

**BUILDING DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION**  
**Minutes of May 17, 2011 Meeting**

Jon Morris opened the Building-Development Commission (BDC) meeting at **3:05 p.m. on Tuesday, May 17th, 2011.**

**Present:** Jon Morris, Ed Horne, Travis Haston, Elliot Mann, Jonathan Wood, Zeke Acosta, Dave Shultz, Bernice Cutler, Will Caulder, Harry Sherrill, Kevin Silva, Hal Hester and Buford Lovett

**Absent:** No Absentees

**1. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

The motion by Harry Sherrill seconded by Dave Shultz to approve the April 19th, 2011 meeting minutes passed unanimously.

**2. BDC MEMBER ISSUES AND COMMENTS**

Harry Sherrill asked if the Charlotte Planning Report presentation had been rescheduled. Gene Morton explained that the City would come back to give a presentation if there were any updates. Said presentation will be rescheduled in the near future. Following is the Q and A discussion that ensued.

**JM:** The idea is that the Code Enforcement Department is going to have administer any changes that they make so that we need to be part of the dialogue.

**JB:** What we've told them is that hopefully this will all be done in an electronic venue so that they will be working with the same drawings that we have and we'll just set them up to get notification in the system. As far as who actually does the review it's them not us. It's their criteria, it's their review. They get a flag in the system and they get access to the drawings.

**EM:** But they impact our critical path, right?

**JB:** What we've told them is if they are smart they will stay out of the critical path.

**EM:** That's why we want to talk to them because they haven't proven that to me yet.

**JB:** Debra agrees with that. I'm not sure that they have thought about exactly how they will do that.

**JM:** We would love to invite them back to talk about the practicality and how that's implemented.

**JB:** Ok, I'll invite them back again. We would approach it the same way that we approach reviews with any of the towns. We want to be sure we are working with the same set of information, that we're not looking at one set and they are looking at another set and we've encouraged them to plan to have this up and running after we have electronic submittals in place because it will just make life a lot easier for everybody. The customer only has to submit one set of drawings, they don't have to submit several sets and then however they do their field verification. Tim and I have talked with them about the different places we can put flags inside the system if we know to put them in. We've designed something where if it's a project that's a concern on their issues then they would have something that would notify them when the project is at some point in the rough. They do the plan review and they do the inspection if they want. Does that answer your question?

Ed Horne thanked Joe Weathers and Gary Mullis for always helping through various situations.

**3. PUBLIC ATTENDEE ISSUES**

Mark Baldwin introduced Joe Padeah, the new head of the Real Estate and Building Industry Coalition and felt the BDC meeting would be a good place for him to learn a little bit about what we do in Code Enforcement.

**4. RFBA –TEMPORARY UTILITIES, LCU, TCO, CC, CO**

Jim Bartl began by confirming all BDC members received the RFBA prior to the BDC meeting and explained that it is a two part presentation on the changes as it relates to both changes in the Building Development Ordinance as well as the LUESA Fee Ordinance and at the conclusion of the presentation, BDC members were asked to formally vote in support of the RFBA that they received.

Gene Morton gave a brief overview of the RFBA being voted on stating that in the last couple of years the department has been more focused on aligning our resources with the current and future needs of our customers and at the same time we've put a lot of effort into being more aware of the need to consistently and constantly look at the way we do our work as well as clarify requirements for staff and customers when questions arise. We've had a lot of policies in place for a lot of years. Some have been in place for a long time and some continue to work well and clearly need no change. But some we've realized that have been in place and implemented don't seem to make a lot of sense today. A good example of this is our outdated refund policy when someone

cancels a permit. Although it may have served us well when it was first implemented years ago, it doesn't recover the cost of plan review, inspections and processing. Departmental policy is not really an ordinance for fee change so that would be something we would want to bring to your attention if we make a change. We are working on a change to our refund policy that will help us retain or recover some of those costs that we seem to be giving back to the customers and losing out on. We'll complete that process and will send you an advance copy of that before we implement. Today we are focused on temporary utilities which is just one of those processes we've found to be a cause of recent code changes that has cost this policy to be outdated. Much of the authority that we have allows us to approve and allows temporary utilities is dictated by state law and building codes. In looking at the old process and the supporting state and local requirements, we quickly realized that the Building Development-Ordinance lagged behind changes that were made in the NC Administrative Code. As an example, reference code sections that are in the Building Development-Ordinance no longer match up to those in some of the building codes. We've gone through several code change cycles and haven't kept our building development ordinance up to date. After reviewing this with the county attorney we thought we should change the ordinance accordingly and that would clarify for our customers both the ordinance and the related process. As Jim said, this is going to be a two part presentation. First, Gary Mullis is going to quickly cover the ordinance changes that we've worked on to include cleaning up the ordinance with some small editorial changes to align it with the code. Adding some definitions and a rewrite of section 108.11 which is what covers Temporary Utilities and Occupancies. We are also revising the temporary utility process and have given you a little bit of that information previously. The process will change to align with these changes in the code. Jeff Griffin will cover the process changes in his presentation and that will cover changes requiring the department to provide temporary utilities with stipulated conditions and changes to automate the temporary utility request process. This will make it more accessible to customers moving it to more of a self managed basis. Finally, at the end, we'll discuss a fee change that will be necessary in the LUESA Fee Ordinance so that we can recover the cost of these required inspections whether it is the initial or the automated reoccurring inspections.

