

BUILDING DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
Minutes of January 18, 2011 Meeting

Jon Morris opened the Building-Development Commission (BDC) meeting at **3:02 p.m. on Tuesday, January 18th, 2011.**

Present: Jon Morris, Ed Horne, Travis Haston, Elliot Mann, Jonathan Wood, Zeke Acosta, Dave Shultz, Buford Lovett, Bernice Cutler and Will Caulder

Absent: Harry Sherrill and Kevin Silva

1. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The motion by Jonathan Wood seconded by Travis Haston to approve the December 21st, 2010 meeting minutes passed unanimously.

2. BDC MEMBER ISSUES AND COMMENTS

Jim Bartl discussed the BDC membership. We have two members that failed to make attendance last year. Barry Hanson failed to make attendance. We have a nominee from the Heating and Cooling Contractor's Association. William Caulder did not meet attendance requirements; we are awaiting re-nomination of William Caulder from the AGC. Until the AGC re-nominates William is welcome to stay and participate as a public member, but will not be able to vote as a BDC member.

3. PUBLIC ATTENDEE ISSUES AND COMMENTS

No public attendee issues or comments.

4. RFBA VOTE on ELECTRONIC PERMITTING

The RFBA on Electronic Permitting was sent out to all BDC members Friday, January 14th. Jim asked the BDC to consider a formal vote. The department has a long term goal of having a totally paperless process. This is something you all are aware of. We have been working on this for a long time, although you may not be aware of how far back this goes, 1992 and 1993.

- Dept has long term goal of a totally paperless process
- Insp by MDT was went paperless in 1992-93
- Documents and Records available by web since 2001
- Meck-SI introduced 2006
- HIP & TIP introduced 2008
- RDS EPS introduced 2008

We are now in the final stages of automating the biggest component left which is Commercial Plan Review.

- OnSchedule and Mega review in one EPS development stream
- CTAC small project review/permitting in 2nd development stream
- Both should be in place by summer-fall, 2011
- At that point, Meck County will have one of most high tech Permitting & Inspections processes in US

In the November meeting we discussed the two issues that bring up:

- a) Technology development (noted above).
 - By December, 2011, all P&I services will have fully electronic capacity.
 - At that point, the only question is "will customers use the most efficient process?"
 - b) Beyond technology, need to revise Department policy and LUESA Fee Ordinance;
 - Establishing the electronic self permitting process as the fee funded base line,
 - Collecting added "cost of service" for customer's hard copies needing staff conversion.
- So the idea is to use the Fee Ordinance to maximize use of electronic tools
 - Dept has never dictated drawing or business format
 - But once the process is fully electronic, that's how we'll do our work;
 - Converting any hard copy (non electronic) submittals to an electronic format

- So the Fee Ord change idea is simple; a) recover the cost of converting hard copy submittals to electronic, and b) add that cost to the individual permit fee.
- RFBA sent to you last week contains four areas of change
 - a) Added charge if we convert/enter a paper permit application or plan review application
 - b) Added charge for converting/scanning hard copy drawings or construction documents, converting to an electronic format (drawings themselves or supporting documentation).
 - c) Added charge for other agency fee collection which is not auto-electronic
 - d) Account charge for hard copy statement requests
- Other to note:
 - AE's who convert drawings/documents and submit in electronic format are no charge
 - Computers will be available in HMC lobby for customers needing same
 - None of these would be refundable if permit is cancelled (cost already incurred)
- We've discussed this policy and Fee Ordinance change for quite a while
 - Department staff met with BDC Chair Jon Morris on Nov 9
 - Discussed with BDC in November meeting
 - BDC budget Sub-comm discussed in both Fy10 & Fy11 budget processes
 - Final drafts reviewed with M Bethune (changes plugged in) and Comm Cooksey (supports)
 - As noted in e-mail, CM requested agenda date to be set after Public Policy workshops.
- Questions? Followed by request BDC formal vote indicating support for;
 - a) **New budget policy, saying when electronic service is available, it's the budget baseline.**
 - b) **May 5 RFBA on Electronic Permitting with activation date of July 1st, 2011.**

Jim Bartl asked for a vote today on two things; one is the RFBA itself and the second is concurrence that the budget policy should change such that when electronic service is available that is the budget baseline.

Questions:

EM: We've had similar discussions using the example if you want to purchase an airline ticket online, there is no cost but if you want to purchase said ticket by phone you will be charged \$25.00. We are expending a lot more labor and effort dealing with paper. Technology is out there and very convenient for people to use and if they choose not to use it they should have to pay a small premium. From our perspective; I think there is logic to it.

DS: There are a lot of small architectural firms out there and the cost of conversion is taking most of their profit out.

JM: I'm used to seeing seven sets of plans come in on my projects and the amount of paper that is and the reimbursable charge on the end of my bill that presents; seems to outweigh any cost savings taking it to Duncan Parnell.

BC: For architects that charge reimbursables separately, they will shift the reimbursable charge of having the drawings converted.

DS: Right now the engineering groups that I've talked to have no problem with this because they are already there, most of them. It's the small architectural firms that are having some real heartache. The small one man firms do a lot of business and in these hard times they work on a small margin. They can bill their paper copies right to the owner without any problem.

