-of-Ways Lines	Prop1	Blue	Continuous
Lot & Deed Parcel Boundaries	Prop2	White	Continuous
Forest Conservation	Prop8	White	Continuous
Public Use (trail, path or equestrian)	Prop9	White	Continuous
Street Names	Propanno1	White	Standard (txt.shx)
Lot, Block, & Parcel Numbers*	Propanno2	Magenta	Standard (txt.shx)
Circles for Block Annotation**	Circle	White	
Subdivision Names	Propanno3	Green	Italics (txt.shx) Obliquing angle :30

* Font size for Lot is 16, Block is 25, and Parcel Numbers is 30.

** Radius for a circle is 40.

Upon receipt of the electronic files, M-NCPPC will import the DXF file into their property base map and revise the existing line work around the new parcel. All of the electronic data submitted will not be rotated or scaled to fit the existing basemap. The data will be held as true over the existing line work depicted in the property basemap.

MONTGOMERY COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION (DEP)

Rockville Center ■ 255 Rockville Pike - Suite120 ■ Rockville, Maryland 20850-4166

240-777-7700 ■ FAX: 240-777-7715

**RECORD PLAT INFORMATION FORM (RPIF)
COMPREHENSIVE WATER SUPPLY AND SEWERAGE SYSTEMS PLAN ISSUES**

DEP reviews all subdivision record plats for consistency with the County's Comprehensive Water Supply and Sewerage Systems Plan. DEP also calculates potential sewage treatment capacity requirements for new development using public sewer service (except for the municipalities of Rockville, Gaithersburg, and Washington Grove). DEP performs this calculation as part of a State-mandated plat approval process, and will not approve plats for development using public sewerage systems until this calculation is performed.

Please complete one form for each record plat submitted, and submit it with one copy of the appropriate plat. For assistance, please contact us, *preferably by Email*: Alan Soukup, alan.soukup@montgomerycountymd.gov, 240-777-7716, or Alicia Youmans, Alicia.youmans@montgomerycountymd.gov, 240-777-7738.

PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE

I. General Plat Information:

MNCPPC Plat # **2-** Plat Name _____

Address and/or Location/Description, e.g., Parcel #, cross-street):

TAX ID # (please provide if possible) _____

Minor Subdivision -or- Prelim. Plan # **1-** Water Category **W-** Sewer Category **S-**

Engineering Firm _____ Phone # _____

Contact _____ EMail REQUIRED _____

II. General Development and Sanitary Systems Information: Please check the following, as applicable.

- A. The properties recorded by this plat will use:
 - public water systems
 - wells
 - water supply not required
 - public sewerage systems
 - septic systems
 - sewage disposal not required
- B. The proposed use for the properties shown on this record plat will result in new or additional sewage flows for public systems. These flows will be collected by the following sewerage system:

Blue Plains WWTP	<input type="checkbox"/> Little Paint Branch	<input type="checkbox"/> Rock Run	Seneca WWTP	<input type="checkbox"/> Damascus WWTP
<input type="checkbox"/> Cabin John Creek	<input type="checkbox"/> Muddy Branch	<input type="checkbox"/> Paint Branch	<input type="checkbox"/> Great Seneca Creek	<input type="checkbox"/> Hyattstown WWTP
<input type="checkbox"/> Little Falls Branch	<input type="checkbox"/> Northwest Branch	<input type="checkbox"/> Potomac Interceptor	<input type="checkbox"/> Little Seneca Creek	<input type="checkbox"/> Poolesville WWTP
	<input type="checkbox"/> Rock Creek	<input type="checkbox"/> Sligo Creek		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Watts Branch		
- C. The proposed development is an expansion of/addition to an existing use already served by public sewer. (Provide information in Section III on the proposed expansion or addition *only*.)
 - Existing structures on this site, served by public sewerage systems, will be demolished. (Use Section III-F, pg.2).
- D. The proposed use for the properties shown on this record plat will not result in new or additional sewage flows for public systems; the properties will be used for; or, the purpose of this plat is to record:
 - open space *only* (HOA or park land, stormwater facilities, etc.)
 - public road right-of-way dedication *only*
 - rights-of-way dedication or abandonment (e.g. public roads)
 - cover page plat *only*
 - re-subdivision *only*
 - correction plat *only* (property line, easement, etc.)
 - septic service only
 - no sewerage system
 - other use (Explain in Section III-E on pg. 2)
- E. Size of the property in SF or acres _____
- F. Critical time constraint involved! Please complete DEP's review no later than: _____ DATE

III. Specific Development Information: For projects generating new or additional sewage flows for public systems, provide the information requested for the land uses described below, as appropriate. (Use Section III-E or attach a page, if necessary):

A. For the following residential uses, provide the number of dwelling units proposed:

<input type="text"/> single-family houses	<input type="text"/> townhouses/duplexes	<input type="text"/> elder housing (also see III.C.*)
<input type="text"/> mobile homes	<input type="text"/> high-rise apartments	<input type="text"/> garden apartments

<input type="text"/>	pre-school/day-care	<input type="text"/>	junior high/middle school**	**specify: <input type="checkbox"/> public school
				<input type="checkbox"/> private school
				<input type="checkbox"/> boarding school
<input type="text"/>	elementary school**	<input type="text"/>	senior high school**	

C. For the following institutional and commercial uses, provide the information indicated:

<input type="text"/>	church: # of sanctuary seats	<input type="text"/>	restaurant: # of seats
<input type="text"/>	hospital: # of beds	<input type="text"/>	swimming pool: # of members
<input type="text"/>	* nursing home: # of beds	<input type="text"/>	theater: # of seats
<input type="text"/>	health/racquet club: # of courts	<input type="text"/>	fire station: # of firefighters

D. For the following institutional and commercial uses, provide the gross square footage of each proposed building:

<input type="text"/>	auto dealership	<input type="text"/>	hotel
<input type="text"/>	bakery	<input type="text"/>	laundry/cleaner
<input type="text"/>	bank	<input type="text"/>	laundromat
<input type="text"/>	barber shop	<input type="text"/>	library
<input type="text"/>	beauty shop	<input type="text"/>	motel
<input type="text"/>	carry out restaurant (not major chains)	<input type="text"/>	office building: medical
<input type="text"/>	car wash (w/ recycle)	<input type="text"/>	office building: non-medical
<input type="text"/>	car wash (w/out recycle)	<input type="text"/>	office building: mixed or uncertain use
<input type="text"/>	club house (American Legion, VFW, etc.)	<input type="text"/>	Pizza Hut restaurant
<input type="text"/>	department store (w/ food service)	<input type="text"/>	post office
<input type="text"/>	department store (w/out food service)	<input type="text"/>	retail store
<input type="text"/>	drug store	<input type="text"/>	service station
<input type="text"/>	dry goods store	<input type="text"/>	shopping center
<input type="text"/>	funeral home	<input type="text"/>	super market
<input type="text"/>	garage (auto/truck repair)	<input type="text"/>	warehouse

E. If the land use categories listed previously do not apply to the development proposed by this plat, please describe the proposed development clearly and provide the gross square footage for each proposed building in the following space. (DEP staff will contact you if additional information is needed.)

