

Building and Safety Division  
**Jim MacDonald**, Building Official

Environmental Health Division  
**Robert Gallagher**, Director

Planning Division  
**Kimberly L. Prillhart**, Director

Code Compliance Division  
**Jim Delperdang**, Director

Operations Division  
**Jennifer Padre**, Director

March 8, 2011

Board of Supervisors  
County of Ventura  
800 South Victoria Avenue  
Ventura, CA 93009

**SUBJECT: Status Report on the Discretionary Land Use Permitting Process Improvement Program and Related Metrics/Performance Measures**

## **RECOMMENDATION:**

**Receive & File** a report on the status and performance of the on-going Discretionary Land Use Permit Process Improvement Program.

## **FISCAL/MANDATES IMPACTS:**

There is no fiscal impact associated with the recommended action. However, since June 2008, there has been a significant expenditure of staff resources by the RMA, PWA, and other agencies involved in the discretionary permitting process. The RMA Planning Division alone has expended approximately 3200 staff hours on the Get-To-Excellence Plan. These hours represent staff time mapping out existing processes, conducting meetings with stakeholders, drafting new processes, and implementing improvements. This Board-directed work represents approximately \$196,000 of budgetary expenditures within the Planning Division during this period.

## **BACKGROUND:**

In April 2008, the Board of Supervisors requested and received a consultant's report regarding the County's Discretionary Land Use Permitting Process. Based in large part upon comments and suggestions from our customers (i.e., landowners, developers, environmentalists, community advocates) and County staff, the consultant's report made a number of recommendations for improving the County's discretionary land use



permitting process. The recommendations in that report were referred to a County management committee for further review and recommendation. In June 2008, a core group of key County staff from the 10 departments involved in the discretionary land use permitting process conducted a *Value Stream Analysis*, wherein they mapped out the permitting process, identified inefficiencies, and developed 23 recommended improvements using Lean 6 Sigma methodology. These recommended improvements were summarized in a *Get-To-Excellence Plan (GTEP)*, which was subsequently approved by your Board in September 2008. Exhibit 1 is a copy of the GTEP, which includes the status and latest schedules for each of the 23 recommendations. To date, all of the GTEP projects have been completed. However, one of the projects (the introduction of e-pay/credit card payments) resulted in a recommendation which is yet to be implemented. RMA staff is currently working with IT Services, the Auditor and the Treasurer to establish e-pay/credit card payments.

Although not a “project” within the GTEP, one of the most significant recommendations in the consultant’s report was for the County to develop a single permit tracking and land use management system to be used by all agencies. That recommendation ultimately led to the current project to upgrade the County’s existing “Permits Plus” system to the “Accela Automation” system. That project is currently underway and on schedule to be delivered in early 2012 as called for in the contract approved by the Board last year.

## **DISCUSSION:**

As noted above, all of the improvement projects in the Board-approved GTEP are complete. This required a significant amount of staff effort not only within the Planning Division and RMA, but also the Public Works Agency, Fire Protection District, Agricultural Commissioner’s Office, Air Pollution Control District and others. In our report to your Board in mid-2010, we highlighted the new consolidated permit application, the establishment of the Development Review Committee and Permit Coordinator, the new single billing system and the initial metrics. In this status report, we would like to focus on some of the projects completed in the last six months as well as present the latest performance metrics.

## **Standard Conditions of Approval & Mitigation Measures for Discretionary Projects (GTEP #8):**

The development of standard conditions of approval and CEQA mitigation measures from every County agency/department for discretionary land use permits is intended to reduce inconsistencies and ensure greater certainty in standard conditioning from project to project. Given the number of departments (10) and the disparate nature of the existing conditions of approval and CEQA mitigation measures involved, this was an enormous undertaking which required significant staff time and well over a year to complete. The result, however, should substantially address the issues of inconsistency raised by County staff and our customers.

An important element of the new standard conditions is the new format, which was developed in consultation with the County Counsel's Office. The new format ensures that for each condition there is not only the standard condition language, but also a clear statement as to why the condition is being applied, when it needs to be fulfilled, and what County agency or department has regulatory oversight for that condition. Two sample standard conditions are enclosed as Exhibit 2. In addition to updating the existing conditions of approval and CEQA mitigation measures, a user guide has been developed to assist staff in preparing new, case specific conditions of approval when they are needed.