BC: If we publish the information that this is going to be the requirement, the owners are aware of that and the architects can say your reimbursable is going to include this conversion instead of all the paper copies we used to make. It will cost less in the end.

TH: Nine times out of ten; we're not incurring the cost nor transferring the cost. It's all handled prior to me even touching a copy. As far as all the residential contractors; there will still be paper copies that are going to have to be created off of those electronic plans. You are still going to have 10 copies that someone is paying for; usually the owner (architect or designer is passing it right down to the owner).

JM: One of Commissioner Cooksey's questions was how might this affect the small business person?

BC: Even the one man interior designers I know are working on computers. To send it .pdf is going to be a breath of fresh air for them.

JM: That is one of the things we conveyed to Commissioner Cooksey; this is a step along the way, if it's five years or fifteen years out where everything is completely interactive. Commissioner Cooksey wanted to highlight how technologically efficient this department is relative to other departments and how that has enabled Code Enforcement to weather the storm a bit better than it might have otherwise.

DS: One reason our office went electronic a long time ago was when we get right down to the bid it goes way over budget and we have to start over. We can change electronic a little bit easier than I can change all those drawings.

JM: We'll have digital storage cost now instead of warehouse storage cost but it's got to be easier.

BC: I think you are right particularly about the paper because it may not be so much in the residential end but in the commercial side when you're getting 200 – 250 sheet sets; the ones that are submitted to the building department are never what you need in the field w/ the exception of those that are stamped and they're kept in the office. You're producing more for what you're using in the field and half the time throwing away the ones you pick up that have been permitted.

A request of formal vote was presented to the BDC in support of Electronic Permitting and new budget policy on standard electronic service. Dave Shultz made the motion to approve this proposal with Bernice Cutler seconding it. Vote passed unanimously.

JM: William, your company is about as advanced as anyone on electronic used in the field w/ superintendents; how long did it take you to ramp up; what sort of quirks did you run into, are you there yet or is it a five year thing?

WC: It started like everyone else. There is a time period where the field changed and people were resistant and superintendents still said "I need a copy". You still have the guys that want a copy. We've had to do different things for different groups of people, like a lot of superintendents now have ipads. Our guys put everything in a file for them and they just carry it around if they are on the jobsite, they pull it open right there; but not all welcome that technology. Three years ago when we had a project like Johnson and Whales where the drawings were changing and we were working on early stage drawings; we could spend \$50k or \$60k in document reproduction between getting revised drawings to subcontractors and now it's probably twice that size. Current cost may be under \$5,000 because now we send an email saying the following drawings are available online. We track when they get them, how many copies they downloaded; so we still have the paper trail that was so important before. People now are more open to the electronic process. Even when we get a project that goes out to bid we will go to the contractors/subcontractors and say, drawings are available here on our web site. The good thing is they can go in and look for them. If there are 100 drawings and 30 of those drawings are not needed they can look only those drawings needed. Where before you have to buy them, look at them before finding the 30 you didn't need in the first place.

5. RFBA INTRODUCTION on LCU/TP/TCO/CO

Gene Morton provided a brief summary of the purpose of the LCU/TP/TCO/CO RFBA: We are in the process of updating the Building Development Ordinance which is our legal instrument used to enforce the NC State Building Code. You as BDC members are in contact more with the Fee Ordinance. The majority of our changes we bring through the BDC to approve have more to do with fee changes than the Building Development Ordinance. The ordinance doesn't make a lot of specific references to the NC Building Code Section but there are several that are in the Building Development Ordinance that we've noticed because of a recent change specifically to the code requirements surrounding temporary utilities. As we went through the ordinance to determine what might need to be changed we noticed several items that are outdated and may be reference code sections that were in previous code cycles. In addition to the cleanup we are trying to do; the most significant change is the rules and regulations relative to Temporary Utilities which is something that we had in place for a long time. Basically the old requirements required you to only have certain circuits that were protected in GFI

circuits when connecting utilities to that building that was under construction. That has been significantly relaxed so that now the rules essentially say you can connect anything that is inspected and approved as long as you have at least one circuit that is GFI protected. The rules have really changed and opened up when you can connect utilities to a building that is under construction. There are some sections that are referenced in the Building Development Ordinance that we want to correct. In addition; the process has been somewhat broken down in that once those utilities were connected through the application process according to policy, it was only good for 90 days. At the end of 90 days you actually had to physically come back in to the building department to restart the process. We're trying to streamline this process and prevent our customers from actually having to come back into the office every 90 days to renew. Gary Mullis provided BDC members with a handout and gave a brief explanation of said handout.

- Staff continues to review the policies and procedures regarding Limited Conditional Utilities (LCU), Temporary Power/Utilities (TU), Temporary CO's and CO's.
- Several Code sections that are referenced in the BDC ordinance no longer match actual Code section numbers and staff is recommending corrective changes.
- In addition NC State Code revisions have changed the minimum requirements for Temporary Power/Utilities making it much easier to qualify for TU.
- Staff recommends an update to the BDC ordinance to reflect code revisions and a change in the process to make it more user friendly, paperless and more manageable for TU.

Questions:

EM: It's encouraging professionally to see it loosen up. For a while with inspectors being so busy and being so limited on its use a lot of residential people just really stopped using it when frankly at this time of the year it does make for a much better product by being able to have the proper utilities, so it's encouraging to see this.