F. Please provide information (as specified above) for all structures on the subject properties that are to be demolished and which are connected to the public sewerage system (i.e. bank: 2500 sq. ft., 1 single-family house, etc).



<http://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/permittingservices/>

Subdivision Record Plat Application

Project Name _____

Preliminary Plan No. _____

M-NCPPC Plat No. _____

Site Plan No. _____

(one application per plat drawing)

Note: the MNCPPC Plat No. serves as the DPS Project No.

CONSULTANT INFORMATION

Name of Consultant: _____

Address: _____ City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

Phone # _____ Fax # _____ Email _____ Contact# _____

APPLICANT INFORMATION

Name of Applicant: _____

Address: _____ City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

Phone # _____ Fax # _____ Email _____ Contact # _____

PROPOSED LEGAL DESCRIPTION and LOCATION OF LOTS

Subdivision Name and Lots/Parcels/Blocks and Associated Street Names: _____

TYPE OF PLAT and review features (check all that apply)

Minor (fee due w/this application) Standard Well Septic

PIA Permit & Bond Floodplain

Other (explain) _____

I declare and affirm, under penalty of perjury, that to the best of my knowledge, information and belief, all matters and facts in this application are correct. I declare that I am the owner of the property or duly authorized to make this application on behalf of the owner.

Print Name

Applicant Signature

Date

FOR STAFF REVIEW AND INFORMATION

PLAT PACKAGE ACCEPTANCE STATUS:

Accepted Incomplete

Reviewed By: _____

Minor Plat Fee: _____



Record Plat Review Checklist

Project Name: _____

Consultant _____

DPS Project No. _____

Phone No. _____

MNCPPC Plat No: _____

DPS Reviewer _____

Preliminary Plan No: _____

Phone No. _____

Plat Type:

- Standard
- Minor
- Other (waivers, etc.)

Submittal Date	Review Date	Initial
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

Other Concerns:

- Well & Septic PIA
- Floodplain Permit & Bond

_____ Record Plat Approvable _____ Date

TO THE SURVEYOR

This checklist has also been designed to provide specific instruction to consultants. All items are expected to be addressed in the first submittal as much as the development process will allow. Your submission for Record Plat approval has been reviewed. The review was made based on the items shown on this checklist. **Failure to submit basic items will result in a less than full first review and/or immediate rejection of your submittal. Always return the Checklist and the Record Plat comment sheets with your resubmittal.** If you do not address a checklist item, including comments on the Record Plat sheets, explain your reasoning on your plans or in your transmittal letter.

-----DPS REVIEW USE ONLY-----

Legend: ✓ - Complete INC - Incomplete/Incorrect NA - Not Applicable

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

---Reviews---

- ____ _ Transmittal specifically explaining purpose of submission
- ____ _ Two copies of Record Plat drawing (3 if well and/or septic involved)
- ____ _ Copy of completed MNCP&PC Record Plat Application
- ____ _ Copy of completed MCDEP Record Plat Information Form
- ____ _ Copy of approved Preliminary Plan and Resolution (if applicable-OK to submit unapproved copy w/ initial subm'l)
- ____ _ Copy of MCDPW&T Preliminary Plan approval letter (if applicable)
- ____ _ Copy of approved Site Plan and Resolution (if applicable)
- ____ _ Two copies of Public Improvements Agreement documents (if applicable) w/justification letter
- ____ _ One copy of approved Grade Establishment Plan (if applicable)
- ____ _ Approved detailed SD/Paving plans or pending DPS Project No.(if applicable)

- ___ ___ ___ DPS Permit No. for "Application for Work in Public R/W" verifying fee & bond and accepted (if applicable)
- ___ ___ ___ Storm Drain Study approved (if applicable)
- ___ ___ ___ Copy of plan view of Stormwater Mgmt plan (if requested)
- ___ ___ ___ Copy of Deed of subject property
- ___ ___ ___ Copy of prior plats of subject property (if applicable)
- ___ ___ ___ Copy of adjoining subdivision plats (if applicable)

GENERAL PLAT DRAWING ITEMS

- ___ ___ ___ Subdivision Name (and Section if applicable) as approved by MNCP&PC
- ___ ___ ___ Lots, Blocks, Parcels, etc. listed
- ___ ___ ___ Election District and/or Municipality
- ___ ___ ___ County and State
- ___ ___ ___ Date Completed
- ___ ___ ___ Name of Registered Land Surveyor with Address and Phone
- ___ ___ ___ MNCP&PC Planning Board Approval Block
- ___ ___ ___ MCDPS Approval Block
- ___ ___ ___ Recordation Block (Recorded Date, Plat No.)
- ___ ___ ___ Plat No. Block
- ___ ___ ___ Owner's Certificate
- ___ ___ ___ Surveyor's Certificate
- ___ ___ ___ General Notes
- ___ ___ ___ Vicinity Map
- ___ ___ ___ North Arrow
- ___ ___ ___ Scale and Bar Scale
- ___ ___ ___ Property boundary lines
- ___ ___ ___ Exact locations and widths noted of all streets, alleys and crosswalks within the subdivision
- ___ ___ ___ Name(s) of all streets shown
- ___ ___ ___ All metes and bounds (bearings and distances) of property being platted including all curve data (length of radii, arcs, chord bearing and distances and central angles) shown. Curve data must be shown in a curve table.
- ___ ___ ___ Area of each lot, outlot, parcel or other unit shown.
- ___ ___ ___ Plat or deed reference for existing R/W(s) that adjoins property that provides legal access or adherence to DPS Policy on apparent prescriptive R/W
- ___ ___ ___ Existing recorded easements established or rights-of-way provided for public services, conservation purposes, ingress/egress, utilities, etc. within the subdivision and any limitations of such easements. Show recordation reference(s).