- **Building Development-Ordinance and LUESA Fee Ordinance Changes – Gary Mullis**
  - Temporary utilities and changes in NC Admin Code and electrical code impacting language in the Building-Development-Ordinance (BDO).
  - Regulations in play; NC Admin Code section 204.8, NC electrical Code section 10.7.2 & 10.8 and NCGS 153A-363.
  - Actual text changes in the BDO cover;
  - Housekeeping changes on titles, index and formatting
  - Changes to definitions
  - Re-write of section 108.11 on Temporary Utilities
  - Align language in BDO and other regulations, for clarity and to mitigate confusion between customers and us
  - Definitions in play include;
    - ✓ Certificate of Compliance
    - ✓ Certificate of Occupancy
    - ✓ Limited Conditional Utility Process
    - ✓ Temporary Certificate of Occupancy
  - Key terms driving the change in process and BDC language; “shall give permission.....to energize” “.....when the following provisions are met.”
  - Change articulates 8 stipulated conditions to be met by the permit holder
  - To accommodate all of the above, section 108.11 of BDO is almost completely re-written
- **Process Changes – Jeff Griffin**
  - Electrical and mechanical temporary utilities
  - Allowed on systems ready to be energized; full electrical power and gas heat only
  - Process change moves to electronic auto-renewal and auto inspection request
  - Repeat inspections every 90 days; verifies installation is still safe, stipulated conditions are still in compliance and no occupancy
  - Agreement submitted with original application; violation of same could lead to termination of utility, following a two step formal notification process, leading to disconnect order.
  - Gaining TCO/CO releases full utility connection
  - Brief review of related LUESA Fee Ordinance changes

**Discussion/Q&A/call for vote:**

**EM:** From a residential perspective it was set in a way to deter people from doing it, right?

**GM:** Before, yes.

**EM:** Most people didn't do it because it was labor intensive. In a lot of other parts of the state, a pretty normal process is that you have a meter before you ever finish the house, which isn't the case here but it is getting us closer in that direction.

**EM:** The \$100.00 vs. \$65.00 is really the difference (\$35.00) because of more administrative or because we can?

**GM:** Before on a commercial project you had very limited portions of building that could be energized so the extent of the inspection to verify that things were in order was a lot more limited. Now again, you can have whole floors, whole multiple floors that we have requests to go out and check for early energizing so we know there is going to be a lot more work associated with these type inspections.

**EM:** Would that be more the case in commercial vs. residential where a very large residential you are going to see sections or wings.

**GM:** You can virtually add the whole house and that is our expectation. Typically it was conditioning in one receptacle and now it's unlimited.

**EM:** I see they will need it twice, once when dry wall is hung and they want to have heat and electrical and then you get your trim outs and you want to finish the house properly having lights on in the finishing stages. Do they have to come in to do two different applications?

**JG:** One's a final if I heard you correctly. One's got to be a temporary utility process and then you'll call for a final process electrical, mechanical and close it out.

**EM:** Say you get your electrical trim out and you've gotten your electrical final but you haven't gotten your certificate of occupancy yet.

**GM:** It would still be up to you.

**JG:** When you get to that point and you've already got electrical, one of the things we talked about with backing up that inspection result from a final electrical to a TDU.

**EM:** I had asked the question last month, in the city of Raleigh when you get your final electrical you get a meter. Are they interoperating the code differently or are they just not feeling that they need a certificate of occupancy to hold hostage. What's the difference on that?

**GM:** There is a difference of opinions on the General Statutes as to what it says and I know Raleigh and one other we did contact and we feel like that is a different issue than what we are proposing here, this has broader scope so we have talked to our attorney about it, and we do have a meeting scheduled next week for that purpose. But other than the general statute our policy under 153.8.363 under certificates of compliance is what they are using and certificate of compliance in the way we look at it, we can't do all and it says that all finals have to be resulted. We can't do all. So that's the difference in their interpretation. They are saying all means electrical or mechanical. In our department all means all.

