



CITY OF

PORTLAND, OREGON

BUREAU OF PLANNING

Gretchen Kafoury, Commissioner
Robert E. Stacey, Jr., Director
1120 S.W. 5th, Room 1002
Portland, Oregon 97204-1966
Telephone: (503) 796-7700
FAX: (503) 796-3156

April 8, 1992

MEMORANDUM

To: Mayor Clark and Members of the Council

From: Robert E. Stacey, Director *RES*
Bureau of Planning

Subject: **Minor Correction of FY 91-92 Fee Schedule**

The Bureau of Planning requests adoption of the attached fee ordinance, in order to correct for unanticipated costs in processing land use reviews. The draft ordinance (attached) makes three specific changes to the fee schedule adopted July 17, 1991. The changes affect fees for adjustments, minor land divisions, and notices of use determination.

No changes are proposed to the Comprehensive Plan or zoning code. The fee changes are minor in nature and will not impose a hardship on applicants. The revised fee schedule is shown as Exhibit A of the attached ordinance.

Background

In May 1991, City Council adopted a fee schedule for land use reviews and related planning services. The fee schedule was intended to achieve an overall 70 percent cost recovery for the bureau. Some reviews were assigned above 70 percent cost recovery; other reviews were assigned below 70 percent cost recovery. In July 1991, the Council adopted a minor amendment to the fee schedule.

Since July 1991, the Bureau of Planning has monitored fee revenues. Fee revenues are substantially lower than anticipated. The number of applications for land use reviews is also dramatically lower than projected, but not enough to account for the total fee revenue shortfall. This proposal addresses other factors responsible for not achieving the revenue target. Two factors that will be deferred for later study are the discount provided for combined reviews and the Hearings Officer fee.

Mayor Clark and Members of the Council
April 8, 1992
Page 2

A more complete evaluation of cost recovery will occur in fall 1992. At that time, the bureau will have collected 12 months of revenue and cost data using the new fee schedule.

Methodology for Setting Fees

There are two parts to setting a land use fee: estimating the average cost to process a certain review, and selecting a cost recovery rate for that review. Cost estimates for the FY 91-92 fee schedule came from a 1989 cost recovery study prepared by the Bureau of Planning. To account for inflation, the 1989 cost estimates were converted to 1991 dollars.

The 1989 data was limited in some respects. One limitation is that the number of lead reviews could not be distinguished from the non-lead reviews. That is, full-price, half-price and free reviews were all combined in the total count. Also, a case involving multiple adjustments was counted electronically as "one" review.

Another problem was created by the recording of costs. Planner time and support costs were generally recorded to the lead review in a case. For instance, in a case involving a Conditional Use and three Adjustments, expenses accrued to the Conditional Use as the lead review.

To more accurately capture the cost of an adjustment case, it is important to separate the lead from non-lead cases. Lead cases always require public notice, staff reports and public hearings. Non-lead cases are a different matter, in which cost savings are passed along to the applicant in the form of charging one-half the fee for the second and third reviews, and not charging for any other non-lead reviews. It is particularly important to isolate the lead cases for adjustment reviews, since they have the highest incidence of combined reviews of all land use review types.

Legislative Changes

House Bill 2261 of the 1991 legislative session has increased public notice and reporting requirements. As a result of these requirements, the bureau must now provide notice on minor land divisions and offer public notice to applicants of land use determinations. The current fee schedule predated these requirements. Two of the proposed changes were prompted by these changes in state law.

Specific Changes

Adjustments

Existing fees for adjustments are as follows: \$300 for residential projects and \$550 for nonresidential projects. These fees were based on an estimated \$666 in processing costs incurred by the Bureau of Planning. Based on more detailed analysis, the bureau now finds that adjustments cost the bureau an average \$844 per case. Keeping the rate of cost recovery, the proposed fees are \$380 for residential adjustments and \$700 for nonresidential adjustments. The revised analysis is described below.