JM: Referencing the fee going from \$65 to \$100; are you saying that you'll be charged \$100 once or it will be charged when you initially apply and then every time that 90 day renewal comes around?

GMullis: Every time the renewal comes up (90 days) you are charged \$100. In the past this was abused.

EM: Is it fair that everyone pays for the abusers?

GMullis: The reality of what we have to go out and do in the inspection process is much more because the scope went up.

WC: The system will catch the guy taking advantage because it automatically renews and charges the account it doesn't wait on him to be honest and come to the county and renew.

GMorton: The big difference is some customers pay the \$65 every 90 days; we have a lot of customers that do not pay anything after the initial fee is collected.

EM: You have to go back out every 90 days and physically do an inspection, so there is a service and not just a renewal there's an activity that follows.

GMullis: Correct, we have to make an inspection in order to clear the renewal; it is automatically put on our inspection plate.

GMorton: The scope of the inspection is far expanded.

TH: Gary, are the violation procedures currently the same as they will be?

GMullis: No, violation now because the admin code has changed, the violation procedures we had to follow would be different because we did not choose as an organization to follow our application agreement in the past and now we will be asking that plus we have teeth within the code that says we can disconnect it immediately.

JM: A general comment: it's good that we're filling in all the gaps on the fee schedule where we are not charging appropriately for the services we provide and it seems like every 90 days we are filling in another gap and the fees keep going up and up incrementally. I agree every time that we've increased fees it has been indeed for a service like this where we are going and inspecting and we are not getting paid for it. But I think now that we're getting closer and closer to filling in all the gaps that we are not charging for services when

the workload does increase hopefully this will put us in a position to be able to lower our overall rates more quickly.

JB: It may seem like we bring this to you every 90 days but that is not the case. The first one we went over today was something that we talked about for years. I don't think we have brought you a fee ordinance change this year, since the one that was part of last year's budget process. We talk a lot but actual formal proposal has not been brought to you since the last budget process.

JM: A customer may say hey my bill changed back in April or May and now w/ electronic drawings my bill might change a bit and then we're going to have more inspections and I understand every single one that we've done but what we are doing is filling all the crevices; we're going to have a nice even playing field with a broader base of fees that cover what actual costs are allowing us to lower the rate more quickly when the time comes; that would be my hope. That is what we promised our customers that we would do; we would sunset these fee increases for technology and that sort of thing and our history has shown that we do.

JB: Technology fee increase is entirely separate scheduled to be sunset. The other things, the level of fee increases we discuss with you every year; I believe it was in 2006 that we actually cut fees 10%. So every year as part of the budget process we go through this stuff.

BC: I want to clarify that in combining them and making it Utilities as opposed to Power and Gas they are requiring someone to say connect the gas when they weren't planning on it in order to get temporary power.

GMullis: Which ever they are requiring. For each trade that would be involved if they don't need mechanical inspections then we would not charge for that.

BC: I just want to make sure they can still get their placard w/ power even though it says utilities (either/or and not and).

GMullis: Very seldom you are going to have Gas w/out Power; a lot of times you are going to have electrical but very seldom you'd ever have the gas w/out the electrical.

6. IRT GOALS on 2nd and 3rd DAYS

- As requested by the BDC, staff studied the last eight months of inspection response time statistics to determine recommendations for 2nd and 3rd day inspection response time goals.
- The current 1st day (On-time) goal is 85% (85 – 90%).
- Based on the study and discussions with staff and customers, staff recommends maintaining 1st day and 3rd day goal; 1st day goal of the current 85-90% range and 3rd day goal of 97%. See detailed topic handout.

Gene Morton distributed a proposal to BDC members for “beyond 1st day inspection response time goals”. Gene discussed inspection response time being 90% for years and in the past we've had very little trouble in meeting this goal. Currently, with the change in the economy and the reduction in staffing it has become more and more challenging. Seven months back the decision was made to change our first day response goal to 85% – 90% range. This allowed us an opportunity to meet first day goals in a reasonable amount of time and gave us a chance to see what our ability would be. We weren't sure if we could meet the 85% goal with the reduced staffing; turns out as you can see in the hand out for the most part; we've been able to meet and exceed the 85% – 90%. We are still monitoring this and would like to track a few more months of data so we have more assurance that the 85% is going to be a reasonable goal for us to live with for awhile. We continue to study this. Jeff Griffin went over the handout and covered some of the factors that we considered in our recommendation. Gene Morton reiterated the proposal to leave the first day goal for awhile longer at a range of 85% - 90% while we continue to collect data and to set a 3rd day goal at 97%.

Questions:

EM: Do you feel more efficient right now? When you look at the inspections performed they have dropped each month so the workload is lower but hopefully these graph lines will go back up when we enter the spring do we feel better equipped to maintain these levels?

JGriffin: We've entered a slower period especially w/ the snow events that have had an impact on us but I think it will be a challenge once we get into the warmer months again and we could get a slight up-tick. Our

staff is spread pretty thin. They've got large geographical areas. We've got a front-end goal of the first day but once that's missed and the damage is done there is no back-in goal. If we didn't have something for staff and we didn't get it the first day you just let it roll on out until you eventually get to it because there is no back-in goal.