**EM:** It crosses over in the need for power to finish up.

**GM:** If in fact that has changed then the TU process that you are talking about in stage 2 will go away, if that's how the DOI and the attorney can work it out, you still wouldn't have to deal with it so it would still be a win win either way. You are either going to get the expanded use under temporary utility or if the ordinance is interpreted legally to change that all doesn't mean all you'd still have that availability too.

**EM:** It looks like you've done this great job of automating the renewal process but looks like the original sign up process is still manual?

**JB:** It requires signatures. There is a number of things and this goes into what we've worked really closely with Marvin on that for us to be in a position where if someone misuses this to be able to disconnect the power we need them to understand the rules and acknowledge it by signature and that's why that one part is on the application and it's also why we have to have people come in and am not sure how we could automate this.

**EM:** Just for example if a builder on every house wanted to have power when they got their drywall they wanted to submit with their permits that we've done a great job of automating and never have to come in but obtain online we've now inserted a step that requires a manual process and someone going to the certificate of occupancy desk? Correct? Seems like there could be a way to streamline.

**GM:** There is not a change from the current. That is the current policy and we are not changing it. What it still says is the agreement with the customer that they know what's going to happen if that policy is breach.

**JB:** This gets into disconnecting power that they have. We went over this very carefully with Marvin Bethune, how to set the chips up so that if somebody violates this we've got everything lined up and we can go get the power and there is nothing that is going to fall back on us legally because they have moved in and occupied and

you gave us a task of approval to occupy it because of the actions you did. This sets it up so there is no way they can argue that. We'd be willing to sit down and talk with Marvin about it again but this is something we went over awhile back.

**EM:** You made the comment we made it easier for people to do it and we believe more people are going to do it but we've taken a great streamlined process and we've now inserted this manual step in the middle that doesn't (I understand we want to cover ourselves but I think there are other ways to do it through electronic signatures.

**ZA:** You're saying multiple signatures, who needs to sign off and do they all need to come in to sign or can they get it signed at the office and bring it in?

**GM:** First signature is the owner/applicant agency, then you have the GC and they are not always the same, then you have sub-trades and part of this in addition to the agreement to turn it off is this lets know (you remember in the statute that said you had to be able to tell those people that they were going to encounter this). This does 2 things for you if you're the GC let say, it puts them into a position where you did notify them and they did agree to have this temporary usage of their equipment it does 2 things from another perspective, so that if I'm the GC and I turn on the power to turn the heat, I've got the heating company's agreement that that's ok and that's when we start and that's when all our liabilities begin under whatever those arrangements may be. So it's not just strictly the act of turning on the temporary utility or strictly the act of the notification so that you can disconnect. There's 2 other factors to it. And the renewal process really what it does, it copies our TCO process.

**ZA:** Going back to the signatures, we get them signed and the people that bring it in have already signed or are you implying that everyone has to come in to sign it.

**GM:** They can be signed and one person can bring them in.

**EH:** The applicant I know you have certain people on there but you have a lot of subcontractors coming in there that are not going to be on that site, are we supposed to post a placard?

**GM:** I think that will probably be the expectation, you will have to consult your own legal counsel but the statute says the people have to be alerted usually in an electrical or gas situation under OSHA there are certain levels and requirements that we do provide a placard since this is not restrictive so you will have to decide what is in your best interest as an alert.

**EH:** So the county doesn't have a definition of what constitutes an alert?

**GM:** No sir, I think that puts into a liability if we create that.

**WC:** Can we not, we're trying to do everything where we are using less staff and more online. Can we not put a process where you can fill this out on line, click a button that says "all parties are aware/if you agree click yes/ if not click no to cancel" and then everyone that is on there is going to be in the system as a contractor on the project and they will be linked electronically so that once we click on this and say yes all parties are aware and that we electronically distributed a memo to those folks that says "today on X project, temporary utilities were applied for in your name?"

**BC:** I know the goal is to make sure that people are actually paying attention that that's what they are doing so maybe the step is to take it to somewhere like USGPC makes you write in "I agree". You have to type in the words "I agree", it's not just a check box for that reason, they are worried that someone will just check it off without paying attention to what it really is? Maybe there is some common ground that we can get them to do something actively i.e. type in their name or whatever to really let us know that they are understanding what they are agreeing to.