During the first half of FY 91-92 (July - December), 57% of adjustment cases were lead reviews; the remaining 43% were non-lead reviews. This allocation of lead reviews and non-lead reviews is applied to the 1989 data, as shown below.

The formula for estimating the average cost of a single adjustment review pro-rates lead cases and non-lead cases as a portion of a total staff cost to process adjustment reviews. The 1989 cost recovery study identifies 45 adjustment cases at a total cost to the bureau of \$27,223. The total cost is converted to 1991 dollars by applying a 5% annual inflation rate for two years. The result is $(\$27,223) (1.10) = \$29,945.30$. L is the average cost of a lead adjustment case in 1991 dollars. It is assumed that non-lead adjustment cases cost the bureau one-half the cost of lead cases, given the efficiencies of consolidated public notice, staff report and hearing.

The formula is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &(\# \text{ of lead cases}) (\text{ave. cost/lead case}) \\ &+ (\# \text{ of non-lead cases}) (\text{ave. cost/non-lead case}) = \$29,945.30 \\ &(26) (L) + (19) (L/2) = \$29,945.30 \\ &35.5L = \$29,945.30 \\ &L = \$844 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the revised average cost to process adjustments is \$844 per case (1991 dollars).

The cost recovery rates for residential adjustments and nonresidential adjustments are set in the context of a Council-mandated 70% cost recovery target. The 1991 fee schedule, using a presumed \$666 bureau cost for an average adjustment case, set a relatively low cost recovery rate (high subsidy) for residential adjustments and a relatively high cost recovery rate (low subsidy) for nonresidential adjustments.

The stated cost recovery rates were as follows: 45% for residential projects and 83% for nonresidential projects. The public subsidy rate for residential projects is higher than average in order that fees not discourage housing repair and construction. Adjustment fees for nonresidential projects serve to compensate for the residential subsidy.

This proposal retains the 45% (residential) and 83% (nonresidential) cost recovery rates. Residential adjustments increase from \$300 to \$380. Nonresidential adjustments increase from \$550 to \$700. Since more than two-thirds of adjustment cases pay the residential rate, adjustment reviews will continue to contribute less than the Council-mandated target of 70% cost recovery.

Mayor Clark and Members of the Council
April 8, 1992
Page 4

Minor Land Divisions

The new state legislation also required that partitions be processed as "limited land use" reviews with public notice. The Council met this requirement by amending Title 34, Subdivision and Partitioning. Previously, the City did not provide public notice on minor land divisions. The fee for minor land divisions is increased from \$270 to \$370 to pay for the notice requirement.

Notice of Use Determination

In response to public notice requirements contained in recently adopted House Bill 2261, the bureau now issues Notices of Use Determination. Such notices are intended to inform adjacent property owners that planning staff has exercised discretion in classifying a particular use for a development permit. The exercise of discretion is inevitable since the code provides examples, not an exhaustive use list. The notices have the practical effect of limiting the appeal period for the use determination.

The bureau incurs a cost similar to the cost it bears to prepare a zoning confirmation letter for a new use. Cost components include preparing a site map, identifying the properties and owners, and preparing and mailing a notice. The attached fee schedule adds "Notice of Use Determination" to the section, "Other Planning Services".

Tentative Staff Recommendation

The Bureau of Planning recommends the following changes to the fee schedule:

1. Increase Adjustment review fees
 - Residential @ \$380 (up from \$300)
 - Nonresidential @ \$700 (up from \$550)
2. Increase the Minor Land Division fee from \$270 to \$370.
3. Under the fee schedule category entitled "Other Planning Services", add "Notice of Use Determination" and the charge of \$100.

Due to additional service costs and a revenue shortfall, the bureau urges that the attached ordinance take effect upon adoption.

RES:RHG:🍏
Attachment

cc: Richard Cooley, President, Planning Commission
Cay Kershner, Council Clerk
Elizabeth Normand, Land Use Hearings Office
Marion Yee, OFA
Darr Durham

Agenda No.