- ___ ___ ___ All proposed easements or rights-of-way to be established by the plat and as to each such encumbrance the general purpose, the grantee and sufficient dimensions to identify the location.
- ___ ___ ___ Public Utility Easements—grant in Owner's Cert
- ___ ___ ___ Slope easements (if applicable)—grant in Owner's Cert
- ___ ___ ___ For Plats involving Well & Septic – Extra copy of Plat at same scale as Preliminary Plan. Any existing structures should be shown on the initial Plat submittal. Once the Plat is approved by Well and Septic, the structures can be removed from the final plat.
- ___ ___ ___ Septic easements – show 20 foot septic building restriction line - 20' SBRL (if applicable)
- ___ ___ ___ Septic areas – show 20 foot septic building restriction line – 20' SBRL (if applicable)
- ___ ___ ___ Well location(s) - show 100 foot radius (if applicable)
- ___ ___ ___ The most restrictive conservation easement must be shown and described and all other conservation easements MUST be shown, without limitation, 100-year floodplain, 100-year floodplain building restriction line (BRL), and forest conservation easement.
- ___ ___ ___ Accurate outlines of common use areas with purposes shown.
- ___ ___ ___ Plats must reference Maryland Coordinate System unless specified as follows:
 - ___ ___ ___ Plat of resubdivision not requiring Preliminary Plan Approval or plat of correction may reference the original Plat Meridian
 - ___ ___ ___ Plats involving no more than 2 lots may reference Deed Meridian in accordance with code
- ___ ___ ___ Maryland State Plane Coordinates of property line monuments shown and clearly labeled---4 minimum.
- ___ ___ ___ Show and identify locations of existing survey property corner markers that coincide with the proposed plat. If held, label as such.
- ___ ___ ___ Names and locations of adjoining subdivisions with their lot/parcel and block numbers along with associated plat references.
- ___ ___ ___ Location and ownership of adjoining unsubdivided properties along with Liber/Folio reference
- ___ ___ ___ PIA line on plat near or within DPS signature block for DPS staff to note applicable PIA reference number.

SPECIFIC NOTES AND MISCELLANEOUS ON PLAT DRAWING

- ___ ___ ___ Notes as to Public/Private Water & Sewer service.
- ___ ___ ___ Notes referencing any approved floodplain study or FEMA floodplain map
- ___ ___ ___ Notes concerning pertinent covenant recordations
- ___ ___ ___ Notes referencing approved preliminary plan for well and septic concerns including maximum number of bedrooms allowed for lots.
- ___ ___ ___ Zoning notes including specific zone of the property
- ___ ___ ___ Plat signed by MNCPPC Planning Board Chairman and Secretary – Treasurer.
- ___ ___ ___ Public Improvements Easement documents recorded and referenced on plat (if applicable).
- ___ ___ ___ Declaration of Covenants for Open Space / Private Storm Drainage recorded and referenced on plat (if applicable).
- ___ ___ ___ Declaration of Covenants for Road Construction recorded and referenced on plat (if applicable).
- ___ ___ ___ Tax Map No. or Tax Map Grid No. reference



City of Raleigh Plan Review Performance Report

10/4/2013

Projected Completion Dates
7/1/2013 through 9/30/2013
Review Cycle 1

	Total Plans	Benchmark	Average Actual Days	Benchmark Met	1-2 Days Late	3-4 Days Late	5+ Days Late	Reviews Incomplete
Preliminary Development Plan Review	48	12	10.04	78%	8	2		1
Recorded Map - Single Track	27	5	4.67	81%	2			3
Recorded Map - Multi Track	20	10	10.27	65%	1	1		5
Construction Plans - Blueline	29	10	10.30	86%	2			2
Construction Plans - Mylar Revisions	1	12	12.00	100%				
Site Development	28		10.32	71%	6	3		
Mass Land Clearing	19		5.45	95%	1			
Standard Commercial Plan Review	16	10	4.10	85%		3		14
Group Housing	40	10	10.45	84%	17			8
Fit Up - Interior Completion	9	4	4.44	78%	2			
Alterations and Repairs	119	8	5.30	86%	10	3	2	5
Additions	5	6	7.14	43%	2	2		
Field Revisions	40	5	3.87	98%				1
Shop Drawings	107	5	4.16	98%				2
Tree Conservation	9	7	7.33	89%	1			
ROW Street Closing	1	7		0%				1
Stand Alone	37	3	1.92	92%	2	1		
Pony Express - Alterations	37	5	2.46	95%		1	1	
SFD / Duplex	188	8	6.61	96%	1	1	2	3
SFD 1st Redi Review	1	8	7.00	100%				
SFD 2nd Redi Review	13	4	3.08	100%				
SFD Certified Review	3	4	3.67	100%				
SFD Field Revision	1	3	1.00	100%				
SFD Restamp	9	5	2.56	100%				
Next Day Review	424	1	1.01	92%	25	6	4	1
1 & 2 FAMILY ADDITION	34	5	4.68	89%				5
CONCURRENT REVIEW	2	10	10.00	50%				1
FINAL SITE	8	10	8.60	63%				3