**GM:** I don't think our staff objects to it. Maybe we can create that as an improvement later in the process.

**JB:** We don't mind revisiting the point Elliot raised about is this something we can do electronically on the very first submission. When we came up with this basic criteria with Marvin, it was when we first developed the limited conditional utilities from a response to a request that you folks made to us (Rogers made) that was a few years ago and certainly technology has changed. We are willing to study it. I will tell you this, and Harry can testify to this that trying to validate who you are electronically on the other end of the computer is not the easiest thing in the world to do.

**EM:** It's not a new challenge.

**JB:** That's true it's a new challenge but I can tell you that the way these general statutes are written, they never anticipated this kind of stuff, they never have and they are not written that way. So we would have to see what's out there and sit down with Marvin and go through it and see what's possible and does what we have to do to put us in a position of being able to without question disconnect the utility cause it's going to happen, but still make the service as workable as we can for you.

**EM:** I'm thinking, the guy that does 50 or 100 of these things, and we come up with all these ways to keep him from having to drive down here including the hours of conversation during plan submittal and now because we have streamlined our process we have him drive down here w/ one form. If nothing else, just figure out a way

that they can get their contractor to sign 50 of them and they submit the one in a .pdf and send it in. Let's not make people drive down here for one form. This is a good improvement over where we are today so I don't think we should hold it up for technology. We've got to get it out. But we've got to come up with some shortcut vs. somebody driving down here.

**BC:** That is a good question. Can you not just .pdf and send in the actual form that you have with the actual signatures and just send you an electronic copy of it?

**JG:** One of the options we have too is that we can pick it up when we do our inspection.

**JB:** I don't like the idea of the guy in the field handling the paper.

**EM:** If we did this at time of permit and we know the time we want to get it is when you come out and do a rough inspection at the time you save a trip and could it not be flagged and done at that time and it's just an automatic process?

**JB:** Often when the person's taking out the permit, they just want to get the permit and get out the door. If you ask them to plan ahead for when they are actually going to need this, they're not going to stop.

**EM:** I do hundreds of them in Raleigh a day and we do it electric, the temporary electric permit with our normal permit which is part of the process, they come out they do the rough inspection, after the rough inspection is done they notify the utility company and the meter shows.

**BC:** So basically you are completing the form in advance taking care of the legal issue, like you are not dating it until you call and say we're ready for this now.

**EM:** We don't even have to for that part of the inspection process.

**WC:** That wouldn't work on the commercial side, when they get a permit for the GC selected to make it a permit before any subcontractors are selected so you couldn't list them on the commercial side.

**JB:** We can certainly study both those things and we'll commit ourselves to do that.

**EM:** This is a good step.

**JB:** I know from the last time we worked on this when Rogers asked us to come up with something novel we came up with limited conditional utilities. This is a far more complicated issue when you get into the general statutes than it would appear from the service. It's not the easiest thing to do and still maintain the County's position where we can come in, don't forget, people that are going to be in there are going to be occupied and you're going to cut off the power and they have to leave often causing additional problems. That's what Marvin's worried about. But we are happy to revisit it and look at the technology that has been developed since then and see what we can come up with. If you want to make that a condition of approval, I'm good with that.

**WC:** In theory, with temporary power you wouldn't have an occupant.

**JB:** No you won't, but the point is, people do. You can wind up in a situation with someone arguing because you had a service that provided something (even though you warned them) that gave them the capacity to move in and take occupancy that you had approved their occupancy and now you are going to cut them off and even though you gave them notice, you are going to cut them and they are going to suffer this loss and so where are they going to look for the loss? That's the concern. Nobody in this room would do it. 90% of the people wouldn't do it and unfortunately it's one of those things when we come up with policy you have to be sure you cover all the basis and this is one that can get really nasty.

**EM:** I will say there are a lot of other large municipalities in this state that are doing it. We are probably more the minority on holding a meter and making it difficult to finish.

**JB:** Now holding up the meter is a separate issue and there are very few authorities in the state that are consolidated like us where we are doing the work for 7 different governments and the statute says all local ordinances, and that brings in all the city and the 6 towns and by inner local agreement we had to do certain things and we can't do other things and that's something Raleigh never deals with. There are only 1 or 2 authorities in the state that have to deal with this and it's not as complicated as ours by far. So when you start to talk about that then you're starting to step into the relationship between us and the city and the towns and the water gets deep in a hurry. That's why it's not a simple yes or no.

**EM:** Even Cary, Durham, Mooresville, a lot of those areas in that part of the world are getting the meters as part of the process, you barely finish a project without power vs. the opposite.

**JB:** I wrote down you comment about an option to plan ahead on the initial permit and we'll look at that too. If you want to make those two things as a condition of your vote on the RFBA, we have no problem with that.

**EM:** I think we're better off moving this forward and getting the rest to catch up rather than staying where we are today.