REPORT

16 53 20

Title

Adopt Report and Recommendation of the Bureau of Planning to amend land use fee schedule
(Report introduced by Commissioner Kafoury)

INTRODUCED BY <i>Commissioner Kafoury</i>	Filed:
NOTED BY COMMISSIONER	Barbara Clark Auditor of the City of Portland
Affairs	By: _____ Deputy
Finance and Administration	
Safety	
Utilities <i>CMK/MAB</i>	For Meeting of:
Works	
BUREAU APPROVAL	Action Taken:
Bureau: Planning	_____ Filed
Prepared by: Robert H. Glascock, AICP:mch	_____ Adopted
Date: 4/8/92	_____ Adopted; prepare contract
	_____ Approved
	_____ Amended
Budget Impact Review:	_____ Continued to: _____
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Completed <input type="checkbox"/> Not Required	
Bureau Head: Robert E. Stacey, Jr. Planning Director <i>[Signature]</i>	

AGENDA		FOUR-FIFTHS AGENDA	COMMISSIONERS VOTED AS FOLLOWS:		
				YEAS	NAYS
Consent	Regular	Blumenauer	Blumenauer		
NOTED BY		Bogle	Bogle		
City Attorney		Kafoury	Kafoury		
City Auditor		Lindberg	Lindberg		
City Engineer		Clark	Clark		

**TABLE 1: PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 1991-92 FEE SCHEDULE
FOR LAND USE REVIEWS, CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON¹**

Land Use Review Column #1	Proce- dure Type #2	Current Fee (\$) #3	Current Recovery Rate (%) #4	Estimated BOP Cost (\$) #5	Proposed BOP Fee (\$) ² #6	Hearings Officer Cost (\$) ³ #7	Proposed Combined Fee (\$) #8
Adjustment							
• Residential	II	250	30	720	380 [44%]	n/a	380
• Nonresidential	II	250	30	720	700 [82%]	n/a	700
Central City Plan Open Space Height Transfer	III	1,000	n/a	666	670 [100%]	615	1,285
Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment	III	1,000 + .001/sf	23	2,442	2,440 [100%]	615	3,055
Conditional Use							
• Major	III	750	28	2,220	1,270 [66%]	615	1,885
• Minor	II	250	28	1,665	955 [60%]	110	1,065
Conditional Use Master Plan and Central City Master Plan							
• New	III	750	n/a	2,442	2,440 [100%]	615	3,055
• Amendment	II	250	n/a	1,831	1,840 [100%]	110	1,950
Convenience Store	II	250	n/a	666	550 [85%]	110	660
Demolition							
• Hist. Landmarks and Contributing Buildings	III	750	n/a	2,442	2,000 [82%]	n/a	2,000
• Nonconforming Bldgs.	II	250	n/a	1,665	1,665 [100%]	n/a	1,665