JB: There is one intangible on the efficiency that comes back to something we discussed previously. We're more efficient than we were in putting more time in to solve problems upfront I think that is going to pay off big time down the road. Staff is working very well in teams with the managers. I think they have yet to see the full payback but I think we all believe it's going to be there.

WC: When the department makes changes is when I usually get the complaints. It's a little push back from everyone. Inspectors often times try to meet the 90% turnaround time so we go through periods where accusations are made that inspections are being canceled and when an inspector calls and says I'm not coming out today, I need you to call back in your inspection; so he would cancel the inspection in the system and have them call it back in. Most of the teams work with that because everyone understands everyone's load but when it starts to be the third canceled call in and it's 3, 4, 5 days later that's usually when it escalates. They call me to say can you make a call because my inspector hasn't been here in two weeks and he keeps canceling my inspection. Making sure that we aren't so goal minded that people are doing whatever to meet the goal when the goal is not being met.

GMorton: I would like to hear of any of those events if you don't mind sharing.

WC: I always like to call because people think they are going to be retaliated against if they do that.

JGriffin: We've had those conversations with staff as to what's appropriate to cancel and not cancel, let roll, reschedule. If we get any specific feedback we'll address it.

WC: When I get the calls I just call you typically I'll call one of you and say here's what we are hearing, please make sure it's not an issue.

JB: Keep doing that, because as much as we can get specifics on it we can follow up on it. With any organization and even after the RIF we have a large body of inspectors; we still have 60 inspectors. It's more than anyone else in the state and this is a big change in how we do business. But the way it is designed now, they can get help and the contractor can get help. All they have to do is say. They have managers now that are not just their trade. The more people communicate the more this works. The less people communicate it's going to break down and it's not going to work the way we all said it would work. It takes communication.

TH: I get that feedback some from my superintendants but it's only when the inspector hesitates or doesn't call prior to heading to the job and then they call when they are there and we can't get there right away. At that point they say I can't be there for 30 minutes so call back in tomorrow.

GMullis: That may be a separate line subject but I need to discuss that w/ Jeff Griffin and make time for you to express some things to us. Our communication policy is that auto notify was to take the place of phone calls and we either knew by appointment or we worked with the auto notify not calling the contractor 30 minutes before we come to the job the auto notify process does that automatically. If our customers are not familiar with that process then we need to communicate better with our customer.

TH: This is when the auto notify is not happening. The auto notify is subject to the inspector triggering that right?

JGriffin: Yes he has to key a button before he goes to that job site.

TH: But that's not happening when those isolated instances are occurring. It seems like they don't want to promise you a time. They're not doing the auto notify and we call and leave a message and they'll check the message on their voicemail and then call my office back.

JB: If you can tell us when this happens, we'll chase it down from our end. Everyone admits that this is the slow time of the year and we're still doing 12,300 inspections in December. There is a high level of customer service events and some of those are not going to work the way we want them to, but if we know about it we'll work on it. Why it's important for us to know, and I know that your superintendents of the field probably have some reluctance to tell us when things like this happen.

WC: I'm just putting it out there. It happens, not to say our superintendents don't do things; I'm sure you all have stories the same way. There are always two sides to the story, but the issue has been out there. It has been out there for years. We've had several go rounds with it.

GM: I think we have staff that sometime misunderstands the expectations that we have on them. Sometimes they think that pass rate means more than Code Enforcement. We've had some in the past that would pass things in records to make sure their pass rates stayed up and we caught some of that and we have corrected that but if we can't find it and identify the problem it is nearly impossible for us to correct it. The auto notify is set up if you are the requestor, that's who the signal goes to. The signal goes to the number that is associated with the inspection request and you do need to just set it up once and it should work each time. We'll make sure yours is set up properly Zeke that something hasn't been disconnected. But if you were set up as the requestor and the notify message was suppose to come back to you; you should be getting those regularly with your inspections.

JGriffin: The only other comment I'll make is that some of the issues that we talk about on a monthly basis with staff is the cancellation; so you are aware of it. We have instructed the staff that they can't just cancel an inspection request. They must put in the notes Jon Doe called me at such and such time requesting cancellation; job not ready. They have to give management notice as to why they are canceling.

JM: I think what I am hearing Will say is that sometimes the customer is being coached into canceling it.

WC: No just the customer will call and say they had an inspection called in two days ago; it's now canceled and I have to call it back in. Meaning the inspector is canceling.

GM: That should not be happening and we certainly want to hear about any of these.

7. FY12 BDC BUDGET SUBCOMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

JB: Next we'll discuss volunteers to the FY12 Budget BDC Sub-committee. Last year's members were Elliot Mann, Harry Sherrill, Wanda Towler, Will Caulder, Jon Morris, Trent Haston and Zeke Acosta. Wanda's gone my understanding is that Trent wanted to participate as a public member; Travis, do you want to explain your thoughts on that?

TH: He just mentioned that he would want to still be involved with the Budget itself.

JB: The BDC has the option of requesting public members to participate in the budget subcommittee process. It doesn't just have to be BDC members just as you conscript people to serve on task forces and things like that you could ask members of the public sector. As it stands now, you have Elliot Mann, Harry Sherrill, William Caulder, Jon Morris, Trent Haston and Zeke Acosta. Do you want to pick someone to replace Wanda?