**Permit Process Training Program (GTEP #22):**

Included among the GTEP projects was the development a training session program for our customers, the public, and County staff in order to provide additional information and training about the various technical submittals and processing requirements for discretionary land use applications. These training sessions are also intended to provide an opportunity for our customers and the public to ask questions or make suggestions directly to the appropriate County staff. The training sessions have been set up so that they occur at a regular time and location so that anyone interested in the topics can plan accordingly to attend. The initial session was held in February; the schedule for the coming year is enclosed as Exhibit 3.

**Website Improvements(GTEP #9 & #10):**

The GTEP included two projects related to improving the information and expanding the County's web presence related to the discretionary permit process. The first was relatively simple and consisted of an effort to make sure all departments and agencies involved in the permitting process included up-to-date information on their individual websites. The second was a far more complex project to develop a new, "stand-alone" website devoted strictly to the County's discretionary land use permitting process. Again, as with the training sessions described above, this effort was designed toward getting as much information out to our customers as possible, and to do so in a manner that was as helpful as possible. The new website, called "One-Stop Permitting" was formally rolled out to the public on March 1, 2011 and can be found on the web at <http://onestoppermit.ventura.org>. Staff will be present at the Board meeting to present a brief demonstration of the new website.

**Metrics/Performance Measures:**

The two-year baseline period for the discretionary land use permit process metrics began on January 1, 2006, and ran through December 31, 2007. With this report, we now have almost two full years of data to compare to the base year. The comparison

period summarized in this report began on March 1, 2009 and ended on January 31, 2011. This timeframe was selected in order to capture as much change in the discretionary land use permit process as possible. March 1, 2009, was the launch date

for several improvements to the discretionary land use permit process implemented from the GTEP. These improvements included a new comprehensive permit application, Development Review Committee input on complex projects, and the date the new Discretionary Permit Coordinator began to meet with applicants and assist them with project submittals.

The metrics summarized in the remainder of this report provide a comparison between this post-improvement implementation two-year period (2009-2011) and the metrics for the baseline period (2006- 2007).

### **Discretionary Land Use Permit Applications - Volume and Current Status:**

There were 292 discretionary land use permit applications submitted in the nearly two year period between March 1, 2009 and January 31, 2011. The current status of these permits is shown below:

Approved and Completed Processing	174
Denied and Completed Processing	2
Withdrawn by the Applicant	12
Returned to Applicant for Inactivity	2
Still in Process	<u>102</u>
	292 Applications

By comparison, there were 415 discretionary permit applications submitted during the baseline reporting period.

### **Average Number of Days for Applications to Reach “Complete” Stage<sup>1</sup>:**

Two goals of this GTEP were to: (1) reduce the length of time it takes for a discretionary land use permit application to be deemed complete; and (2) reduce the number of times a permit application is deemed incomplete. Table 1 provides the average length of time for a permit application to reach the completeness determination stage for the 180 permits (of 292 total submitted in the reporting period) with permit application completeness dates. The remaining 112 discretionary land use permits submitted during the reporting period were either withdrawn, were recently submitted, or remain incomplete and cannot be represented in Table 1.

---

<sup>1</sup> *This is the length of time, expressed in days, from the date the initial application is formally submitted to the County for processing to the date the application is “deemed complete” in terms of the disclosure of relevant information for County land use processing. Formal processing of the permit application, including the determination of the appropriate environmental documentation, cannot begin until an application has been “deemed complete”. See Government Code § 65920 et seq. and NCZO §§ 8111-2.1 to 8111-2.4.*

**TABLE 1**  
**MEAN NUMBER OF DAYS FOR A DISCRETIONARY LAND USE**  
**PERMIT APPLICATION**  
**TO BE DEEMED COMPLETE<sup>2</sup>**

<b>Permit Type</b>	<b>Baseline Metric: January 2006- December 2007 (No. of Permits in Sample)</b>	<b>Current Metric: March 2009 – January 2011 (No. of Permits in Sample)</b>	<b>Change in Processing Time</b>
<b>Planned Development Permit</b>	217 days (37)	52 days (21)	-76%
<b>Minor Modification Permit</b>	159 days (26)	43 days (34)	-70%
<b>Major Modification Permit</b>	302 days (6)	47 days (21)	-80%
<b>Conditional Use Permit</b>	145 days (62)	48 days (21)	-70%
<b>Parcel Map Waiver/Lot Line Adjustment</b>	162 days (47)	58 days (10)	-64%
<b>Parcel Map Waiver/Subdivision</b>	295 days (12)	No Data (0)	N/A
<b>Parcel Map Waiver Merger</b>	132 days (22)	29 days (3)	-78%
<b>Variance</b>	229 (3)	29 (3)	-87%

<sup>2</sup> The number of days the applicant was gathering new reports and materials for a resubmittal to the County was subtracted from the processing time before calculating the mean shown in the New Metric column. Note: the number of days the applicant was working on their permit application during the "incomplete" stage was not previously tracked by the Permits Plus database prior to implementation of discretionary permit improvements and, therefore, is not reflected in the Baseline Metric column.