Land Use Review Column #1	Proce- dure Type #2	Current Fee (\$) #3	Current Recovery Rate (%) #4	Estimated BOP Cost (\$) #5	Proposed BOP Fee (\$ rounded) ² #6	Hearings Officer Cost (\$) ³ #7	Proposed Combined Fee (\$) #8
Design							
• Major	III	0.3% of value (\$750 min, \$1,500 max)	19	2,031	0.3% of value (\$1,500 min, \$4,000 max) [98%]	n/a	0.3% of value (\$1,500 min, \$4,000 max)
• Minor/A (includes all minor design reviews not identified in Minor/B, below)	II	0.3% of value (\$250 min, \$1,500 max)	19	1,532	0.3% of const. cost (\$750 min, \$1,500 max) [55%]	n/a	0.3% of const. cost (\$250 min, \$1,500 max)
• Minor/B (awnings, signs, rooftop eqpt, storefront remodels affecting less than 25 feet of lineal frontage, colors in historic districts and all Type II residential projects)	II	0.3% of value (\$250 min, \$1,500 max)	19	1,532	0.3% of const. cost (\$100 min, \$750 max) [21 %]	n/a	0.3% of const. cost (\$250 min, \$1,500 max)
Environmental Conservation	II	250	n/a	688	290 [42%]	110	400
Environmental Protection	III	750	n/a	2,442	2,440 [100%]	615	3,055
Essential Service Provider	II	250	n/a	666	670 [0%]	110	780
Excavation & Fill	II	250	n/a	832	750 [91 %]	110	860
Forest Disturbance	II	250	n/a	688	290 [42%]	110	400
Greenway	II	250	13	1,665	750 [48%]	110	860
Hazardous Substances	II	250	n/a	832	750 [91 %]	110	860
Historical Landmark Designation or Removal							
• Individual Property Designation	III	0	0	0	0 [0%]	n/a	0
• Multiple Properties and Districts	III	0	0	2,442	2,000 [82%]	n/a	2,000
• Historical Landmark Removal	II	0	0	1,665	1,665 [100%]	n/a	1,665
Industrial Park	II	250	41	1,665	1,350 [82%]	110	1,460
Interim Resource Protection	II	250	n/a	688	290 [42%]	110	400

Table 1, Page 2
Minor Correction of FY 91-92 Fee Schedule

4/8/92

EXHIBIT A

165320

Land Use Review Column #1	Procedure Type #2	Current Fee (\$) #3	Current Recovery Rate (%) #4	Estimated BOP Cost (\$) #5	Proposed BOP Fee (\$ rounded) ² #6	Hearings Officer Cost (\$) ³ #7	Proposed Combined Fee (\$) #8
Lot Line Adjustment	n/a	100	61	166	165 [97%]	n/a	165
Major Land Division	III	750 + 15/lot	25	2,886	1,230 + 50/lot [73%]	615	1,845 + 50/lot
Minor Land Division	n/a	100 + 15/lot	46	433	370 [85%]	n/a	370
Nonconforming Use	II	250	n/a	1,665	1,665 [100%]	110	1,775
• C, E or I zone	III	750	n/a	2,220	2,220 [100%]	615	2,835
Planned Unit Development ⁴	III	750+15/unit>3	n/a	2,220	1,230 + 50/unit	615	1,845 +
• Major	II	250	n/a	100	[86%]	110	50/unit
• Minor					305 [53%]		415
Prop Tax Exemption	III	1,200	27	2,442	2,000 [82%]	615	2,615
Reasonable Use	II	250	n/a	888	890 [100%]	110	1,000
Revocable Permit Extension	III	750	54	1,665	1,665 [100%]	615	2,280
Rocky Butte Historic Features	III	n/a	n/a	1,831	750 [56%]	615	1,365
Statewide Planning Goal	III	2,000	n/a	2,442	2,440 [100%]	615	3,055
Substandard Lot	II	250	n/a	333	250 [86%]	110	380
Tree Removal	II	250	n/a	680	560 [85%]	110	670
Zoning Map Amendment	III	750	38	1,831	1,500 [86%]	615	2,115
Other unassigned reviews	II	250	n/a	666	470 [70%]	110	580
• Type II	III	750	n/a	2,220	1,540 [70%]	615	2,155
• Type III							

Table 1, Page 3
Minor Correction of FY 91-92 Fee Schedule

4/8/92

EXHIBIT A

165320

Land Use Review Column #1	Procedure Type #2	Current Fee (\$) #3	Current Recovery Rate (%) #4	Estimated BOP Cost (\$) #5	Proposed BOP Fee (\$ rounded) ² #6	Hearings Officer Cost (\$) ³ #7	Proposed Combined Fee (\$) #8
------------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--	---	--

