

BUILDING DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
Minutes of February 21, 2012 Meeting

Jon Morris opened the Building-Development Commission (BDC) meeting at 3:02 p.m. on Tuesday, February 21st, 2012.

Present: Bernice Cutler, Hal Hester, Harry Sherrill, Ed Horne, Travis Haston, Jon Morris, Elliot Mann, Zeke Acosta, John Taylor and Rob Belisle

Absent: Tim West, Kevin Silva and John Wood

1. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The motion by Bernice Cutler seconded by Ed Horne to approve the January 17th, 2012 meeting minutes passed unanimously.

2. BDC MEMBER ISSUES AND COMMENTS

Elliot Mann shared that it has been interesting to watch how other municipalities are dealing with the code transition and commended Mecklenburg County Code Enforcement in taking a stance to get this rolled out.

3. PUBLIC ATTENDEE ISSUES AND COMMENTS

No public attendee comments.

4. SI UPDATE ON WEB

Patrick Granson shared that Code Enforcement held its first meeting with industry representatives on January 19th dealing with the Special Inspections program documents. The two things reviewed were 1) bring into compliance with the 2012 code changes and 2) modifications to documentation where necessary as well as modifications to programming. The next meeting will be held on February 23rd, where we will go back through the flow chart references to make them more user friendly as well as some of our brochures that are dated back to 2006. We had an outside vendor look at our web site and are currently awaiting proposal of any changes that the vendor thinks will be beneficial. The following documents are being modified; a) Pre-Construction Meeting Checklist, b) DPIRC Letter, c) Special Inspections Scope, and d) Statement of Special Inspections. The Statement of Special Inspections is a special form that we built and embedded into Appendix B. Jim Bartl stated that Special Inspections is over six years old and has run with very little maintenance. It's due for some analysis/tweaks and Patrick is leading this effort. SI is an excellent tool and these modifications will keep us up to speed with the code change.

5. RFBA SUPPORTING CRWG FINAL REPORT

Jim Bartl discussed the RFBA that was previously distributed to BDC Members. It is the culmination of an effort started in September responding to a request from the BDC Budget Subcommittee last spring that was endorsed by the BDC. You wanted us to take a look at the Fee Ordinance specifically to "level out the valleys". 9 industry representatives on the Task Force as well as 5 BDC representatives participated. There were 6 meetings of the task force itself and then there was a 7th meeting that was just public representatives focusing on a particular topic that the task force asked for their input. We discussed this last week with the 3 BDC representatives on the work group. We've gone over this in great detail with the people that represent you. The RFBA always starts with a background and justification for the board and the manager's office, and then it goes into a brief snapshot of what the RFBA is about. There are 8 changes we are making to the Fee Ordinance and 6 changes we are making in the Building Development Ordinance. The next section is an estimate of physical impact.

- Section II.A has three changes:
 - Relating to item 17, revises wording regarding the term "construction permit value"
 - Relating to item 4, adds a note regarding owner equipment declaration in construction cost.
 - Relating to item 1, add 'note d' incorporating 'Upfit Construction Permit Value Calculator' into the permit fee calculation process. (similar to renovation project calculator).

EM: Are those costs tied to an indicator?

JB: It is something where we specify in the ordinance that we use it and then we post on the web similar to the building valuation data; which we don't go into constantly but we go into it every other year and update it and whatever is on the web is what we are going to use. In this case, some of the work that's left is to actually create the nuts and bolts of how this construction permit value calculator will work. Patrick has developed and reviewed the calculator with the BDC members that were present in the meeting last week. More work to be done through a subcommittee to work on a few of the details before we put the ordinance in place. Note at the end of the Fee Ordinance it states that there is a 60 day lag between when the BOCC finally approves and when we are going to start it. That gives us enough time to get all the programmatic changes made and the process changes.