Although the data for some permit types is based on a smaller sample size than the baseline data, it is notable that in every discretionary land use permit type, the new metrics reveal an improvement in completeness determination time of more than 60%. This level of improvement is significant, but our target remains 30 days and staff will continue to work to improve the process further.

Quasi-legislative actions like zone changes, ordinance amendments, and General Plan Amendments are not shown in Table 1 because only two privately initiated applications were submitted during the reporting period and neither is very far in processing. Although these quasi-legislative projects are exempt from the timeframes of the California Permit Streamlining Act, the Planning Division is tracking these and will include them in future performance reports when such applications are received and processed.

### **Number of Times a Discretionary Land Use Permit Application was Deemed Incomplete:**

Since March, 2009, 27 percent (49 of 180) of the permit applications that reached the “complete” stage were deemed incomplete at least once. Only nine of those 49 applicants (approx. 18%) received a second incomplete letter. In contrast, the baseline metrics period revealed that 42% of all permit applications were deemed “incomplete” and returned to the applicant at least once.

### **Average Length of Time to Process Discretionary Land Use Permit Applications<sup>3</sup>:**

In the current metrics reporting period only one discretionary permit application submitted after March 1, 2009 was reviewed by the Board of Supervisors. This was a major modification to an existing Conditional Use Permit to allow expansion of the Piru Wastewater Treatment Plant. This major modification was processed in 167 days.

During the same reporting period, there were seven discretionary permits reviewed by the Planning Commission. Of these, three were conditional use permits, where comparable baseline data was available for comparison. Though the sample sizes are relatively low, the chart below illustrates an average six month decrease in total processing time for conditional use permits reviewed by the Planning Commission.

---

<sup>3</sup> *This is the length of time, expressed in days, from the date the initial application was formally submitted to the County to the date the permit was approved or denied by the appropriate decision-making body.*

Permit Type	Baseline Metric: Jan 2006 - Dec 2007		Current Metric: Mar 2009 - Jan 2011		Percentage Change
	Average Processing Time (days)	No. of Permits	Average Processing Time (days)	No. of Permits	
Planning Commission Conditional Use Permit	402	3	220	3	-45%

Mirroring the results above, the average (mean) length of time from permit application submittal to review by the Planning Commission for all project types in the baseline reporting period was 366 days. The average processing time for the seven projects reviewed by the Planning Commission during the current metrics reporting period was 218 days.

Virtually all of the discretionary land use permits in the current metrics reporting period were approved by the Planning Director, either after a public hearing or administratively per the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. Table 2 illustrates the change in processing time for Planning Director approved permits that were submitted after March 1, 2009 and have been approved or denied.

Permit Adjustment and Coastal Site Plan Adjustment permits do not require a formal Planning Director hearing, but are administratively approved or denied by the Planning Director. Typically, these applications are very minor in scope and require less time. However, as shown in Table 3, improvements in processing time have been achieved at this level as well.

There were 91 Permit Adjustment and Coastal Site Plan Adjustment applications submitted between March 1, 2009 and January 31, 2011. Sixty-eight of the 91 submitted applications have been approved and are shown in Table 3 below. Though there was less room for improvement, given the speed with which these permits were processed in the baseline metric period, both the mean processing time as well as the variation in processing time have improved over the baseline metrics collected.