JM: Kevin's our public representative and Wanda always brought a great perspective from that arena to the meetings. I don't know if Kevin brings the same perspective. He certainly doesn't have the institutional knowledge of this committee that Wanda does.

JB: The thing that Wanda brought is that she used to be an Assistant County Manager, she understood the political side of it and before she was Assistant County Manager, she came out of the finance side. She knew the numbers side inside and out.

EH: Are you good with the people you mentioned previously?

JB: Yes, we have strong representation for the homebuilders. If the engineers feel comfortable Harry will be representing them too. Harry is a strong advocate. Will is a strong representative for the contractors and the renovation contractors and the subcontractors are being represented by Trent and by Zeke that puts that side of it into the mix because there is a large difference between small projects and big projects in Residential and Commercial. This is why we put the mix together. What's missing is the public perspective and the numbers side and you're not going to find that; that was rare what Wanda brought to the table.

EH: What about asking Wanda if she would be interested in serving on the Budget Subcommittee?

JB: I could ask her and am not sure what she is doing now but I can ask.

JM: We would love to have her because I do thing she brings a great perspective.

JB: There is nothing wrong with asking and I'll be happy to do that.

JB: Other than that, the names stay as we have sketched out. We have tentatively set meeting dates of Friday 2-11th 1-3, Tuesday 3-1st 10-1, and Friday 3-11th 1-4. We've had to juggle our schedules because some things have

changed in my schedule. I will get a formal invitation out to you folks sometime in the next week to 10 days. Rebecca will take care of the Outlook appointment, what I am going to do is send you a formal memo that talks about the things we are going to cover at each meeting; an overview of our work and the schedule.

- Preparing draft memo to budget subcomm members
- Need budget sub-comm volunteers; Fy11 was E Mann, Harry S, Wanda, Will C, Jon M, Trent H, Zeke
 - So need replacements for Wanda and Trent
- currently planning on 3 meetings, about 2 – 3 hrs long; tentative dates
 - Friday, Feb 11, 1-3pm__, Tuesday, March 1, 10-1pm__, Friday, March 11, 1-4pm__
- Plan is that BDC March 15 meeting will be budget only

These are tentative dates. The final schedule may move around as the CM's office clarifies the Fy12 budget process, but we will work hard to hold those dates.

8. QUARTERLY REPORTS

8.1. Commercial Plan Review Report

Special report note: we do not have a typed report to give you as we are sorting out some reporting nomenclature confusion, which we discovered while computing mid-year numbers.

- This impacts the total project review cycle counts, which differs from the discipline review cycle counts.
- It requires correction in the July and October reports as well. We will issue this report and reissue the cover to the July and October reports before the next BDC meeting.
- The pass rate and %AAN use, as well as the most common defects listed below were not affected by the reporting error.

Part I:

- 81% of projects pass on 1st rev'w; 98% have passed after 2nd rev'w
- pass rates on 1st review by trade:
Bldg – 77%; -Elec – 89%; -Mech – 85%; Plbg – 82%;

Part II: most common defects: examples (most frequent almost all same as last quarter, but reordered)

Bldg: egress, AE passive fire protection, accessible routes
Elec: wiring methods, service eqpt location, load calcs, conductor types, service conductors
Mech: ventilation/exhaust, condensate drain piping, eqpt approval, eqpt accessibility, Energy Code
Plbg: venting, minimum facilities, fixture requirements, accessibility req't, water pipe req'ts

Part III: 1st rev'w use of approved as noted at 32% by all trades on the average (up from 29%)

biggest users; Fire (86%)
critical path users; Bldg (25%), Elec (14%), Mech (9%), Plbg (18%), Zoning (4%)

8.2. Code Compliance report: now have 13 years of this report

- “Not ready” up a little in Bldg (6.28%) & Elec (4.2%), and down a little in Mech (4.8%) & Plbg (7.18%)
- Rough/finish % split varies, some up, some down
 - Bldg; rough @ 34.44% (down 2%), finish @ 26.35% (up 2%)
 - Elec; rough @ 13.07 (down 1.5%), finish @ 69.28% (up ½%)
 - Mech; rough @ 18.02% (down 3%), finish @ 67.54% (down 2%)
 - Plbg; rough @ 21.93% (down 1%), finish @ 47.26% (down 4%)
- Higher number of new items than in past (B-3, -4, M-4, P-4).

8.3. Consistency Team report

- Front end:
 - customer letter on Permit Extension Act of 2009 and Session Law 2010-177
 - customer letter on Code Compliance summary
- Building: 33 issues addressed in QA format, 16 residential and 17 commercial

- Electrical: 28 issues addressed in QA format,
- Plumbing/Mechanical/Fuel Gas:
 - Plumbing; 7 new Q&A topics
 - Mechanical; 6 new Q&A topics
 - Fuel Gas; 4 new Q&A topics
- Note; Commercial Plan Review consistency issues are covered in building section above.

8.4. Initial Technical Advisory Board Quarterly Report

Jim asked Phil Edwards to review the TAB Quarterly Report and explain where we are going.