City of Raleigh Plan Review Performance Report

10/4/2013

Projected Completion Dates
7/1/2013 through 9/30/2013
Review Cycle 2

	Total Plans	Benchmark	Average Actual Days	Benchmark Met	1-2 Days Late	3-4 Days Late	5+ Days Late	Reviews Incomplete
Preliminary Development Plan Review	27	12	9.30	74%	1	2		4
Recorded Map - Single Track	3	5	4.33	100%				
Recorded Map - Single Track Mylar	39	3	2.72	87%	5			
Recorded Map - Multi Track	13	10	8.75	85%		1		1
Recorded Map - Multi Track - Mylar	14	5	3.50	100%				
Construction Plans - Blueline	21	10	10.30	95%				1
Construction Plans - Mylar	7	12	7.33	86%				1
Construction Plans - Mylar Revisions	1	12	12.00	100%				
Site Development	30		5.53	79%	1			7
Mass Land Clearing	12	7	3.15	92%	1			
Standard Commercial Plan Review	12	5	10.23	31%	65			
Group Housing	21	5	3.56	97%	3			
Fit Up - Interior Completion	7	2	2.71	43%	3	1		
Alterations and Repairs	74	4	2.49	95%	1			3
Additions	4	3	3.00	80%	1			
Change of Use	1	3	3.00	100%				
Field Revisions	12	2	1.50	100%				
Shop Drawings	23	2	1.04	100%				
Tree Conservation	4	4	3.25	100%				
Stand Alone	10	2	0.90	100%				
Pony Express - Alterations	5	5	1.00	100%				
SFD / Duplex	104	4	2.12	99%	1			
SFD 2nd Redi Review	1	4	3.00	100%				
SFD Certified Review	3	4	1.00	100%				
SFD Field Revision	1	2	4.00	100%				
SFD Restamp	1	4	1.00	100%				
Next Day Review	87	1	0.39	98%			2	
1 & 2 FAMILY ADDITION	7	5	0.67	100%				



City of Raleigh Plan Review Performance Report

10/4/2013

Projected Completion Dates
7/1/2013 through 9/30/2013
Review Cycle 3

	Total Plans	Benchmark	Average Actual Days	Benchmark Met	1-2 Days Late	3-4 Days Late	5+ Days Late	Reviews Incomplete
Preliminary Development Plan Review	10	12	9.56	70%		2		1
Recorded Map - Single Track Mylar	21	3	1.76	100%				
Recorded Map - Multi Track	2	10	10.50	100%				
Recorded Map - Multi Track - Mylar	8	5	3.88	100%				
Construction Plans - Blueline	10	10	10.67	50%	1			4
Construction Plans - Mylar	12	12	9.45	83%	1			1
Construction Plans - Mylar Revisions	3	12	6.50	67%				1
Site Development	19		3.41	97%				1
Mass Land Clearing	7	7	3.50	75%	2			
Standard Commercial Plan Review	9	5	4.10	100%				
Group Housing	4	5	1.76	100%				
Fit Up - Interior Completion	4	2	4.00	75%		1		
Alterations and Repairs	20	4	2.38	100%				
Additions	3	3	1.60	100%				
Change of Use	1	3	1.00	100%				
Field Revisions	2	2	1.50	100%				
Shop Drawings	2	2	2.00	100%				
Stand Alone	1	2	1.00	100%				
SFD / Duplex	23	4	1.96	100%				
Next Day Review	16	1	0.47	94%		1		
	177			95%	4	4	0	



City of Raleigh Plan Review Performance Report

10/4/2013

Projected Completion Dates
7/1/2013 through 9/30/2013
Review Cycle 4

	Total Plans	Benchmark	Average Actual Days	Benchmark Met	1-2 Days Late	3-4 Days Late	5+ Days Late	Reviews Incomplete
Preliminary Development Plan Review	5	12	9.50	83%	1			
Recorded Map - Single Track Mylar	3	3	1.00	100%				
Recorded Map - Multi Track - Mylar	5	5	2.80	100%				
Construction Plans - Blueline	1	10	22.00	100%				
Construction Plans - Mylar	6	12	8.40	83%				1
Construction Plans - Mylar Revisions	2	12	9.50	100%				
Site Development	9		4.77	100%				
Mass Land Clearing	1	7	3.00	100%				
Standard Commercial Plan Review	5	5	0.92	100%				
Fit Up - Interior Completion	2	2	2.00	100%				
Alterations and Repairs	7	4	3.18	82%		2		
SFD / Duplex	7	4	2.00	100%				
Next Day Review	3	1	0.33	100%				
	56			95%	1	2	0	



City of Raleigh
Plan Review
Approval Rates / Review Cycle
July through September 2013

10/4/2013

	Approved during 1st Review	Approved during 2nd Review	Approved during 3rd Review	Approved during 4th Review
Preliminary Development Plan Review	0%	41%	30%	26%
Recorded Map - Single Track	89%	9%	2%	0%
Recorded Map - Multi Track	44%	44%	11%	0%
Construction Plans - Blueline	28%	48%	21%	3%
Construction Plans - Mylar Revisions	14%	14%	0%	43%
Site Development	7%	27%	43%	17%
Mass Land Clearing	32%	27%	36%	5%
Standard Commercial Plan Review	29%	7%	43%	29%
Group Housing	42%	45%	13%	0%
Fit Up - Interior Completion	17%	50%	17%	0%
Alterations and Repairs	26%	52%	15%	5%
Additions	0%	40%	60%	0%
Change of Use	0%	0%	100%	0%
Field Revisions	66%	29%	6%	0%
Shop Drawings	77%	22%	1%	0%
Tree Conservation	50%	50%	0%	0%
ROW Encroachment	88%	13%	0%	0%
Stand Alone	69%	26%	3%	3%
Pony Express - Alterations	89%	11%	0%	0%
SFD / Duplex	42%	45%	10%	2%
SFD 2nd Redi Review	90%	10%	0%	0%
SFD Certified Review	0%	100%	0%	0%
SFD Field Revision	0%	100%	0%	0%
SFD Restamp	89%	11%	0%	0%
Next Day Review	79%	17%	3%	1%
Others	69%	31%	0%	0%