**TABLE 2  
 MEAN NUMBER OF DAYS TO COMPLETE PROCESSING OF  
 PLANNING DIRECTOR APPROVED PROJECTS<sup>4</sup>**

<b>Permit Type</b>	<b>Baseline Metric: January 2006- December 2007 Processing Time in Days (No. of Permits in Sample)</b>	<b>Current Metric: March 2009 – January 2011 Processing Time in Days (No. of Permits in Sample)</b>	<b>Percentage Improvement</b>
<b>Planned Development Permit</b>	291 (24) Range: 48-659 days	107 (20) Range: 17-227 days	-63%
<b>Minor Modification Permit</b>	267 (18) Range: 88-561 days	112 (25) Range: 49-224 days	-58%
<b>Major Modification Permit</b>	391 (1) Range: N/A	No Data (0)	No Data
<b>Conditional Use Permit</b>	189 (48) Range: 25-738 days	197 (9) Range: 138-336 days	+4%
<b>Parcel Map Waiver/Lot Line Adjustment</b>	178 (24) Range: 42-583 days	80 (9) Range: 48-127 days	-55%
<b>Parcel Map Waiver/Subdivision</b>	487 (3) Range: 324-672 days	No Data (0)	No Data
<b>Parcel Map Waiver Merger</b>	129 days (14) Range: 52-540 days	84 (9) Range: 50-138 days	-35%

<sup>4</sup> In calculating the processing time, timeframes where the applicant requested a hold on processing of the permit for various reasons is subtracted from the overall processing time so that it more accurately reflects the amount of time the Case Planner was working on the permit. Note: this information was not previously tracked by the Permits Plus database prior to implementation of discretionary permit improvements and, therefore, is not reflected in the Baseline Metric data above.



**TABLE 3**  
**MEAN NUMBER OF DAYS TO COMPLETE PROCESSING OF**  
**ADMINISTRATIVELY APPROVED PERMIT ADJUSTMENTS**

<b>Permit Type</b>	<b>Baseline Metric: January 2006 - December 2007 Processing Time in Days (No. of Permits in Sample)</b>	<b>Current Metric: March 2009 – January 2011 Processing Time in Days (No. of Permits in Sample)</b>	<b>Percentage Improvement</b>
<b>Site Plan Adjustment</b>	71 days (18) Range: 0-452 days	44 days (8) Range: 1-185 days	-38%
<b>Permit Adjustment</b>	69 days (67) Range: 2-431 days	36 days (60) Range: 1-125 days	-47%

**CONCLUSION**

The metrics/performance measures evaluated since March 2009 indicate there has been much progress made in the County’s discretionary land use permitting process. Many of the GTEP recommendations that have been implemented to date were directed toward improving the discretionary permit application completeness phase of the process. And the current metrics point to a high level of success in this area. Two more recently completed GTEP projects, the *Initial Study Assessment Guidelines* and the *Standard Conditions/Mitigations* projects, are directed toward the post-permit application completeness phase of permit processing. With the implementation of those GTEP projects, RMA, and other County agencies and departments associated with discretionary permit processing, are hopeful that results similar to those shown to date in the completeness phase of the process will be realized.

Board of Supervisors

March 8, 2011

Page 10 of 10

This letter has been reviewed by the County Executive Office, Auditor-Controller's Office and the County Counsel's Office. If you have any questions concerning this item, please contact either Kim Prillhart at 654-2481, or Chris Stephens at (805) 654-2661.



---

Chris Stephens  
RMA Director



---

Kim Prillhart  
Planning Director

Attachment:           Exhibit 1 - Discretionary Permit Process Get-To-Excellence Plan  
                              Exhibit 2 - Sample Standard Condition  
                              Exhibit 3 - Training Session Schedule for 2011