**HS:** Gene you said you thought this would be an increase in activity. At \$100 each are we going to be in the losing mode again?

**GM:** We don't think so. Some will take less time but others obviously will take more time. We are hoping it will average out.

**HS:** I can see in a high-rise this could happen quite a bit.

**GM:** Still on a high-rise you'll have the inspector there possibly every day anyway so he will be checking the work as it goes along and then get a request for a first floor, you just finished the first floor inspections, it'll be further along.

**WC:** And typically you'll tell them that next week we'll get temporary utilities.

**HS:** So we are getting \$100 for that one inspection.

**GM:** Yes

**EM:** When will this go into effect?

**BC:** I know you are saying it automatically renews and you are charged that \$100 right when it renews. Is there any type of a notifier, for example if the project has actually shut down, they've turned off the power, they aren't actually using it and nobody bothered to tell you. Or is it just an automatic renewal and they won't know until they get charged \$100 and come down here and complain.

**GM:** The customer in that case the customer would have to call in to say "I'm off the project". We deal with this on a daily basis and chasing it down and putting it on the TCO was the big improvement. We don't have to wrestle with it and the consent as we had before but really getting there so we can take action and making it automatic is seamless for us. I've got 84 setting on my desk right now. 84 of those and they've already occupied them and you've got to go through a hearing process to turn the power off and that's part of what we are trying to advance in this it's not really the efficient place for us to be.

**BC:** I can see with the automatic renewal that you're going to hit people that either shut it off or just walked away and haven't shut it off but they don't need it and don't want it to renew and didn't tell then they are going to come back around and want you to refund that \$100.

**WC:** That's part of the discussion we had when we initially pulled the team together to discuss going this direction and that was part of the problem, chasing down the people that hadn't come to notify.

**GM:** As you agree to this process and sign the sheet and hand it in the possibility of managing that process to avoid those \$100 charges and in the trip, the inspector may have to go out and perform unnecessarily can be avoided by the customer but it is their responsibility. And I don't know if they would be entitled to any refund if we've paid for an inspector to go out and realize what they didn't let us know.

**JB:** Back to the date: there are two dates in here, both sections of the RFBA's say that they take effect on June 21<sup>st</sup> which is what the second vote was scheduled to be although we're trying to verify if we can even get June 7<sup>th</sup>'s agenda. We'll probably need to reword it to say on approval by the BOCC. The background for the RFBA indicates that the process revisions won't be in place until July 11<sup>th</sup>. We have to get the BOCC's action in place before that.

**EM:** You talked about for example if you had gas hooked up to the house and you cap off the water heater when someone goes to trim the house out they've got to hook up the water heater to get their mechanical final. How does that work?

**GM:** As long as it's not energized it's ok. By policy you would lose your gas until you had your reinspection.

**EM:** I think this is an improvement in the right direction; we just have to tweak some things.

**WC:** Are you approving just the utility section or the TCO and CO sections as well?

**JB:** Should include an automated initial step and another option for somebody that wants to plan it at the start.

**WC:** On the TCO revision it says "account holders with expired TCOs will have their TCO privilege suspended for any additional projects until such time that the TCO is renewed or a CO is issued". If you have 10 projects in Charlotte, one TCO expires do you then lose your current TCOs on the other 9 projects or can you just not obtain future TCOs?

**GM:** The way it currently works is that you do not get renewals or future TCOs if one expires.

**JB:** That's not new, that's our current process.

**WC:** I'm reading the proposed new definition.

**JB:** There are parts of the definition that are new but that part is a change we wrote into it when we negotiated all the changes that created the LCU that you folks asked for 5 years ago.

**CALL FOR VOTE:**

*Elliot Man made the motion, seconded by Ed Horne, to support the RFBA as drafted by the Department and amended on May 16<sup>th</sup>, 2011, with the condition that the Department going forward (separate from the RFBA), investigate the concern about automating the initial frontend application process while still maintaining the verification concern and investigating an option to give applicants the possibility to plan ahead on the initial permit. Motion passed unanimously.*

**EM:** How do you get this information out to people in an understandable fashion?

**GM:** We'll most likely do a mass mailing outlining the changes in the ordinance and the new process. Certainly the customers that come in to take advantage of the temporary utility process will be enlightened.

**EM:** One thing I would recommend, we sit in these meetings and we hear these acronyms over and over and some of these people out there do not understand the acronyms. And for the group that just wants to figure out how to get a temporary electric meter/gas meter on the house they are building, then the group that needs to obtain TCOs on levels, you need to break that correspondence up so people will understand.