CLARK COUNTY BUILDING DEPARTMENT

Plan Review Timeliness Report

April 2014



Type	FIRST REVIEW						
	Time Goal (Days)	No. Plans Rev.	Average Time (Days)	No. of plans Not Meeting Goal	Target Goal %	% Goal Achieved	Goal Achieved
Complex/Phased Projects							
Architectural	42 Days	0	0 days	0	90%	n/a	n/a
Structural		0	0 days	0	90%	n/a	n/a
Electrical		0	0 days	0	90%	n/a	n/a
Plumbing/Mechanical		0	0 days	0	90%	n/a	n/a
On-Site Grading		0	0 days	0	90%	n/a	n/a
Fire Protection		0	0 days	0	90%	n/a	n/a
Commercial Projects							
Architectural	21 Days	62	11 days	1	90%	98%	+8%
Structural		45	3 days	0	90%	100%	+10%
Electrical		52	10 days	0	90%	100%	+10%
Plumbing/Mechanical		45	1 days	0	90%	100%	+10%
On-Site Grading		16	1 days	0	90%	100%	+10%
Fire Protection		34	4 days	0	90%	100%	+10%
Minor Commercial Projects							
Architectural	14 Days	138	11 days	52	90%	62%	-28%
Structural		114	2 days	0	90%	100%	+10%
Electrical		126	8 days	18	90%	86%	-4%
Plumbing/Mechanical		66	0 days	0	90%	100%	+10%
On-Site Grading		33	1 days	0	90%	100%	+10%
Fire Protection		33	5 days	0	90%	100%	+10%
Residential Project							
Custom Residence-A/E/M/P	14 Days	10	6 days	0	90%	100%	+10%
Custom Residence-Structural		10	7 days	0	90%	100%	+10%
Residential Standard Plans-A/E/M/P		8	22 days	7	90%	13%	-78%
Residential Standard Plans-Structural		10	12 days	0	90%	100%	+10%
Minor Residential-A/E/M/P		43	6 days	4	90%	91%	+1%
Minor Residential-Structural		73	1 days	0	90%	100%	+10%
Plan Revisions							
Architectural	10 Days	118	8 days	33	90%	72%	-18%
Structural		178	2 days	0	90%	100%	+10%
Electrical		91	5 days	16	90%	82%	-8%
Plumbing/Mechanical		39	0 days	0	90%	100%	+10%
On-Site Grading		21	1 days	0	90%	100%	+10%
Fire Protection		4	0 days	0	90%	100%	+10%
TOTAL		1369	n/a	131	90%	90%	+0%

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	Allow County Attorney to sign off on bond form rather than each bond. Requires amendment of 49-37(c) <i>This occurs presently for standard forms but is a code clean-up item.</i>	Days to week	DPS staff concurs	90 days following introduction 6/12 Update - County Attorney does not sign off on bonds using the standard template; Deviations require OCA sign off.
2	Moved to	Supplemental	Table of items	Not being	changed	
3	Bonds	Takes too long to get	DPS and MNCPPC need to	would save	DPS and MNCPPC	3/31/2012 (MNCPPC)

1

Color Key:

Completed

In process

Not part of streamlining initiative

No Action (no color)

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
		bond released at MNCPPC and DPS (forest conservation; swm/sc and ROW)	look at business processes to simplify and expedite eligible release	developers money in bond premiums and free up financial capacity	staff agree to look at process and staffing	modified Bond approval process -- Bonds are released within 10 business days of request); DPS has assigned additional staff and managers to process release requests.
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	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 Implemented

Color Key: Completed In process Not part of streamlining initiative No Action (no color)

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
			sc that they need to submit to MNCPPC for forest conservation)			
5	Building Permit	Staffing is insufficient for timely plans review	MNCPPC has increased staff allocation by ½ workyear DPS to fill vacancies for plans reviews and reviewing its staffing needs	Added cost to departments but for well-prepared plans will result in time savings.	DPS and MNCPPC concur	DPS has filled plans reviewer vacancies, and has standby contracts for reviewers, and rearranged staffing assignments. DPS has prepared new performance measures.
6	Building Permit	Establish timeline for permit review	Performance measures for review for MNCPPC, Building Construction, and Land Development (DPS)	Customer knows what to expect; for properly prepared plans this will result in a	DPS and MNCPPC Concur MNCPPC	DPS and MNCPPC have developed metrics which are to be in effect by 12/31/2012

Color Key: Completed In process Not part of streamlining initiative No Action (no color)

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
				several days reduction in review time (plans with deficiencies will take longer)		Metrics were revised and will be implemented by 6/30/2013. DPS has developed performance measures and headline measures which it is using in FY2015 for FY2014 performance report
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	Draft prepared with goal to finalize by 8/1/2014
8	Building Permit	Quality of plan submittal is poor which	1) Periodically educate applicants on plan	Cost savings to applicant with need	1 and 3) DPS provides periodic training and	1) Currently occurs and plans submittal

4

Color Key: Completed In process Not part of streamlining initiative No Action (no color)

July 23, 2014 Edits

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
		results in multiple resubmissions lengthening the permit issuance time	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> submittal 2) enable applicant to see reviewer's comments on line 3) Create and update list of most common design mistakes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> for fewer revisions Efficiencies for plans reviewers with fewer submissions to review Time savings for applicant --Saves numerous trips to DPS office 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> will create list of most common design/permit mistakes. 2) DPS will create ability for comments to be accessed on-line 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> guide is on website. 2) Both MNCPPC and DPS are moving to ePlans which enables applicants and authorized individuals to see reviewer comments online 3) list of most common design/permit mistakes - are posted online and will be updated Park and Planning has posted list

Color Key: Completed In process Not part of streamlining initiative No Action (no color)

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
						WSSC list is available and WSSC conducts training
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 of them)		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 Completed 9/1/2012
10	Pre-DRC ¹ , DRC ² and Site Plan	1. Applicants feel that they do not get the	1. Several process changes will be implemented to	Total changes attributable to	MNCPPC, DOT and DPS staffs concur;	New processes will be put in place by

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

Color Key: Completed In process Not part of streamlining initiative No Action (no color)

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
		<p>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>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>improved process result in an estimated year of time savings.</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>WSSC to attend 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>Note that WSSC has received funding to collocate two people in DPS offices and DPS and WSSC are preparing collocation</p>	<p>December 1, 2012</p> <p>Implementation began in January, 2013; Reports on performance are circulated.</p>

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

Color Key: Completed In process Not part of streamlining initiative No Action (no color)

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
		project gets to DRC.	<p>agency initial review comments to each agency on Monday</p> <p>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</p> <p>c. Applicants should attend DRC prepared to discuss items in comments and notes of Pre-</p>		memorandum; DPS also included space for WSSC in its POR for Wheaton	

8

Color Key: Completed In process Not part of streamlining initiative No Action (no color)

July 23, 2014 Edits

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
			<p>DRC; MNCPPC to provide Planning Board date for projects that are ready for PB review</p> <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</p>			

9

Color Key: Completed In process Not part of streamlining initiative No Action (no color)

July 23, 2014 Edits

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
			<p>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 resolution of agency issues	<p>Same as #3 in preceding row.</p> <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</p>	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above