Action Plan					Exhibit 1									
25-Feb-11					Get-To-Excellence Plan									
KAIZEN	PROJECT	IMPLEMENT NOW	PRIORITY	VSA - DISCRETIONARY PERMIT PROCESS										
				Recommendation	Team Lead/Belt	Plan Dates		Problem Statement	Status	Date Edited	Additional Comments	Charter		
Start	Finish													
1	x		1	Create Application Checklists by Permit or Project Type	Dan Klemann/GB Elaine Crandall, GB Linda Le	1-Aug-2008	60 days Oct	Develop an intelligent, on-line questionnaire and create project type specific checklists for applicants, based on the permit type. Each checklist to include the requirements of all development review agencies (e.g. traffic, drainage, fire, etc. requirements).	COMPLETE	03-Mar-09	Although complete, the form content will be continuously reviewed and revised as needed to ensure it is functioning as needed. The Planning Division will be creating tailored application forms for telecommunication facilities and subdivision projects.	X		
2	x		1	Create a Template for a Comprehensive Project Description and Comprehensive Site Plan (or Map) to Be Submitted with All New Applications	Dan Klemann/GB Elaine Crandall, GB Linda Le	1-Aug-2008	60 days Oct	Address existing problem of inadequate site plan and project description submittals that lead to predictable delays in permit processing. Often, the submitted project descriptions or site plans do not satisfy all agencies. This would be an attempt to define the requirements for all agencies at the outset of the process.	COMPLETE	03-Mar-09	Although complete, the form content will be continuously reviewed and revised as needed to ensure it is functioning as needed. The Planning Division will be creating tailored application forms for telecommunication facilities and subdivision projects.	X		
3		x	1	Create New Positions for a "High-Level Intake Coordinator" and Assistant to Facilitate One-Stop Application Submittal	Chris Stephens, Matt Carroll	1-Aug-2008	90 days Nov	Delays in permit processing frequently occur due to the absence of someone familiar with the requirements from all of the agencies/departments involved in the discretionary review process. Many departments have no-one available to answer general questions or to make standards and regulations clear at the beginning of the process. Lack of face-to-face contact early in the review process has been cited as an issue by many customers.	COMPLETE	03-Mar-09	The new Permit Coordinator joined the County in January 2009. He began fully functioning in the role of Permit Coordinator on March 2, 2009.			
4		x	1	Draft a Written Procedure for How Other Agencies Should Respond to Requests by Applicants for Modifications to Permit Conditions and Mitigation Measures After Project Approval	Tricia Maier	1-Aug-2008	30 days Sept	Applicants frequently request individual agencies to modify project conditions and mitigation measures after the Board and Planning Commission have already approved the permit.	COMPLETE	03-Mar-09	The Planning Division prepared and distributed a memo to reviewing agencies restating the policy that any substantial revisions to an existing permit and its conditions require approval by the original decision making body.			
5		x	1	Establish and Convene a Development Review Committee that Will Meet Regularly to Provide Agency Coordinated, Quality Responses to Applicants Early in the Permitting Process	Brian Trushinski	1-Aug-2008	150 days Jan	Currently the customer is required to travel between departments to receive general feedback on a proposed project, leading to longer processing time and haphazard agency communication and coordination.	COMPLETE	03-Mar-09	The Development Review Committee policies and procedures are complete. All agencies have not yet appointed their members and alternates. As experience is gained reviewing projects, adjustments to the procedures will be reviewed and implemented as needed. Also, work regarding "post-application" DRC review processes remains to be done.			

Action Plan					Get-To-Excellence Plan									
25-Feb-11														
KAIZEN	PROJECT	IMPLEMENT NOW	PRIORITY	VSA - DISCRETIONARY PERMIT PROCESS										
				Recommendation	Team Lead/Belt	Plan Dates		Problem Statement	Status	Date Edited	Additional Comments	Charter		
Start	Finish													
6	x		1	Update Land Use Permitting Policies & Procedures in Each Department Responsible for Development Review	Tricia Maier/BB Sean Payne, GB Myra Chavez	1-Nov-2008	180 days June	Address problem of outdated departmental policies and procedures as they relate to permit processing and identify unnecessary overlap between departments responsible for project review.	COMPLETE	09-Jul-09	Work now being done to identify best platform for sharing P & Ps among all departments. This will have the added benefit of improving policy coordination between agencies.	X		
7	x		1	Update Initial Study Assessment Guidelines (Each Agency/Department Responsible for Updating Their Section)	Bruce Smith/BB Sean Payne,GB Rosa Cenicerros	1-Sep-2008	Mar-11	Address problem of outdated Initial Study Assessment Guidelines and improve policy coordination between agencies.	Final Board Action scheduled for 3-1-11	26-Jan-11	On July 27, 2010 the Board of Supervisors approved the Administrative Supplement and all ISAG changes except those related to Biological Resources. Biological Resources section was directed to be returned to Board in six months after further review and comment by affected groups and individuals. Two public forums were held, additional comments received, and minor changes were drafted to provide clarification.	X		
8	x		1	Standardize Mitigation Measures and the Conditions of Approval Used by Each Agency/Division for Development Projects	Winston Wright/BB Sean Payne, GB Rosa Cenicerros	15-Sep-2009	Oct-10	The standardization of CEQA mitigation measures and conditions of approval for all land use entitlements will minimize the potential for inconsistent application of regulations and mitigation measures from like or similar projects.	COMPLETE	28-Jan-11	The standard conditions and mitigation measures will be updated periodically to reflect changes in state and local law, and as experience is gained in applying them to specific projects. The master list will be stored on the RMA Intranet under the Policies Icon.	X		
9	x		1	Update Individual Agency/Division Website Information Related to the Discretionary Permit Process	Tricia Maier BB Sean Payne, GB Jose Moreno	1-Feb-2010	Sep-10	Much of the information available to applicants on individual department websites does not reflect current regulations and standards.	COMPLETE	28-Jan-11	Completed as part of GTEP Project #10. Individual agencies/departments are responsible for updating and maintaining permitting information to be linked to the centralized website described in GTEP #10.	X		
10	x		1	Create a Customer Friendly One-Stop Website for Discretionary Permit Applicants	Kim Rodriguez BB Sean Payne, Joe Clark, GB	1-Oct-2009	Oct-10	Permitting information on the internet is found on many different webpages for various agencies and departments, is often outdated, and sometimes unavailable. This would be a centralized, agency-neutral website that would incorporate pertinent information from all agencies/departments.	COMPLETE	07-Feb-11	Project meetings that included all permitting departments/agencies have been completed and the website developed and agreed upon. Each department/agency is responsible for updating and maintaining information on their portion of the One Stop Permitting Website. Work to launch the "live" website is underway and expected to be launched on March 1, 2011.	X		