Other Planning Services	Procedure Type	Current Fee (\$)	Current Recovery Rate (%)	Full BOP Cost (\$)	Proposed Fee (\$)
Residential Plan Check	n/a	25	n/a	n/a	1 per 1,000 const. cost (\$50 min.) [105%]
Nonresidential Plan Check	n/a	1 per 1,000 const. cost	n/a 0	n/a	1 per 1,000 const. cost (\$50 min.) [206%]
Pre-Application Conference	n/a	250 / 60	54	444	290 [65%]
Photo Copy	n/a	0.30 per page	n/a	0.30 per page	0.30 per page
Transcripts	n/a	2.50 per page	n/a	2.50 per page	2.50 per page
Notice of Use Determination	I	n/a	n/a	100	100
Zoning Confirmation					
• New	n/a	100	n/a	100	100
• Renewal	n/a	25	n/a	25	25

- 1 This fee schedule will be adjusted annually and evaluated periodically.
- 2 When more than one land use review is requested, the full Bureau of Planning fee for the most expensive review is charged, plus one-half the Bureau of Planning fee for the next two highest value reviews. No more than three concurrent land use reviews are charged for a given request.
- 3 In the case of concurrent PUD and land division reviews, only the PUD fee is charged.

**TABLE 4: FISCAL YEAR 1991-92 FEE SCHEDULE
FOR LAND USE REVIEWS, PLANNING SERVICES AND HEARINGS
CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON¹**

Land Use Review	Proce- dure Type	Bureau of Planning Fee (\$)²	Hearings Officer Fee (\$)	Combined Fee (\$)
Adjustment				
• Residential use (only)	II	380	n/a	380
• Nonresidential or mixed use	II	700	n/a	700
Central City Plan Open Space Height Transfer	III	670	615	1,285
Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment	III	2,440	615	3,055
Conditional Use				
• Major	III	1,270	615	1,885
• Minor	II	955	110	1,065
Conditional Use Master Plan and Central City Master Plan				
• New	III	2,440	615	3,055
• Amendment	II	1,840	110	1,950
Convenience Store	II	550	110	660
Demolition				
• Hist. Landmarks and Contributing Buildings	III	2,000	n/a	2,000
• Noncontributing Bldgs.	II	1,665	n/a	1,665
Design				
• Major	III	0.3% of const. cost (\$1,500 min, \$4,000 max)	n/a	0.3% of const. cost (\$1,500 min, \$4,000 max)
• Minor/A (all minor design reviews not identified in Minor/B (below).	II	0.3% of const. cost (\$750 min, \$1,500 max)	n/a	0.3% of const. cost (\$750 min, \$1,500 max)
• Minor/B (awnings, signs, rooftop equipment, storefront remodels affecting less than 25 lineal feet of frontage, colors in historic districts, and all Type II residential projects)	II	0.3% of const. cost (\$100 min, \$750 max)	n/a	0.3% of const. cost (\$100 min, \$750 max)
Environmental Conservation	II	290	110	400
Environmental Protection	III	2,440	615	3,055
	II	290	110	400
Essential Service Provider	II	670	110	780
Excavation & Fill	II	750	110	860
Forest Disturbance	II	290	110	400
Greenway	II	750	110	860
Hazardous Substances	II	750	110	860

Land Use Review	Procedure Type	Bureau of Planning Fee (\$) ²	Hearings Officer Fee (\$)	Combined Fee (\$)
Historical Landmark Designation or Removal				
• Individual Properties	III	0	n/a	0
• Multiple Properties and Districts	III	2,000	n/a	2,000
• Landmark Removal	II	1,665	n/a	1,665
Industrial Park	II	1,350	110	1,460
Interim Resource Protection	II	290	110	400
Lot Line Adjustment	n/a	165	n/a	165
Major Land Division	III	1,230 + 50/lot	615	1,845 + 50/lot
Minor Land Division	n/a	370	0	370
Nonconforming Use Establ.				
• Nonconforming Devt.	II	250	110	360
• Nonconforming Use	II	470	110	580
Nonconforming Use Review				
• C, E or I zone	II	1,665	110	1,775
• OS or R zone	III	2,220	615	2,835
Planned Unit Development³				
• Major	III	1,230 + 50/unit	615	1,845+50/unit
• Minor	II	305	110	415
Prop Tax Exemption	III	2,000	n/a	2,000
Reasonable Use	II	890	110	1,000
Revocable Permit Extension	III	1,665	615	2,280
Rocky Butte Historic Features	III	750	615	1,365
Statewide Planning Goal	III	2,440	615	3,055
Substandard Lot	II	250	110	360
Tree Removal	II	560	110	670
Zoning Map Amendment	III	1,500	615	2,115
Other unassigned reviews				
• Type II	II	470	110	580
• Type III	III	1,540	615	2,155