- Section II.B - on Plan Review Fees has two housekeeping changes:
 - one striking a process we don't use (II.B.1)
 - and another describing a CTAC process on abandoned projects (II.B.1.b)
- Section II.D – 14; relates to redefining a small project inside contractor pass rate incentives:
 - Also adds statement turning off charges/credits in contractor pass rate if 47.3 & 47.4 in play
- Section II.D - 46.5; relates to item #5 on breaking project up after permit is issued.
- Section II.D – 46.6; relates to item #8 on coordinating project, in the absence of owner coordination.
- Section II.D – 47.2; relates to item #13 on bundling multi-trade inspections.

EM: On 47.2, say someone wants to have a single inspection done, so we send one inspector out instead of three?

JB: 47.2 deals with multi-trade inspections which are a defined group of inspections. What this says is that when those are multi-trade inspections we are going to bundle them rather than going out piece milled we are going to wait until all of them are ready at once and we go out and make the inspections once. If the contractor doesn't want to wait and needs an inspection right away, we'll give them that option but they will have to pay for it.

- Section II.D – 47.3; relates to item #5 on the cost of incremental service in field inspections.
- Section II.D – 47.4; relates to item #18 on “owner as contractor” added inspections

EM: So these types of projects don't fall under the contractor failure rate?

JB: Correct. We discovered when doing the detail work on this and that's why under disapproved inspections we are adding a Part D Section 47.3 and Part D Section 47.4 of this ordinance; there will be no disapproved inspection charges and credits. The cost of incremental service kicks to a charge by the inspection or owner as contractor kicks to a charge by inspection; it shuts off the disapproved charges or credits.

JB: On that last item, I would note that the public representative discussion on December 16th split over what the rate should be on this. 2 of your public representatives argued for a lower rate while the 2 sitting public representatives on the BDC argued for the rate that's in the fee ordinance.

- Section II.D - 51; relates to item #16, Meck-SI registration fees and charging for pre-con meeting staff time.
- Section II.D - 56; relates to item #17, aligning MCFM P&I charges with CFD.

Building Development Ordinance Changes

- Section 106 definitions;
 - “Upfit” relates to item 13 in the report.
 - “inspection counts” supports item 5 and 18 in the report.
- Section 108.10.4.1; relates to item #13 on bundling multi-trade inspections

- Section 108.10.4.2; relates to item #5 on the cost of incremental service in field inspections, when a contractor exceeds an inspection limit stipulated at permit issuance.
- Section 108.10.4.3; relates to item #18 on “owner as contractor” added inspections, when an owner exceeds an inspection limit stipulated at permit issuance.

JM: As I read this looking at it from the standpoint of my industry peers whether it be Beacon Partners, Childress Klein, Crescent or an Upfit Contractor that has never seen this before. The RFBA comes out, you read it and see items have been deleted; replace construction cost with construction value; ok I get that and we delete in Section B, and then we begin to add on page 4, add per hour fee and on page 5 you are adding a lot of fees and page 6 you are adding 30 fees for fire and then you are making me submit a full set of plans on page 7 for an upfit and you are giving me a designated number of inspections; more stipulations on inspection allocations, seems like you are just setting me up for more rules and more fees. If one of my peers or one of your peers looks at this for the first time and says that; what’s the department’s response? How can we communicate proactively through the Chamber or through an article in the paper to say “this was a set of issues that we the industry came up with and Code Enforcement put through a process embedded through the specific disciplines of the industry and we think it is the fairest and makes a more efficient use of our inspection allocations so the contractors that have been doing it right, Rodgers, keep doing it the same way they’ve always done, found that the contractors who were using inspections as quality control pay for it.” So how do we communicate that because when you first read this it’s a lot of paper and it’s a lot of numbers. So that contractors and customers that are conscientious about their use of resources aren’t subsidizing the people who abuse the Department’s resources and use it for their quality control process.