10

Color Key: Completed In process Not part of streamlining initiative No Action (no color)

July 23, 2014 Edits

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
			for additional meetings for lead agencies to work out specific remaining issues			
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 on discussion of resolutions and issues.	NA
13	Pre-DRC, DRC and Site Plan	Planning Board Hearing dates can't be scheduled because agency comments have not been received	1. Establish hearing dates at the end of DRC meeting, (see above for projects ready for PB	1. None identified 2. This would not result in savings as	1. MNCPPC staff, DOT and DPS do not agree that hearing dates should be	For projects that are ready hearings are being set at DRC

Color Key: Completed In process Not part of streamlining initiative No Action (no color)

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
			<p>review).</p> <p>2. Allow cases to go to the Planning Board even if agency recommendations have not been received (currently not allowed by law).</p>	<p>projects may be approved at Planning Board but not be able to receive permits because of code issues</p>	<p>set at DRG 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.</p> <p>2. MNCPPC staff has concerns about this approach. DPS and DOT do not concur that cases go to PB even if agency</p>	

Color Key: Completed In process Not part of streamlining initiative No Action (no color)

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
					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	Traffic impact studies are being forwarded to DOT and SHA upon acceptance of those studies. Scoping studies are being reviewed, on average, within 14 calendar days. Process was 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	All non-codified guidelines and policies need to be published	Clarity will result in an unquantified time savings;	MNCPPC and DOT staffs concur that guidelines and policies should be published	Most guidelines are published; Landscape and lighting guidelines

Color Key: Completed In process Not part of streamlining initiative No Action (no color)

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
		delays completion of reviews (but see row 17)	Distinguish between policy and precedent Have more policy discussions with Board		but does not concur that as applied they are a problem	are in the draft Zoning Rewrite published May, 2013
16	Pre-DRC, DRC and Site Plan	Agency comments and other information related to reviews are not universally available to all.	Improve use of technology to keep better records and meeting notes that can be easily accessed by all. Note -- ProjectDox will enable better access to agency comments; process described in row 10 will help to address this issue	unquantified	MNCPPC, staff, DOT and DPS concur	ProjectDox is implemented. Preliminary and Site Plan were implemented April, 2013 and comments are viewable by applicants team and reviewers.
17	Pre-DRC, DRC and Site Plan	Applicant requests to deviate from standards cause review delays that are too lengthy.	1. Hold pre-submission meetings that include reviewers from agencies to	Following published guidelines, regulations and standards will help	1. Pre-submission meetings are difficult to staff—	NA

14

Color Key: Completed In process Not part of streamlining initiative No Action (no color)

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
			<p>work out possible solutions prior to submission.</p> <p>2. Modify standards, if necessary, to address different development situations (e.g. infill vs. non-infill)</p>	greatly to streamline process	<p>increased staffing will be needed to support Pre-DRC, DRC and post-DRC issue resolution; 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	Moved to	Supplemental	Table of items	Not being	changed	

Color Key: Completed In process Not part of streamlining initiative No Action (no color)

#	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 - 	Saves 6-9 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 	<p>Board adopts day of hearing if not controversial; If controversial the board adopts the resolution within approx. 1 month.</p> <p>The Planning Board and the Board's legal counsel do not want draft resolutions published prior to adoption.</p>

Color Key: Completed In process Not part of streamlining initiative No Action (no color)

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
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 plan type and don't revisit issues decided at prior points. 2. MNCPPC to develop standard templates for the review of each plan type that clarify what needs to be decided at each stage 	expect several weeks savings	<p>MNCPPC has revised processes to have a single reviewer for all plan types to minimize inconsistencies and new issues; DOT concurs for separate plan-type reviews</p> <p>MNCPPC staff concurs in the recommendation to develop standard templates</p>	Plans review templates to be adopted by 6/30/2013
21	Pre-DRC, DRC and Site Plan	In practice Planning Board requires projects to comply with Master Plans which may be difficult or even	Clarify that requirement is that projects must substantially comply with master plans; and develop an interpretation that	Could facilitate projects and eliminate lengthy processes	Law already calls for substantial compliance. The solution is to update master plans which is	NA

Color Key: Completed In process Not part of streamlining initiative No Action (no color)

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
		undesirable if plans are older and out of date	allows for finding of substantial compliance Make clear what the burden of proof for master plan compliance should be		a substantive law change Limited master plan amendments help but are still time consuming	
22	Env't., SWM and SC	Totally impervious properties, such as parking lots require the submission and approval of a NRI/FSD	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Need to better get the word out that applicants can submit an "Existing Conditions Plan" -- 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 	Would save weeks - month and corresponding costs	MNCPPC staff concurs	<p>Staff training to be developed and implemented by 12/31/12 -</p> <p>MNCPPC has information on website.</p> <p>MNCPPC, with assistance from DPS has developed a fact sheet and posted by 12/31/2013</p>

Color Key: Completed In process Not part of streamlining initiative No Action (no color)

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
			on MNCPPC and DPS websites)			Implemented and continuing
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 Staff training is implemented and ongoing - would like customer feedback on progress.

Color Key: Completed In process Not part of streamlining initiative No Action (no color)

#	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> <p>PB determined not to open guidelines and believes that enough flexibility exists under guidelines as written.</p>

Color Key:

Completed

In process

Not part of streamlining initiative

No Action (no color)

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
25	Env't., SWM and SC	ESD - lack of clarity as to what is acceptable and new products take	State needs to publish guidelines and amend from time to time	Several weeks to months	DPS concurs; DEP concurs	6/13 - DPS has issued design and construction

Color Key: Completed In process Not part of streamlining initiative No Action (no color)

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
		too long	DPS to develop guidelines for proprietary approved ESD and other stormwater measures and post on DPS website			standards for several ESD practices and continues to work on others. MDE also recently issued design guidance. The New Products Committee (comprised of representatives of DPS, DEP, Rockville, Gaithersburg, and consulting engineers) does not believe that the existing process needs change.
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		DPS, DEP, MNCPPC staff, WSSC staff and DOT concur	Bioswales guidelines to be published by 10/1/2014

Color Key: Completed In process Not part of streamlining initiative No Action (no color)