Action Plan					Get-To-Excellence Plan									
25-Feb-11														
KAIZEN	PROJECT	IMPLEMENT NOW	PRIORITY	VSA - DISCRETIONARY PERMIT PROCESS										
				Recommendation	Team Lead/Belt	Plan Dates		Problem Statement	Status	Date Edited	Additional Comments	Charter		
Start	Finish													
11	x		1	Identify Discretionary Uses That May Lend Themselves to Being Processed Ministerially with Adopted Development Standards	Bruce Smith BB Sean Payne, GB Lisa Yoshimura	1-Jan-2011	Aug-11	Review existing NCZO Use Matrix to identify uses that might qualify for being approved over-the-counter (ministerially) rather than through the longer discretionary review process.	COMPLETE	26-Jan-11	Report has been completed, which recommends administrative guidelines for antenna permits, but no ordinance amendments are proposed at this time. Administrative Guidelines could be prepared using existing staff, but Zoning Ordinance Amendments would require budgetary/staffing augmentation.	X		
12		x	2	Provide Input to the VS Champions for one Countywide Permitting Database to Tie all Agencies Together	Joe Clark/Sean Payne	1-Aug-2008	90 days Nov	There are too many databases across the county that don't "talk" to each other. This hinders the ability of County agencies to easily share information during the permit process.	COMPLETE	07-Jul-10	There is a need to identify all agencies information databases related to the discretionary permitting process and migrate all of the data into Permits Plus to ensure that all agencies have access to the same "real time" data and would eliminate the need for duplicate entries. To be done as part of Accela Automation Project.			
13		x	2	Establish Future Benchmarking Based on Current Metrics For On-Going Evaluation of the Discretionary Permit Process	Tricia Maier	1-Aug-2008	15 days Sept	Currently there is no on-going feedback loop for evaluation of the permitting process.	COMPLETE	11-Mar-09	The new entries to Permits Plus by project planners will, over time, allow a comparison and evaluation of permit processing efficiency.			
14		x	2	Review Existing Customer Service Survey for Potential Improvements	Massoud Araghi / Tricia Maier	1-Sep-2008	30 days Oct	Generate a Customer Service Survey that Allows for Public Comments on All Agencies Involved in Development Review.	COMPLETE	05-Oct-09	Collecting electronic versions of existing forms. Project needs to follow initiation of new consolidated application process.			
15		x	2	Assess the Need for a Public Kiosk with Web Access for Applicants in Various Locations	Ben Emami	1-Sep-2008	30 days Oct	Currently, it's nearly impossible for an applicant to collect the necessary information to file for a permit without driving to the Government Center. A public kiosk with web access in Simi Valley or the Fire Dept. headquarters in Camarillo might make it possible for applicants to gather and print information in more convenient locations.	COMPLETE	07-Jul-09	Future installation of kiosks dependent on the development of the new one-stop permitting website.			
16		x	2	Provide Routine Training on the County's General Plan Policies and CEQA Regulations to Staff in Other County Agencies/Divisions	Bruce Smith	1-Sep-2008	30 days Oct	Cross agency information and basic CEQA training for agencies outside of the Planning Division are lacking.	COMPLETE	03-Mar-09	Senior Planning staff, with assistance from County Counsel, could provide CEQA 101 and General Plan workshops to staff in other agencies involved in the development review process.			