Other Planning Services	Fee (\$)
Plan Check	1 per 1,000 const. cost (\$50 min.)
Pre-Application Conference	290
Photo Copy	0.30 per page
Transcripts	2.50 per page
Notice of Use Determination	100
Zoning Confirmation	
• New	100
• Renewal	25

¹ This fee schedule will be adjusted annually and evaluated periodically.

² When more than one land use review is requested, the full Bureau of Planning fee for the most expensive review is charged, plus one-half the Bureau of Planning fee for the next two highest value reviews. No more than three concurrent land use reviews are charged for a given request. Concurrent fees do not apply to environmental reviews for separate development sites.

³ In the case of concurrent PUD and land division reviews, only the PUD fee is charged.

BUDGET/FINANCIAL ORDINANCE IMPACT STATEMENT

A. INITIATOR'S SUMMARY OF ORDINANCE ACTION

(Deliver original to Budget Office. Retain a copy.)

B.M.B. USE
No.

1. NAME OF INITIATOR	2. ROOM NO. 106/1002	3. TELE. NO.	4. BUREAU Planning
5. DEPARTMENT Public Utilities		6. TO BE a. DATE FILED: b. CALENDAR (Check One) <input type="checkbox"/> REGULAR <input type="checkbox"/> 4/5ths	
7. SUMMARY OF ACTION (State what you seek to accomplish, state effect on programs affected where known. Cite titles of funds, accounting codes, and BUC's, where applicable. Continue on reverse.)			

This Ordinance will authorize the City to increase land use review fees for selected items: adjustments and minor land divisions. Also, a new fee is created to cover the cost of mailing notice of notices of use determination decisions to affected property owners:

<u>Fee Title</u>	<u>Current Fee</u>	<u>Proposed Fee</u>	<u>Change</u>
Adjustment (residential)	\$ 300	\$ 380	+ 80
Adjustment (non-residential)	550	700	+ 150
Minor Land Division	270	370	+ 100
Notice of Use Determination	none	100	+ 100

When the current rates were established, based on the average cost per case, the Bureau did not factor in the discount allowed for multiple reviews on a single project. On a project, the developer pays full-fee for the first, most expensive review, half-price for the 2nd and 3rd review, all other reviews are free. A homeowner seeking 3 adjustments currently pays \$300 for the 1st, plus \$150 each for the 2nd and 3rd, a total of \$600. Under the new scheme the same homeowner would pay: $\$380 + 190 + 190 = \760 .

As a result, the Bureau is not collecting the proportion of processing costs authorized by Council. Reviews commonly done in multiples or as the 2nd and 3rd review on a project are adjustments and minor land divisions. 42% of adjustment reviews are processed as the 2nd or 3rd review at half-price; 1% are free.

The notice of use determination is created as a result of new state legislation. We are now required to notify adjacent property owners of administrative decisions. This involves preparing a site map, identifying the properties and the owners, preparing and mailing a notice.

Passage of this ordinance will result in slightly increased revenues for the balance of FY 91-92. If the fees are in effect for the 4th Quarter, adjustments and minor land divisions should produce \$9,000 additional revenue. Projections for notice of use determination revenues have not been done, due to lack of historical data. Income produced by these increases will merely reduce the deficit of fees generally, not provide "new" income.