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
		9/13 RRB Ongoing committee meetings	guidelines for tentatively approved SWM methods for implementing Environmentally Sensitive Design under different scenarios (open vs closed section roads, urban/suburban/rural locations, etc.)			<p>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)</p> <p>Committee composed of DPS, DEP, DOT, MNCPPC, and WSSC meet regularly. On schedule to have guidelines by 9/2013.</p>
27	Env't., SWM and SC	Minimize review of simple projects by	Already permitted.	Approx. 90% of reviews are	NA	12/31/2012

23

Color Key: Completed In process Not part of streamlining initiative No Action (no color)

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
		combining stages 1 and 2 SWM reviews	DPS and MNCPPC to develop information to post on website	combined already so material savings are not expected.		6/13 update - already in County Code
28	Env't., SWM and SC	preliminary and final forest conservation 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	Minimize reviews by combining into one plan for review at DRC. This is only happening approx. 10% of time Education; website;	This could save weeks to months of time	MNCPPC staff and DPS concur	This is done to the extent possible where tied to sediment control permit; For preliminary plan and site plan would require a regulatory change - PB staff to discuss with PB
29	Env't., SWM and SC	SPAs are a continuing problem; ongoing post completion BMP monitoring interferes with permit closeout	Create a fee-in-lieu of post-completion monitoring to pay for DEP to provide BMP monitoring (better consistency and	Savings to developers by not having on-going monitoring and bonds;	DEP and DPS concur	Requires a law change and adoption of regulations. DEP to prepare draft by 3/1/2013

Color Key: Completed In process Not part of streamlining initiative No Action (no color)

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
		and is expensive	eliminates oversight conflict)	<p>Will also save time by eliminating proposals and reviews between Developers and DEP over monitoring plan approval</p> <p>Permits can close-out;</p> <p>Better consistency and eliminates oversight conflict;</p> <p>Help fund DEP monitoring; saves DPS permit tracking and</p>		Done - legislation was adopted 3/19/2013 - regulations are pending.

Color Key: Completed In process Not part of streamlining initiative No Action (no color)

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
				enforcement resources; frees up developer capital		
30	Env't., SWM and SC	Need to look at SPA law - are individual plans still needed;	Amend SPA law to correspond to current development requirements and standards SPA law should also include steps to eliminate processes that have been found to be of little value		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 recommendations	7/31/2013 publish recommendation DEP and DPS are deferring until completion of Ten Mile Creek and pending impervious bills discussions.
31	Env't., SWM and SC	Processing SWM as-built takes too long and large bonds are	New requirements will help, but DPS is willing to allow application for	Reduced carry costs, but there would be additional	DPS concurs; Procedure is on	12/31/2012 6/13 Update -

Color Key: Completed In process Not part of streamlining initiative No Action (no color)

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
		kept open too long	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	work on the part of DPS	website but needs to be updated to reflect current devices	Progress delayed due to workload spike related to expiration of grandfathering period for sediment control. DPS created performance metric with 28 day completion target
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	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	NA SPA law changed to transfer monitoring responsibility to DEP

Color Key: Completed In process Not part of streamlining initiative No Action (no color)

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
		releases?			that may create a risk that is greater than if the transfer is at 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	6/13 Update - DPS hired Field supervisor who is working on training using current modification policy. Modifications drafted and will be sent to MDE for review and approval summer 2014
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	DPS in collaboration with MNCPPC and DEP will develop draft

Color Key: Completed In process Not part of streamlining initiative No Action (no color)

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
					be done under existing environmental guidelines	DPS will work with MNCPPC and DEP staff for review and final by 8/31/2014. Currently allowed on an individual basis.
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 to benefit of County to Director	2+ weeks	DPS concurs	Completed.
36	Record Plat	Takes too long MNCPPC (reviews for compliance with Ch. 50 requirements/resolution and forest	MNCPPC added an additional reviewer (1 $\frac{3}{4}$ WYs); DPS is reviewing staff assignments; performance metrics: -	Performance Metrics should reduce review times by approximately 1 - 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ months on	DPS and Planning Staff concur in the metrics	Additional staff added for review. Review times have decreased from 8 weeks to 2-3 weeks. DPS, MNCPPC and

Color Key: Completed In process Not part of streamlining initiative No Action (no color)

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
		<p>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>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>	average		<p>the record plat committee continue to work on process improvements.</p> <p>DPS 2014 average completion is 14 days</p> <p>Parties now have DPS sign before PB to be more efficient</p>
38	Record Plat	Sign off on covenants and easements takes too long	Let DPS Director sign covenants and easements that burden private	2 + weeks		Immediate if authorized by CAO

Color Key: Completed In process Not part of streamlining initiative No Action (no color)

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
			property and benefit county			Same as 35.
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 depending on number per year	
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	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 on	3/01/2013 The Planning Board, DPS and MNCBIA have agreed on items that must be shown on the plat. MNCBIA to preparing table

Color Key: Completed In process Not part of streamlining initiative No Action (no color)

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
			content recommendation from industry representatives		surveyors -	template of items to be shown on the multi-page plats. DPS will publish a policy with 30 days advance notice of effective date for plat note page for multiple plat subdivisions
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	MNCPPC is currently working on a draft to be reviewed with DPS in the Fall 2015
42	ROW permits	ROW permits expire before sediment control permits and	Change from 18 months to 24 months to coincide with sediment control permit	*Avoided expense of applying for extension (10% of	DPS has no objection and needs to coordinate with the	DPS to work with DOT, County Attorney and Council

Color Key: Completed In process Not part of streamlining initiative No Action (no color)

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
		SWM permits	life	original fee) * 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 Fewer extensions to process resulting in improved work management	Office of the County Attorney	staff to address
43	Moved to	Supplemental	Table of items	Not being	changed	

Color Key: Completed In process Not part of streamlining initiative No Action (no color)

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
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	Done
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 criteria for decision making.	Annual training clinic for attorneys and residents by the Hearing Examiner's Office Power point to be posted on-line	Approx. 40 hours initial time investment to prepare Anticipate time savings offset during hearing process	OZAH believes this is of limited value	Zoning Rewrite addressed this Website has been updated to add accessory apartments; procedures for objecting to

Color Key: Completed In process Not part of streamlining initiative No Action (no color)