PE: This is the first TAB quarterly report. What we'd like for you to do is review and see if this is what you need, or if there are any changes you need. The first item is the TAB meeting report, which would typically have the minutes of the meeting as well as any projects that were submitted to the panel to include any decisions that the panel rendered. The second portion is the Green Build team activity; this is where we keep you abreast of how the team is working. We finalized the team in December and we are now looking for green related training activities. We've seen a few webinars from ICC so we are plugging into those as we start up and of course we are looking for any other educational opportunities for this group, the Green Team, which is comprised of staff throughout the department. The last item is any other sustainable design issues. Is this the type of report that you need or is there something else you would like to see, this is what we need to know from you.

JB: If you'll recall when we first started reporting back on the Green Permit Rebate Program on a quarterly basis; we went through a mock quarter where we made up a report, gave it to you, asked your thoughts, you made comments, gave back to us, we brought it back in the next meeting and in closing we made some final comments and that's what we stuck with for the year and one half that we did reports of the program. This is similar; we are giving you a first shot on how we will be reporting to you on a quarterly basis. You can make comments now or you can take it away, adjust it and bring it back. We can put it back on the agenda to receive final comments. We want to come up with some idea of how you want us to report on this.

BC: I think your item at the back where you are mentioning the IGCC and so on; I think if you would maintain an item that includes any discussion you have because of the members of that group and where they come from discussions related to code and green code and USGBC and LEED requirements that are in motion related to each other so if LEED is coming up with something that's counteracting or not working with code that's something that I think you would discuss even if there is not a specific. Is that something you can bring up when you have a meeting and have any discussion related to it while those brains are in the room and then put it in the report?

JB: That's a good point. I think we could add that to the agenda of TAB; kind of an open inquiry for things that they've heard that are cooking on the LEED side and then the Code Administrators reflecting on how that might plug in or be at odds with what we see coming down the road.

BC: USGBC and LEED changes so frequently that I would think that is something we'll continue to talk about. Right now in the absence of an application form; is there a formal application?

PE: Yes we have an application form.

RS: I can email the form to you along with the link.

BC: I've got someone. When you are asking about education opportunities; are you interested in having local people that are involved in those kinds of projects doing any kind of education for the group or is that conflictive?

PE: We would welcome any type of education opportunity available to us.

JB: We'll come back to you in the next meeting to see if you have any other thoughts.

9. QUARTERLY BDC BULLETIN EXERCISE

Previous bulletin topics:

<p>January, 2009</p> <p>Residential Drawing Submittal changes</p> <p>Utility transformer draft policy</p> <p>Changes to www.meckpermit.com</p> <p>Progress in OnSchedule process revisions</p> <p>Development of future single portal for permit submittals</p>	<p>April, 2009</p> <p>Budget impact on customers</p> <p>Gatekeeper changes</p> <p>Virtual co-location with the City of Charlotte</p> <p>NC transition to the 2009 NC Building Code family</p> <p>AE Pass Rate Incentives Program dev't progress</p> <p>ISO rating report</p>	<p>July, 2009</p> <p>Fy10 budget impact on customers</p> <p>AE Pass Rate data collection</p> <p>Self-gatekeeping</p> <p>NACO award on RDS-EPS</p> <p>Accessibility Code format change</p> <p>CFD single family review delay</p>	<p>October, 2009</p> <p>Dept Reorganization</p> <p>Low voltage permits</p> <p>Self-Gatekeeping transition</p> <p>Accessibility Code transition</p> <p>AE Pass Rate Incentives Program status & timeline</p> <p>GPR program status</p>
<p>January, 2010</p> <p>Reorganization focus on customer centric service</p> <p>Nissan ID's Meck process as best practice</p> <p>Trades Internet Permits (TIP)</p>	<p>April, 2010</p> <p>Fy11 budget presentation available</p> <p>Green Permit Rebates suspension</p> <p>Technical Advisory Board startup</p> <p>New Commercial Plan Review Tools</p>	<p>July, 2010</p> <p>Expanding TIP</p> <p>AE Pass Rate update</p> <p>Web tools for contractors</p> <p>Current inspection service levels</p> <p>2010 Reorg Field impact</p>	<p>October, 2010</p> <p>Why Meck County is a project asset</p> <p>Nissan ID's Meck process as best practice</p> <p>AE Pass Rate success</p> <p>Progress on reorg Plan</p> <p>Field Service improvements</p>
<p>January, 2011</p> <p>TAB purpose and customer participation</p> <p>Budget baseline changes and technology development</p> <p>Status of Electric Vehicle introduction</p> <p>Electrical journeyman's Program pilot</p> <p>Changes in www.meckpermit.com</p>			

10. DEPARTMENT STATISTICS and INITIATIVES REPORT

10.1. Statistics Report

10.1.1. Permit Revenue

December- \$836,225, with Fy11 YTD at \$5,395,171

Fy11 projected permit revenue at December, \$944,065/mo x 6 = \$5,664,390

- so at mid-year, we are below projection by \$262,219 or 4.75%

10.1.1.1. Revenue/Expense Status after 6 Months (50% of year)

- Revenue: Total revenue projection of \$13,328,353 breaks down into;
 - permit fees; \$11,328,781
 - Other revenue; \$1,749,572

- Tech surcharge transfer; \$250,000
- Status at 12/30/2010;
 - permit fee revenue; \$5,730,145 vs. projection of \$5.664M (see note 1)
 - Other revenue; \$1,032,046 vs. projection of \$874.8k (see note 2)
 - Tech surcharge collected; \$121,550

Note 1: this number includes Plan Review fees for OnSch Projects and Abandoned Plans which require the permit fee to be paid up front (these go into the permit fee revenue code when received). However, these payments (\$334k) aren't recognized as revenue (in BDC monthly) until the project is actually permitted

Note 2: this includes amounts billed in the system not yet rec'd (CMS Plan Rev'w @ \$54.2k).