**JB:** Typically we would do it by email using NotifyMe, by doing some type of poster at the CO counter where customers go now, we'll post to our web site and then we would also as we go to meetings point it out to people that it's a change, so those are the 4 venues we would typically use in distributing information. If there is something out there you think we are missing, we certainly are happy to pay attention to it

**5. TECHNOLOGY SCHEDULE UPDATE**

Commercial electronic plan submittal, electronic plan review software development and also the second stream that we are setting up to automate electronic plan submittal review inside of CTAC which are the last two big components to take us to a totally paperless process. We are making good progress on it, we're pouring lots of staff time into the building submittal requirements side of it and we'll have that complete this month. The site submittal requirements are being developed too; they are dependent on certain hurdle's being cleared by Raleigh in handing us information. At the end of this month we'll be going through a special review process to assure that we align ourselves as close with Raleigh's site submittal package as we possibly can while still taking care of our customers. We are making good progress on the CTAC-EPS side. Tim Taylor is working on developing the intelligent .pdf tool and after that; the team will move on to chart a new electronic process stream for CTAC. We had a really strong discussion last week on BlueBeam and how it's going to support either stream. BlueBeam is the plan review vehicle that we've elected to go forward with. It does look like the delivery schedule has slipped probably 3 – 4 months. Originally we were telling you that we would deliver this around October 1<sup>st</sup>, 2011 and we had in our meeting on April 26<sup>th</sup>, 2011 with the City of Raleigh and with Sages we verified that the date is not going to be possible that in fact it is more likely that we'll deliver this 3 – 4 months late, either in late 2011 or early 2012 and there are three reasons why it slipped. First of all our site development programming which as I indicated is dependent on some of the work done on Raleigh side has actually pushed ahead of Raleigh's schedule which we have no control over. Because it's dependent on Raleigh's development of certain components it's extending our schedule. We can't push the site development in programming along as fast as we would like. We are backtracking a bit to ensure we are staying as close to their criteria (their site requirements) as we can. On our side, the switch from Adobe to BlueBeam which we think is a really good change. It has review tools/assets that we think are beneficial and not just the people in management but the line staff that are going to do the review in CTAC and Commercial Plan Review OnSchedule/Mega, they all think that the BlueBeam is a superior product to Adobe. Unfortunately when we gave a second look to BlueBeam at Harry's suggestion we did have work invested on using the Adobe format and so we've had to back track to realign ourselves to use the BlueBeam tool. The third reason that our schedule is slipping some is just the sign-off on building submittal requirements is taking us longer than we thought so our own schedule on confirming our building plan review (when I say building I mean building, electrical, mechanical, plumbing) program requirements has slipped and also there are some things on the integration of what we call the plan review matrix that have created challenges for us. So for those three reasons which are all very good reasons the technology schedule for delivering commercial plan review EPS/EPR has slipped and we're still nailing down the final date but as I said we know we can't make it on October 1<sup>st</sup> we think more likely it's going to fall in the range of mid January to mid February is when we'll bring it on line, depending on when we get into beta testing. We do think possibly that we'll be able to bring the CTAC stream online a bit ahead of that. We thought they'd both come on line at the same time we actually think now from what we've studied we can actually bring CTAC up faster. We first found out about changes in the schedule on April 26<sup>th</sup> and have digested what it means and wanted to provide you with this update.

**6. DEPARTMENT STATISTICS AND INITIATIVES REPORT**

**6.1. Statistics report**

**6.1.1. Permit Revenue**

April- \$1,182,380 with Fy11 YTD at \$9,729,992  
 Fy11 projected permit revenue at April, \$944,065/month x 9 = \$9,440,650  
 So at April 30, we are above permit fee revenue projection by \$2289k+/- or 3%

**6.1.2. Construction Value of Permits Issued**

April total - \$178,487,344, with YTD amount \$1,299,337,232  
 Fy10 Total at April – \$1,327,828,098  
 So YTD figure is down \$28.5M or 2.19% below YTD at April 2010

**6.1.3. Permits Issued:**

	March	April	3 Month Trend
Residential	3294	3396	2553/2527/3294/3396
Commercial	2483	2326	1558/2392/2483/2326
Other (Fire/Zone)	539	429	314/399/539/412
Total	6316	6151	4425/5318/6316/6151

Residential up 3%; commercial down 6.32%; total down 2.61%  
 New constr SF Res'd YTD Permit totals after 10 months in Fy11:  
 Fy11YTD total of 1545 is down 16.22% from Fy10 YTD total at April 30 of 1844 permits