Action Plan					Get-To-Excellence Plan									
25-Feb-11														
KAIZEN	PROJECT	IMPLEMENT NOW	PRIORITY	VSA - DISCRETIONARY PERMIT PROCESS										
				Recommendation	Team Lead/Belt	Plan Dates		Problem Statement	Status	Date Edited	Additional Comments	Charter		
Start	Finish													
17	x		2	Identify and Address the Roadblocks to a Viable Condition Compliance Process	Tricia Maier/GB Jennie Pittman GB Gina Spoerlien, BB Sean Payne	1-May-2010	Aug-10	There is a notable lack of coordination between agencies when it comes to enforcement of permit conditions after a permit is issued.	COMPLETE	02-Feb-11	This item required review of enforcement procedures and responsibilities for the standard conditions of approval developed in GTEP #8. A new "Monitoring and Reporting" section was added to each condition. It is understood that when Accela Automation is developed a new record for "Condition Satisfaction" will be developed that will allow all departments/agencies to track and enforce the conditions they apply to discretionary projects.	X		
18		x	3	Identify GIS Datalayers Currently Underutilized by Other Agencies and Facilitate Better Sharing of this Data	Debbie Millais/BB Sean Payne, GB Joe Clark	1-Aug-2008	180 days Feb	Existing, valuable GIS information is not available to all agencies.	COMPLETE	09-Jul-09	Identified layers are in process of being finalized and uploaded to common GIS repository.	X		
19		x	3	Develop One Billing/ Deposit/ Fee Process for Applicants	Chris Stephens, Alec Pringle/GB Linda Le	1-Sep-2008	60 days Nov	Eliminate duplication of effort and streamline - customer pays at one location or receives one bill rather than three.	COMPLETE	03-Mar-09	Implemented March 2, 2009.	X		
20			x	3	Explore the Potential for Applicants to use Credit Cards or Paypal to Pay Permit Fees, Deposits and Monthly Bills	Chris Stephens, Matt Carroll	1-Jan-2009	Sep-10	Applicants often voice the desire to pay their bills by credit card.	COMPLETE Working to Implement	01-Sep-10	Board approved credit card vendor in January, 2010. Development meetings underway with ITSD/ Auditor-Controller/ Treasury to determine cost estimate. Cost estimate anticipated in March, implementation date unknown.		
21			x	3	Improve Existing Signage at the RMA and PWA Public Counters	Jennifer Padre	1-Dec-2009	Dec-10	There is a lack of customer-friendly signage to guide customers to the appropriate locations for permit processing.	COMPLETE	09-Feb-11	Survey of existing signage is complete; new division/directional signs to be installed February. This project has been combined with an RMA Lean project to review and better coordinate RMA counter activities.		
22			x	3	Create Regular Public/Consultant Training Sessions on Topical Land Use Development Issues	Jim O'Tousa/GB Rosa Ceniceros, GB Liz Sandoval, BB Sean Payne	1-Dec-2009	Sep-10	Permitting materials submitted by applicants and consultants are often inadequate. Regular trainings would address this by clearly spelling out the requirements. Ideally, these workshops would also create a feedback loop to provide more input from the "voice of the customer".	COMPLETE	14-Feb-11	Training Guide is complete. First year schedule of monthly sessions has been developed. Initial Training session held on February 10, 2011.	X	

Action Plan					Get-To-Excellence Plan								
25-Feb-11													
KAIZEN	PROJECT	IMPLEMENT NOW	PRIORITY	VSA - DISCRETIONARY PERMIT PROCESS		Team Lead/Belt	Plan Dates		Problem Statement	Status	Date Edited	Additional Comments	Charter
				Recommendation			Start	Finish					
23	x		N/A	Improve the Environmental Impact Report Contract (EIR) Administration Process		Dan Klemann/GB Elaine Crandall	1-Jun-2008	45 days	No consistency in the procedures for contracting with outside firms for preparation of EIRs for projects that require them.	COMPLETE	27-Mar-09	Streamlining of the RFQ/RFP process to contract with consulting firms for preparation of project Environmental Impact Reports.	X

**PRIORITY RATING**

- 1 = ESSENTIAL/SHOWSTOPPER
- 2 = HIGHLY RECOMMENDED
- 3 = HIGHLY DESIREABLE

**STATUS LEGEND**

- Preparation** Belt and Lead working together to design event
- In Process** Event has started
- Complete** Charter deliverables are complete
- Implementation** Lead is implementing change actions

## Exhibit 2

### SAMPLE STANDARD CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR A DISCRETIONARY PERMIT

The following are two standard conditions to be used for applications requesting a permit to operate a *Recreational Vehicle/Mini-Storage Facility*. These conditions apply only to non-coastal projects.