- Expenses: original budget was \$13,328,353
 - Status at 12/30/2010
 - With encumbrances; \$6,941,963
 - Actual amount expensed; \$6,570,211
- Conclusions: see graphic charts
 - Permit Revenue: at 50.6% of total Fy11 permit revenue estimate; 47.6% if adjusted for note 1
 - Other Revenue: at 58.9% total Fy11 other revenue estimate
 - Expenses: at 49.35% of total Fy11 expense estimate
 - Total picture;
 - Conservatively, after 6 months looks like we're about \$17k below breakeven.
 - However, yearend projections indicate we'll be about \$470k ahead; expenses projected to save \$258k and revenue projected to take in \$201k over projection.

10.1.1.2. Mid-year Code Enforcement Data Sheet Included in Handout

JB: Jim explained the Revenue and Expense picture from the data sheet that was handed out the BDC meeting. Please see attachment. The handout is the Revenue and Expense picture so far this year. It shows the gross expense picture is under budget and we project through the end of the year we'll be under budget by approx. \$260K as we sit here today; it's .65% under budget. Revenue picture which is the bottom chart is made up of permit revenue and other revenue. Other revenue is running about 9% over by our projection. The permit revenue is running approximately 2.4% under projection (or just a shade over).

10.1.2. Construction Value of Permits Issued

- December total - \$89,266,781, with YTD amount \$673,345,745
- Fy10 Total at December – \$751,760,685
- So YTD figure is down \$78.415M or off 11.6% from YTD at December, 2009

10.1.3. Permits Issued:

	November	December	3 Month Trend
Residential	3284	3602	3405/3255/3150/3284/3602
Commercial	1947	1855	2134/1784/2194/1947/1855
Other (Fire/Zone)	408	303	468/479/374/408/303
Total	5639	5760	6007/5518/5718/5639/5760

- Residential up 9.7%; commercial down 4.6%; total up 2%
- YTD Permit totals: comparison to Fy10YTD after the 2nd quarter
 - Residential permits total 20,200, up 7.4% from 18,802 on Dec. 31, 2009
 - Includes SF new constr permits at 885, down 21% from Dec ,2009 YTD total of 1071
 - Commercial permits total 11,741 up 8.55% from 10,816 on Dec. 31, 2009
 - Total permits at 34,395, up 7.23% from 32,075 on Dec. 31, 2009

10.1.4. Inspection Activity: Inspections Performed

Insp. Req.	Nov	Dec	Insp. Perf.	Nov	Dec	% Change
Bldg.	3921	3355	Bldg.	3888	3334	-14.25%
Elec.	4698	4527	Elec.	4719	4654	-1.4%
Mech.	2717	2652	Mech.	2688	2676	- 0.45%
Plbg.	1777	1755	Plbg.	1760	1750	-0.4%
Total	13,113	12,289	Total	13,055	12,414	-4.1%

- Bldg down 14%+; Elec down 1.5%; Mech & Plbg down <.5%
 - total inspections requested down 56.3% __, total inspections performed down 4.1% __
- Inspections performed were 101% of inspections requested
- YTD Inspections completed: comparison to Fy10 after the 2nd quarter
 - building – 24,522, down 8.4% from 26,769 on Dec. 31, 2009
 - electrical – 29,227, down 9.9% from 32,431 on Dec. 31, 2009
 - mechanical – 16,588, down 7.86% from 18,003 on Dec. 31, 2009
 - plumbing – 11,130, down 18.4% from 13,642 on Dec. 31, 2009
 - total-81,467, down 10.4% from 90,845 on Dec. 31, 2009

10.1.4.1 Inspection Activity: Inspections Response Time

Insp. Resp. Time	OnTime %		Total % After 24 Hrs. Late		Total % After 48 Hrs. Late		Average Resp. in Days	
	Nov	Dec	Nov	Dec	Nov	Dec	Nov	Dec
Bldg.	93.9	97	94.9	97.9	97.9	99.2	1.16	1.07
Elec.	83.7	88	86.9	91.7	94.4	97.1	1.39	1.25
Mech.	92.3	96.7	92.9	97.7	97.3	99.4	1.2	1.07
Plbg.	96.3	98.5	96.4	98.9	98.8	99.8	1.09	1.03
Total	90.2	93.8	91.8	95.7	96.6	98.5	1.24	1.13

- All trades improved 2%-3%
- YTD % inspections on time (in 1st 24 hours): for all disciplines 91.73%

10.1.5. Inspection Pass Rates for December, 2010:

OVERALL MONTHLY AV'G @ 87.99%, compared to 87.17% in November

Bldg: November – 82.42% **Elec:** November – 86.46%
 December – 83.09% December – 86.88%

Mech: November – 89.58% **Plbg:** November – 92.56%

December – 90.01%

December – 94.08%

- All improved, B/E/M about ½%, P about 1.5%
- YTD Inspection Pass Rate: for all disciplines 87.128%

10.1.5.1 CFD Inspection Pass Rate for December, 2010

- See handout; shows overall rate of 76.95% for December, or up 1.5% from November (75.5%).