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
						accessory apartments has been adopted and OZAH will be conducting training
47	Special Exceptions	<p>Time it takes from intake to the hearing</p> <p>Hearings are currently set not earlier than 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ months from receipt to allow for PB position; but there is a class like accessory apts. that do not go to PB first</p>	<p>PB look for other uses that it does not need to review Pre-OZAH (such as small home occupations)</p> <p>PB staff to establish tracking system and performance metrics for its staff review and recommendations</p>	<p>Would save at least one month as posting and public hearing at PB session would be avoided</p>	<p>OZAH and PB staff concur</p>	<p>Addressed by the Zoning Rewrite</p> <p>Rules of procedure are being revised to simplify for conditional uses and special exceptions</p> <p>Hearing to be set within 120 days with OZAH and Planning Staff with Planning Department to do the intake per the Zoning Rewrite</p>

Color Key: Completed In process Not part of streamlining initiative No Action (no color)

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
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	Currently not getting requests; review after implementation of the Zoning Rewrite
49	Moved to	Supplemental	Table of items	Not being	Changed	
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	Addressed in the Zoning Rewrite
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	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

Color Key: Completed In process Not part of streamlining initiative No Action (no color)

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
		complicated and it is unrealistic to expect resident to know the process				
52	Special Exceptions	extensive time delay to commencement of a project	Develop a case management approach for minor or uncontested and other types of special exception	Minor/uncontested cases could proceed eliminating potentially months of delay; work has to be done anyway, but other work would take longer to accommodate preferential timing	OZAH concurs	Zoning Rewrite has partially addressed
53	Special Exceptions	extensive time delay to commencement of a project	Allow construction to proceed at owner's risk where BOA has approved special exception (consider allowing but	Eliminate months to year of delay for a BOA approval that has been appealed; could still provide	Planning Staff concurs; BOA opposes	Requires a law change. With a sponsor could be done

Color Key: Completed In process Not part of streamlining initiative No Action (no color)

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
			acknowledge that Circuit Court has power to issue injunction)	process to request stay by court		
54	Special Exceptions	different submission requirements for each zone (ex. Need, distance from other similar uses, etc.)	Create standardized, uniform application for submissions This should be discussed at zoning rewrite	Labor intensive to Identify and compare the submission requirements for all special exceptions, but could simplify submission process and create more focused hearing	None	OZAH is drafting a rule change for adoption by 10/29/14
55	Moved to	Supplemental	Table of items	Not being	changed	
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	PB staff concurs; DPS concurs; DOT concurs	Addressed by Zoning Rewrite.

Color Key: Completed In process Not part of streamlining initiative No Action (no color)

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
				information		PB will do intake and hearing will be assigned within 4 months of completed application.
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 vehicles	DPS and DHCA concur that additional staff would allow for more inspections ; DPS and DHCA will review staffing needs.	DPS is filling vacancies and cross training for better use of resources.
58	Transportation & Utilities	Many conflicting law and industry practices (and newly adopted	DOT, DPS, MNCPPC, DEP and WSSC to review commonly approved	could save months	DOT, DPS, MNCPPC staff concur; WSSC is open to discuss	DOT is doing a table; A tabular summary

Color Key: Completed In process Not part of streamlining initiative No Action (no color)

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
		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	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)			of Design Execeptin requests to DOT (2011 to present) is currently being prepared; this document will help identify regularly recurring requests (and frequency of same) to determine which policies should be updated. Completion of this document is now expected in December 2014; policy modifications to follow. WSSC is working on

Color Key:

Completed

In process

Not part of streamlining initiative

No Action (no color)

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
						a fee structure for exceptions and expects work to be concluded by July, 2015
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 to eliminate problems post-filing	DOT and MNCPPC staff concur	6-12 months post funding Both DOT and MNCPPC have filled positions

Color Key: Completed In process Not part of streamlining initiative No Action (no color)

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
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; Bill 33-13 may help to address some of the "parking lot" issues.
62	Transportation & Utilities	Time it takes to negotiate, finalize, manage and enforce traffic mitigation	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.

Color Key: Completed In process Not part of streamlining initiative No Action (no color)

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
		agreements				
63	Transportation & Utilities	Development plans get hung up due to unanticipated staging impacts and lack of detail in master plan	Master plans need enough detail to know what ROW is needed and enough study to know what can be implemented For example, include horizontal and vertical alignment and interchange foot print studies at the time staff drafts of master plans are prepared	Months of review, discussion and redesign can be saved This would require additional staff or consulting services	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	Positive but not able to quantify.	DOT, DPS and MNCPPC staff	11/1/2014 DOT is the lead and expects work to be completed by end of 2014

Color Key: Completed In process Not part of streamlining initiative No Action (no color)

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
			transportation-related reviews			
65	Transportation & Utilities	Need for urban guidelines/standard practices to fit utilities and other amenities within constrained rights-of-way	Hire a consultant to convene an inter-agency workgroup - with utilities and development community members - to identify best practices for policies & procedures; develop sustainable solutions, and quantify costs.	Estimated consultant cost \$200,000 for MCDOT/DTE; Estimated time savings in entitlement process - months of time with corresponding staff efficiencies	DOT, DPS, MNCPPC staff and WSSC staff concur	12 -- 24 months after the necessary funding has been secured and consultant services have been procured 6/2014 - determined DPS to get a consultant to put together best practices from other jurisdictions
66	Transportation & Utilities	Disconnect between master plans and developers desire to make public roads private roads - WSSC	Easement to be required with any private ROW Do not allow substitution of master planned public	Months of negotiation would be eliminated; recent trend creating	All agency staff concur	

Color Key: Completed In process Not part of streamlining initiative No Action (no color)

#	Work Group	Problem	Recommended Solution	Costs/Savings	Agency Staff Consensus	Timeframe to implement
		needs same right to put utilities in ROW as if 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	disconnects for WSSC under state law will be avoided		
67	WSSC	Developer cannot release more than 50% of project for 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.	Allow up to 75% partial releases This will require a change to WSSC Development Services Group processes	Will have some positive impact to the tax base Will save developers some carrying costs	WSSC will allow as a pilot program and will evaluate workload impacts for funding requests during	WSSC has begun a pilot. If change is made permanent it will be addressed in the FY2015 budget cycle.

Color Key: Completed In process Not part of streamlining initiative No Action (no color)