JB: That’s the sound-bite. The long explanation is three part: 1) a continuation of three years of work. We started this in the FY10 budget process. You asked us to throw out a net and bring some ideas back, which we did. FY11 you asked for this again, we did it; we brought some ideas back and on both cases it was like a smorgasbord, you picked things you wanted in FY10 and you pushed things back to FY11. Then you made more selections and last year you said you didn’t want to do it again instead you wanted us to go through this process with customers which took some time. We looked at the ordinance globally, you specifically said there were three things you wanted us to pay attention to one being the upfit calculator, the other was mega projects and the other was small projects then we added three on to that and in the first meeting we threw the floor open for ideas where there were 14 added which is how we came up with the 20 that we addressed. It’s part of a three year effort. The second thing I would point out is that it was done with the industry; there was a lot of time spent by a lot of industry members. The 5 BDC members were very active in this; they weren’t in all the meetings but there was a large body of them that were in a lot of the meetings. So it’s had tremendous amount of input and these are all things that were agreed to by the work group. And the third thing I’d say is it was a whole lot of work.

EM: When I read it in this format; it needs to be in this format for the RFBA, right?

JB: Yes, it’s in that format because that’s what you have to vote on so that we can send it on to the Board.

EM: This is not what needs to go to a consumer. First of all I need to commend those involved because it’s obvious this was a ton of work, but I think this does a great job of filling in; we did a lot of work shoring up the dam and this is filling in a lot of the cracks in which things are not equitable for example a homeowner who can go in and have 20 inspections and there’s no way to charge them for it, that’s wrong; when a contractor has 2 failures and they are paying more. So I think it does a good job of filling in some holes; I just don’t think this is the format we need to use to communicate that out beyond this forum.

JM: And if we fill in the holes we’ll know this is successful within 2 years when we are climbing our way out of this mess and we’re able to lower permit fees fairly dramatically across the board because we are recapturing our actual costs and the big projects are not subsidizing the little project and the little projects are paying their way.

EM: We’re going to charge you “x” but we’re going to send 1 inspector to do three things; if you want 3 people to come do one thing then you can pay for that service.

JM: Ed, John and Zeke, when you are actually applying for the permits do you think that this will make a more efficient process for your company and your customers? How do you feel about it?

EH: I think it'll lead the industry to be more efficient and it's putting the cost where the costs need to be and if you plan and organize right it will help eliminate some of those things that are just spinning wheels for the department. It will force the industry to be more efficient.

ZA: If they know they only have a certain number of permits to do maybe they'll wait another day.

TH: These are all inefficiencies that the consumer has pointed out. Topics thrown out at the entire panel and then elaborated on not so much by the county as much as it was the industry. It will help everyone become more efficient in the process and save the County dollars.

JM: And customer dollars at the end of the day.

TH: To voice it out to the consumer; you can take each topic from the report and it much easier to understand than read through this. If you haven't read through it; it is just good information.

JB: That's why the bottom of page 6 is important where it says 60 days. This isn't the format in which you would distribute but it's a format that the BOCC has to comment on and typically on things like this we don't go out and advertise to people that we are going to make the change until the BOCC votes to approve it. We know that we need more than 2 weeks notice to explain this to customers; hence the 60 days which is a long time for us. Getting the word out is a whole different set of the problem and it is reasonable once the BOCC votes on this; if you are so inclined to vote on this and send it on, I think we certainly are accountable to come back to you after the BOCC votes and have a public info strategy ready to go.

EM: Is 60 days long enough?

TH: Once it's approved we have to come back and determine how the changes are made strategically and what we use to get the information out there.

JB: I think 60 days is enough because there are details that have to be worked out and how quickly we jump on that is going to depend on how soon you vote on this. We don't want to spin our wheels on this if you don't want to push it forward. There will be a subcommittee to include some of the task force members to work out at least three of the issues here. Once you decide to send it forward there's a timing before it gets in front of the board. For it to pass the first time on the board it has to be unanimous with all present which almost never happens, so it is going to take at least two votes which means there is at least a month lag time after approval by the BOCC, so really you aren't talking 60 you are talking at least 90 days. We will put together a subcommittee that Patrick, Gene and others on our side would start to work on the details of those three items and at the same time we will put together a team probably Rebecca, Kathleen and others that focuses on how to take this and put it in nomenclature that people can absorb and get it out.

RB: What are the three issues you continue to refer to?

