

***Statewide Consistent Forms & Fee Methodologies  
Rulemaking Advisory Committee  
Regular Committee Minutes***

***Friday, November 2, 2007  
1:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.***

**Members Present:** Lori Graham, City of Portland  
Jeff Starkey, City of Salem  
Stuart Ramsing, City of Eugene  
Don Miner, OMOA  
J. L. Wilson, OAPHCC  
Warren Jackson, Marion County

**Members Absent:** Nathan Phillips,  
Susan Steward, BOMA  
John Killin, IECO  
Ron Murray, UA Local 290

**Guests Present:** Alan Seymour, ODOE

**Staff Present:** Andrea Simmons, policy and technical services manager  
Richard Blackwell, policy analyst  
Nicole Jantz, executive assistant

1. **Introductions**  
Committee and audience introduced themselves.
2. **Review Tri-County forms and fee methodologies**

Members of the committee requested that the division make sure that a place for customers to put an email address box on each form.

The committee reviewed the [standardized forms](#) provided. Committee members expressed concern about the email size of the field for email addresses. Andrea Simmons explained these forms are to provide a consistent standard between jurisdictions although the local building departments may add to them as the forms can be somewhat flexible as long as items are not removed.

Andrea Simmons explained that this rulemaking stemmed from the work done in the Tri-County area. She stated that the intent of this rulemaking was to get the majority of forms and fee methodologies consistent statewide, but with the realistic expectation that there will not be exact uniformity due to local conditions.

Committee members also discussed the rule language in [OAR chapter 918, division 50](#). The methods for calculating building permits in the Tri-County area will become consistent statewide with this rulemaking; Andrea noted that the end fee amount may be different between jurisdictions.

Stuart Ramsing, City of Eugene, suggested adding a space for permit numbers on the forms. He also mentioned that the travel time/distance for the inspector is another issue local jurisdictions consider in their current fees.

Members of the committee raised concerns that the current methodologies do not address the actual cost of providing service. The committee discussed local jurisdictions' costs of operations and how those varied costs affect fee amounts from jurisdiction to jurisdiction.

Committee members also discussed the intent behind "administrative fees." Andrea explained that the intent of the original rulemaking committee was to discourage establishing fees without meeting process requirements. The committee asked the division if the rules could be limited to disallowing surcharges only for building-related activities.

Commercial fee methodology was also discussed by the committee

### **3. Discuss implementation**

The committee discussed the timeframes for implementation at the local jurisdiction levels. Andrea suggested that implementation may occur by July 1, 2008. Members of the committee suggested at least a six-month implementation time period. Members of the committee expressed concern that municipalities would not be expected to have implemented the new requirements by the proposed effective date.

### **4. Adjourn**

Committee adjourned at 3:05 p.m.