10.1.6. OnSchedule and CTAC Numbers for December, 2010

CTAC:

- 79 first reviews
- Projects approval rate (pass/fail) – 67%
- CTAC was 35% of OnSch first review volume (79/79+149 = 228) = 35%

OnSchedule:

- October, 09: 131 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 95.04% all trades, 93.67% B/E/M/P only
- November, 09: 114 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 92.07% all trades, 91.09% B/E/M/P only
- December, 09: 106 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 94.72% all trades, 95.18% B/E/M/P only
- January, 10: 104 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 93.79% all trades, 93.28% B/E/M/P only
- February, 10: 119 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 94.49% all trades, 93.3% B/E/M/P only
- March, 10: 161- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 97.51% all trades, 97.16% B/E/M/P only
- April, 10: 138- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 95.87% all trades, 94.07% B/E/M/P only
- May, 10: 95 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 97.43% all trades, 97.61% B/E/M/P only
- June, 10: 153 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 89.71% all trades, 91.59% B/E/M/P only
- July, 10: 110 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 87% all trades, 90% B/E/M/P only
- August, 10: 154 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 87% all trades, 90% B/E/M/P only
- September, 10: 100 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 85% all trades, 83% B/E/M/P only
- October, 10: 158- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 92% all trades, 90% B/E/M/P only
- November, 10: 154- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 94% all trades, 94.25% B/E/M/P only
- December, 10: 149- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 74.5% all trades, 80% B/E/M/P only

Note: lower on time rate owed to holiday staffing and very low County zoning rate.

YTD % on time or early:

- 86.58% for all trades, 87.88% for B/E/M/P

Booking Lead Times

- OnSchedule Projects: **for reporting chart posted on line**, on January 3, showed
 - 1-2 hour projects; at 1 work day booking lead time
 - 3-4 hour projects; at 2 work days lead time, except;
 - Bldg-5 days and M/P-7 days
 - 5-8 hour projects; at 3 work days lead time, except
 - Bldg-7 days, M/P-13 days, and CFD-8 days
- CTAC plan review turnaround time; 5 work days across the board
- Express Review – booking lead time was;6 work days for small projects, 6 work days for large

10.2. Status Report on Various Department Initiatives

10.2.1. December Meeting Followup

10.2.1.1. Electronic Permitting Final RFBA Prep

- Met with Marvin Bethune On Jan 4th and Commissioner Neil Cooksey on Jan 5th

- See item 5.

10.2.1.2. meckpermit.com redesign changes into place

- Continuing to move new page designs into place on the website, with a completion target date of February 15.

10.2.1.3. BDC membership changes

- Two members failed to reach minimum attendance threshold in 2010.
 - Charlotte Plumbing, Heating and Cooling Contractors Association nominated Hal Hester as BDC rep.
 - Still working on status of Will Caulder rep for the General Contractors Association

10.2.2. NC BCC BIM-IPD Ad Hoc Committee progress

- The BIM-IPD Ad Hoc Committee completed its work on December 6.
- Lon McSwain delivered the revised BIM-IPD Admin Code Change Proposal to the BCC on December 14.
- Meeting of the joint Admin Code & Bldg Code Standing Committee to review and comment on the proposal is scheduled for Monday March 7, 2pm +/- . All Ad Hoc Comm members welcome to attend.
- This pushes the BCC action schedule to; public hearing at March 7 meeting, final vote at June 14 meeting.

10.2.3. Advance Electrical Journeyman's Program Testing Pilot

- BOCC approved Journeyman's Program change on December 7; program is set to convert on January 1
- First NCAEC administered test is scheduled for Jan 20 at 8:00, with 6-10 applicants registered.

10.3. OTHER

10.3.1. Status of Permit Extension Act of 2009

- Reminder on the basics
 - The Permit Extension Act of 2009 effectively suspended permit expirations ("stopped the clock" on construction start or continuation) for projects active on January 1, 2008, through December 31, 2010
 - Applied to both building permit and site work permits; in short stopped the permit validity clock
 - Session Law 2010-177 extending that period to December 31, 2011, but provide an "opt out" provision for local governments.
 - All local governments decided to stay in (not "opt out"), including Charlotte and all six Towns.
 - So active project permit expiration clock has now been stopped until January 1, 2012.
- On December, Department sent e-mail memo to all customers advising of same.

10.4. Manager/CA added comments

- *Wendell:* Jim just one quick reminder for the BDC members as of February 1, the Department will discontinue accepting American Express. We have sent out email blasts and posted notices on the web but wanted to mention it.
- **Special "Goodbye" to Phil Edwards; fortunate to have strong leadership in Code interps across the board in B/E/M/P; Phil E is big part of that.**
 - thanks for taking on the Tech LT chair, and years as M/P Chief.
 - Good luck in future endeavors

12. Adjournment

The January 18th, 2011 Building Development Commission meeting adjourned at 4:59 p.m.

NOTE: The next **BDC Meeting** is scheduled for **3:00 p.m., Tuesday, February 15th, 2011.** Please mark your calendars.