#### 1. Prohibition of Businesses Operating from Rental Spaces

**Purpose:** In order to comply with §8107-31.12, §8107-31.14, and §8107-31.17 of the *Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance*.

**Requirement:** Permittee shall not:

- a. conduct any business or "garage sales" in or from any rental space within the facility;
- b. allow bulk storage of waste products or materials, painting or mechanical work (except for maintenance of the facility); or
- c. allow automobile bodywork or painting within any rental space within the facility.

**Documentation:** The Permittee shall include this condition in each lease to rent a space within the facility. Each person or entity renting a space with the facility must agree to this condition in writing as part of a lease agreement.

**Timing:** Prior to the issuance of a Zoning Clearance for use inauguration, the Permittee shall provide the Planning Division with a standard lease agreement that will be used for rental spaces within the facility. The Permittee shall ensure compliance with this condition by requiring all tenants to sign a lease agreement that includes this condition and by enforcing the terms of said lease.

**Monitoring and Reporting:** A copy of the approved standard lease agreement provided by the Permittee will be maintained in the project file. Upon request, the Permittee shall provide any current lease agreements to the Planning Division to ascertain whether the facility is in compliance with this condition. The Planning Division has the authority to conduct periodic site inspections to ensure ongoing compliance with this condition consistent with the requirements of §8114-3 of the *Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance*.



## 2. **Graffiti**

**Purpose:** In order to comply with §8107-31.15 of the *Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance*.

**Requirement:** The Permittee shall submit a graffiti control plan for approval by the Planning Director. The said plan must address the prevention of graffiti by such means as landscaping materials, special surface finishes, misting/irrigation strategies, alarms, or other means deemed feasible by the Planning Director. The plan must also include strategies which detail how graffiti will be removed within 48 hours of its discovery.

**Documentation:** The Permittee shall prepare the graffiti control plan.

**Timing:** The graffiti control plan shall be approved by the Planning Division prior to Zoning Clearance for construction and the Permittee shall implement the plan in accordance with the schedule approved by the Planning Director.

**Monitoring and Reporting:** The Planning Division has the authority to conduct periodic site inspections to ensure ongoing compliance with this condition pursuant to the requirements of §8114-3 of the *Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance*.



### Exhibit 3

## TRAINING SESSION PROGRAM DISCRETIONARY LAND USE PERMIT PROCESS

### Training Sessions Topics & Schedule

The training sessions will be held once a month beginning in February, 2011. The initial schedule of topics and presenters for the first year is as follows:

MONTH	GENERAL TOPIC	DEPARTMENT/PRESENTER
February 10	General Plan and CEQA Overview	RMA / Bruce Smith
March 10	The Discretionary Permit Application	RMA / Winston Wright
April 14	Construction Waste Diversion Program	IWMD / Howard E. Hope
May 12	Access and Water Supply Requirements	FPD / Larry Williams
June 9	Water Supply/Availability	EHD / Melinda Talent
July 14	Groundwater Resource Submittals	WPD / Glenn Luscombe
August 11	Grading Permit Requirements	ESD Development / Jim Myers
September 8	Agricultural Buffer Requirements	Ag Commissioner/Rita Graham
October 13	Transportation Impacts/Traffic Studies	TD / Ben Emami
November 10	Geology & Soil Report Requirements	ESD Development / Jim O'Tousa
December 8	Map Submittal Requirements	ESD Survey & Mapping/Wayne Battleson
January 12, 2012	Stormwater Permitting Requirements	WPD / Ewelina Mutkowska
February 9, 2012	Floodplain Submittal Requirements	WPD / PWA Representative

### Training Session Location/Time

The training sessions will generally be held in either Room 311 or the Multi-Purpose Room at the County Hall of Administration, 800 South Victoria Avenue, Ventura. The sessions will be held on the second Thursday of the month and they will begin at 5:00 PM.