**6.1.4. Inspection Activity: inspections performed**

Insp. Req.	March	April	Insp. Perf.	March	April	% Change
Bldg.	4142	4293	Bldg.	4081	4223	+3.5%
Elec.	5122	4790	Elec.	5094	4754	-4.95%
Mech.	2665	2592	Mech.	2646	2573	-2.8%
Plbg.	1954	1920	Plbg.	1930	1865	-3.4%
Total	13,883	13,595	Total	13,751	13,415	-1.93%

Bldg up 3%+, all other trades down 3-5%+/-  
 Total inspections requested down 2.1% \_\_, total inspections performed down 2.45%+ \_\_  
 Inspections performed were 98.6% of inspections requested

**6.1.4.1 Inspection Activity: inspections response time**

Insp. Resp. Time	OnTime %		Total % After 24 Hrs. Late		Total % After 48 Hrs. Late		Average Resp. in Days	
	March	April	March	April	March	April	March	April
Bldg.	98.5	97.9	98.9	98.2	99.9	99.1	1.03	1.05
Elec.	94.8	92.3	95.5	93.2	99.4	98.0	1.10	1.17



Mech.	98.9	95.2	99.2	96.1	99.8	97.3	1.02	1.13
Plbg.	97.9	97.4	98.1	97.41	100	99.0	1.04	1.06
Total	97.1	95.3	97.6	95.9	99.5	98.3	1.06	1.11

Electrical down 2.5%; Mechanical down 3.7%; Building & Plumbing down <1%  
 All trades down, but still well above 85-90% goal range

**6.1.5. Inspection Pass Rates for April, 2011:**

OVERALL MONTHLY AV'G @ 86.25%, compared to 87.17% in March

**Bldg:** March – 80.32%                      **Elec:** March – 86.3%  
 April – 79.23%                                      April – 86.24%

**Mech:** March – 90.89%                      **Plbg:** March – 94.13%  
 April – 89.52%                                      April – 93.55%

All down; Elec & Plbg <.5%; Bldg & mech down 1% +/-  
 Overall average, and individual disciplines still close to historic highs

**6.1.5.1 CFD Inspection Pass Rate for April, 2011**

CFD overall inspection pass rate of 78.47% for April, or down 1.3% from March (79.79%)

**6.1.6. OnSchedule and CTAC numbers for April, 2011**

**CTAC:**

103 first reviews

Projects approval rate (pass/fail) – 66%

CTAC was 40.12% of OnSch (\*) first review volume (103/(103+147 = 250)) = 40.12%

\*CTAC as a % of OnSchedule is based on the total of only scheduled and Express projects

**OnSchedule:**

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: 140\* - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 87% all trades, 90% B/E/M/P only  
 August, 10: 159\* - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 87% all trades, 90% B/E/M/P only  
 September, 10: 148\* - 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 (1)  
 January, 11: 137- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 82.65% all trades, 83.5% B/E/M/P only  
 February, 11: 136- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 86.6% all trades, 88% B/E/M/P only  
 March, 11: 185 (\*)- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 85.75% all trades, 84.5% B/E/M/P only  
 April, 11: 147- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 78.37% all trades, 84.8% B/E/M/P only

\*Indicates numbers restated from previous month to correct error in transferring #'s from report

**Booking Lead Times**

OnSchedule Projects: **for reporting chart posted on line**, on May 2 showed

1-2 hour projects; at 1 work day booking lead time, except bldg at 15 days & M/P at 8 days

3-4 hour projects; at 2 work day lead time, except bldg at 20 days & M/P at 19 days

5-8 hour projects; at 3 work days lead time, except bldg at 20 days, M/P at 20 days; CMUD at 6 days and City Zoning at 8 work days.

CTAC plan review turnaround time; 3 work days lead time, except Bldg at 4 & City Fire at 1 work day

Express Review – booking lead time was; 13 work days for small projects, 13 work days for large

**6.1.6.1. Action on OnSchedule booking lead time**

Last month we reported the Department is studying the recent uptick in booking lead times in building and M/P, and that we were pursuing a couple of options to increase plan review hours available in those trades. Here's where we are on that;

We have the D Team (Inspector Team of 4 staff members) in place and they are making progress in the reduction of our lead times in regards to small projects.

Temporary Employees -we have posted the position (4-PTE's) and it will close on May 17<sup>th</sup>. We will begin reviewing the applications/ resumes and proceed with interviews shortly after.

## **6.2. Status report on various Department initiatives**

### **6.2.1. April meeting follow up**

#### **6.2.1.1. Promoting new website page design and organization**

Draft customer letter complete and e-mailed to all on May 12.

CEM's, Code Administrators and other managers will begin promoting the new website design and organization in meetings with Trade and Professional Association groups.