JB: Three points I was making; this is part of 3 a three year strategy; wasn't an isolated effort unto itself. The third cycle that we hope closes the door on looking at the Fee Ordinance except for cases where we come up with new ideas either you do or we do and we need to go in and tweak the Ordinance, so it's part of a large strategy. Two, it was put together by task force; it wasn't the department sitting in the closet working on its own. There was a lot of representation from the industry and a lot of representation by the BDC, a lot of dialog and there was agreement on all these points. Third is it has a lot of time and energy invested in it by industry representatives as well as the department. We've worked on this thing for 6 months. Those are the three points that I've made that if you take the sound bite that Jon talked about and talk about why this has merit, those are the three items.

JM: What action do you want from us today Jim, a vote on this? Or do you want more discussion?

EM: Does anybody have questions or concerns on anything that is in there?

ZA: Basically we are looking at 90 days.

TH: I am open to the vote.

HS: Question, when we talk about the upfit auto cost calculator is that where I've got a high rise and I am doing tenant upfits on 3 – 21. They've already placed the drywall, metal studs, lights and everything already and the owner's purchased that and put that on the floor. Are we going to have the upfit contractor come back for a permit to upfit that shell per floor?

JB: Good question which explains why after working on this for awhile we felt we had to go in and add the definition for that very thing and if you look at the definition under 7 that was driving us and is what we are after.

PG: There is no trigger to balance the score card; it's whatever they tell us, there is nothing to stop them, so if they say it's really \$10k and you've got 40 sheets of drawings and you look at them and say kind of looks like \$150k, but I can't stop it; it's allowed to move forward. This will allow a balanced playing field for all people in the services.

JB: The actual formula will be loaded on the web. The same way we worked out the renovation cost calculator with you two years ago, brought it to you and you folks said it made sense. Then we loaded it up on the web, same thing. That is why we came to an agreement with the BDC representatives last week that there is another set of work that has to happen behind this. A subcommittee that can be part of the action telling us to go forward on the three things they will help us work out.

HS: When we break our permits apart and we are going to charge by the hour whatever it takes to reformat everything, project delivery strategy you've got here after permit holder; is that applicable to Meck-SI?

JB: Yes, what we discussed in the meeting last week there is a line in the sand you can mess with your strategy as much as you want to up until the permit is issued; once the permit is issued; everything is locked in, if we have to go back and unsnarl it then it gets time consuming and it can involve Meck-SI. One of the things we discussed last week is that the sooner a customer identifies this is an issue it will be easier to pull it apart and put back together, the deeper it gets into the project the messier it gets and the more time that we are going to spend on it. Right now we don't collect anything for that time. One of the worst projects for that and for coordination was the Epicenter. We bled to death on that project.

JT: The 60 – 90 days you are describing; you have the subcommittee and say for instance the quantity of inspections trying to determine how many that is going to be; what if you don't come to an agreement? Can you explain that process?

JB: We've always managed to come to an agreement in the past; it's a subcommittee that will be made up of BDC Representatives, representatives from the industry and the department. We have to come up with something that makes sense and is reasonable. The most complicated thing that we ever had to work our way through, actually there were two of them; was the contractor pass rate incentives which Elliot will remember and architect/engineer pass rate incentives which Harry and Bernice are familiar with. Those were messy with a lot of tugging and pulling and we feel if we can work our way through that we probably can work our way through anything.

JM: Travis you had suggested bringing this to a vote, do you have a motion to approve this RFBA as written?

TH: Yes, after numerous meetings within these chambers, reviewing all topics listed on the RFBA, I file for motion to vote on this RFBA as written with the subcommittee to review the final points brought forth by the department.

ZA: Seconded this vote.

JM: All in favor of the motion to approve the RFBA issued by Travis Haston, seconded by Zeke Acosta say I. Any opposed? Let the record show the motion passed unanimously. Thank you Travis.

A request of formal vote was presented to the BDC in support of the RFBA - Cost Recovery Work Group (CRWG) Final Report. Travis Haston made the motion to approve this RFBA with Zeke Acosta seconding it. The vote passed unanimously; all are in favor of supporting the RFBA – Cost Recovery Work Group Final Report.