8. APPROPRIATION UNIT HEAD (Typed name and signature)

9. AUTHORIZED DEPARTMENT
OFFICIAL (Signature)

ORDINANCE No. 165320

★ Amend land use fee schedule (Ordinance)

The City of Portland ordains:

Section 1. The Council finds:

1. During the FY 91-92 budget deliberations, the City Council directed that Bureau of Planning achieve a 70 percent cost recovery rate for site specific planning services. This directive means that applicants should pay, on average, 70 percent of processing costs incurred by the Bureau of Planning. The General Fund will pay for the remaining 30 percent of processing costs incurred by the bureau.
2. The Council set the cost recovery target as a means to retain General Fund resources allocated to the bureau for long range activities and district planning activities.
3. In order to implement the cost recovery target, the Council adopted Ordinance No. 164184, updating the fee schedule for land use applications and related planning services. In July 1991, the Council adopted Ordinance No. 164469, making minor corrections to the fee schedule.
4. For the first half of FY 91-92, fee revenues are substantially lower than anticipated. This discrepancy has prompted the Bureau of Planning to review certain fees. Fee increases are needed to achieve the cost recovery target.
5. If the cost recovery target is not met, the Bureau will be forced to reduce its workforce and scale back long range and district planning activities.
6. Selected land use review fees are increased to correct for unanticipated processing costs, including additional public notice requirements resulting from new state legislation. The affected fees include adjustments, minor land divisions and notices of use determination.
7. The amendments are limited in scope to fees charged for land use applications and related planning services. No changes are proposed to the Comprehensive Plan or zoning code. Therefore, no state planning goals or city Comprehensive Plan goals apply.

NOW, THEREFORE, the Council directs:


- a. That the report and recommendation of the Bureau of Planning entitled "Minor Correction of FY 91-92 Fee Schedule," is hereby adopted and incorporated by reference.

- b. Tables 1 and 4 of the report entitled "Fiscal Year 1991-92 Fee Schedule for Land Use Reviews, Planning Services and Hearings," adopted by the Portland City Council May 15, 1991 and amended July 17, 1991, are further amended as shown in Exhibit A attached to this ordinance.

Section 2. The Council declares that an emergency exists because the City is unable to achieve the target 70 percent cost recovery rate for site specific planning services until certain fees are adjusted. Therefore, this ordinance shall be in force and effect upon adoption of this ordinance.

Passed by the Council, **APR 15 1992**

Commissioner Gretchen Kafoury
Robert H. Glascock, AICP:RHG:Ⓜ
April 8, 1992

BARBARA CLARK
Auditor of the City of Portland
By  Deputy

700

Agenda No.

ORDINANCE NO. 165320

Title

★ Amend land use fee schedule (Ordinance)

INTRODUCED BY Commissioner Gretchen Kafoury	Filed: APR 10 1992
<i>Gretchen Kafoury</i> NOTED BY COMMISSIONER	Barbara Clark Auditor of the City of Portland
Affairs	By: <i>Cary Kershner</i> Deputy
Finance and Administration	
Safety	
Utilities <i>CMH/MPB</i>	For Meeting of:
Works	
BUREAU APPROVAL	
Bureau: Planning	
Prepared by: Robert H. Glascock, AICP:mch	Action Taken:
Date: 4-8-92	_____ Amended
	_____ Passed to 2nd Reading
Budget Impact Review:	_____ Continued to:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Completed <input type="checkbox"/> Not Required	
Bureau Head: Robert E. Stacey, Jr. Planning Director <i>RS</i>	

AGENDA		FOUR-FIFTHS AGENDA	COMMISSIONERS VOTED AS FOLLOWS:		
				YEAS	NAYS
Consent	Regular X	Blumenauer	Blumenauer	✓	
NOTED BY		Bogle	Bogle	✓	
City Attorney		Kafoury	Kafoury	✓	
City Auditor		Lindberg	Lindberg	✓	
City Engineer		Clark	Clark	✓	