#### **6.2.1.2. BDC Quarterly Bulletin**

New quarterly bulletin complete, e-mailed to customers and posted on [www.meckpermit.com](http://www.meckpermit.com)

#### **6.2.1.3. Begin planning meetings for Cost Recovery Work Group**

All BDC members given Dept memo e-mail request for industry participation, briefly describing the charge for the group, noting that meeting topics will be scheduled to allow selective attendance.

We need 2 GC's, 4 small contractors, MEP trade reps, 2-AE's (solicit volunteers)

BDC members T Haston and E Horne have confirmed they will rep BDC in meetings.

Working on detailing out the meeting topic list. To date have the following

Original three;

Does the Fee Ordinance work when we have no auto cost calculator (as used in residential) to match up the permit fee with the Department resource level required to service the project?

Should the Mega project permit fee discount be reduced from 25%, or eliminated?

Are our costs on small projects and "change-out" work appropriately (or adequately) addressed by the current permit fee structure?

Added topics

Equipment permitting costs (Gary M & Jeff G)

\$1 permits and phasing

Advise JNB if you have others.

Hope to start CRWG meetings in June or July, depending on how soon BDC members hand off industry names with which Dept will solicit participation.

### **6.2.2. NC BCC BIM-IPD Ad Hoc Committee progress**

The proposal is currently scheduled for a public hearing at the BCC's next meeting on June 13.

The BIM-IPD Ad Hoc Committee will hold a pre-public hearing conference call to prep for the hearing, as the BCC requested private sector members attendance to address particular questions from the BCC on the use of BIM-IPD in design and construction. The BCC's action after the June 13 public hearing, should lead to a final vote in their Sept. 13 meeting.

#### **Advance Electrical Journeyman's Program testing pilot**

NCAEC administered the second test in this pilot program on April 21 and second round went well; seven applicants, with four of those testing and one applicant passing the exam.

After two successful rounds of testing, it appears the Electrical J-Man test outsourcing pilot is a success.

EV car qualified list of engineers and contractors .....by Joe W

The Department continues working with BDC member Ed Horne and CAAEC to solicit interest in the program certifying Electrical engineers and contractors as proficient in EV supply multiple commercial installations.

Other to note;

Meeting with the Chamber Land Use Committee on April 27, noted Nissan's recognition of Meck's P&I as an EV best practice.

REVAC (Regional Electric Vehicle Advisory Committee) continues to meet; discussions currently centering around bid for federal funding for EV infrastructure and a partnership with South Carolina's EV interest group.

Duke Energy - Carolina PEV/EVSE Pilot

This is a pilot program developed to educate Duke Energy on the grid impacts of typical charging behavior of EV customers.

Plan is to provide insight into the actual impacts of EV use on the Duke Energy Carolina's distribution system through the collection of customer charging data.

Duke Energy will install EV supply and monitoring equipment for a limited number of Duke Energy residential customers in the Carolinas.

The monitoring equipment will enable Duke to collect charging data for a 24-month period.

Pilot timeline and eligibility;

Beginning in Spring 2011, EV owners who wish to be considered for Carolina Pilot must:

Be Duke Energy Carolinas residential customers.

Own the residences where the electric vehicle supply equipment is to be installed.

Provide Duke access to install and maintain the EV supply & monitoring equipment.

### **6.3. Other**

**6.3.1. Invite BDC members to SOD, Wed am, May 18 at 7am.**

**6.3.2. Announced and introduce Patrick Granson as Director of Permitting, promoted effective April 20**

**6.3.3. Announced Melanie Sellers' promotion as Code Enforcement Manager of Commercial Plan Review**

**6.3.4. Update on Department participation in auto-plan check pilot**

As noted in the April BDC meeting, Target is working with Fiatch, ICC and Solibri to develop auto-plan check software for use on BIM projects. Their work developing a proof of concept includes comparison to a conventional review by various authorities across the country.

Kevin Fulbright of Meck will participate in both the manual review and evaluating the BIM auto plan check comparative product. The pilot's initial review focus is on exiting and accessibility.

We received electronic drawings; our initial review work is scheduled for completion in mid June.

**6.3.5. Other**

RFBA on electronic permitting is on BOCC agenda Tuesday night, May 17

Considering developing Electronic Permitting Process main page; have example.

Chamber Land Use presentation return topics; need ideas.

### **6.4. Manager/CA added comments**

There were no added manager comments.

## **7. ADJOURNMENT**

The May 17<sup>th</sup>, 2011 Building Development Commission meeting adjourned at 4:48 p.m.

**NOTE:** The next BDC Meeting is scheduled for 3:00 p.m., Tuesday, June 21st, 2011. Please mark your calendar.