EM: Thank you to everyone that worked on this.

JM: I am personally fascinated by process; the fact that these ideas were brought forth by the industry, digested by the department, reconstituted by the industry, discussed and then we brought more people in, not just in this room and put in a 7 page format, is a great example how the BDC is a public advisory board that works really well with the department and we brought the ideas together. The private industry brought ideas forth to raise their fees in an effort to make this work; is a great example how this body should operate.

JB: I think the report that was delivered to you last month is really a good reflection of how the BDC as an advisory board and customers wanting to contribute their time work very effectively to tackle problems that affect the process and affect the well being of your businesses. I think it made a lot of sense.

JM: When you ask your customers to make the process better they give you feedback that can work.

TH: We didn't sit in a room to see how we can make the county and the department better, we looked at how to make everybody better as a whole and that's where it has value.

JM: Thank you guys again for all your work, the department, the BDC, the subcommittee; it's good stuff.

6. DEPARTMENT STATISTICS AND INITIATIVES REPORT

- January permit (only) revenue- \$1,443,556, compares to December revenue of \$1,038,733.
- FY12 budget projected monthly permit revenue; $\$12,001,001/12 = \$1,000,083 \times 7 = \$7,000,583$.
- At 12/31/11, YTD permit rev of \$8,858,014 is above permit fee rev projection by \$1,857,431 or 26.53%

Construction Value of Permits Issued

- December total - \$341,425,189, with YTD total of \$1,631,085,643
- Fy11 Total at Jan.31, 2011 – \$773,114,183
- So Fy12 ahead of Fy11 by \$857,971,460 or greater than a factor of 2

Permits Issued

	December	January	3 Month Trend
Residential	2299	2854	3138/2928/2299/2854
Commercial	2322	2402	2419/2148/2322/2402
Other (Fire/Zone)	398	399	374/396/398/399
Total	5019	5655	5931/5472/5019/5655

- Residential up 24%; commercial up 3.45%; total up 12.7%
- SF detached new construction permits YTD at 1216 vs. 1009 at 1/31/2011, so up 20.5%

Inspection Activity: Inspections Performed

Insp. Req.	Dec	Jan	Insp. Perf.	Dec	Jan	% Change
Bldg.	3716	3818	Bldg.	3681	3772	2.48%
Elec.	4764	4460	Elec.	4816	4417	-8.3%
Mech.	2737	2558	Mech.	2787	2513	-9.83%
Plbg.	2050	1865	Plbg.	2016	1893	-6.11%
Total	13,376	12,701	Total	13,394	12,595	-6.03%

- Bldg. up 2.5%; Elec, Mech & Plbg down 6%-10%
- Overall average inspections performed counts down 6%
- Inspections performed were 99.17% of inspections requested

Inspection Activity: Inspections Response Time

Insp. Resp. Time	OnTime %		Total % After 24 Hrs. Late		Total % After 48 Hrs. Late		Average Resp. in Days	
	Dec	Jan	Dec	Jan	Dec	Jan	Dec	Jan
Bldg.	93.4	96.1	95.3	97.3	98.1	98.4	1.15	1.09
Elec.	96.2	93.1	96.7	94.7	99.6	98.4	1.08	1.15
Mech.	93.9	94.5	95.1	96.2	98.5	98.3	1.13	1.11
Plbg.	96.5	97.2	97.1	97.2	99.3	97.6	1.07	1.08
Total	95.0	94.9	96.0	96.1	98.9	98.3	Dec	1.12

- B-M-P trades improved; electrical down 3%
- Overall average position well above 85-90% goal range

Inspection Pass Rates for January, 2012

OVERALL MONTHLY AV'G @ 85.65%, compared to 85.72% in December

<u>Bldg:</u>	Dec – 79.99%	<u>Elec:</u>	Dec. – 83.70%
	Jan – 78.52%		Jan. – 84.48%
<u>Mech:</u>	Dec. – 88.70%	<u>Plbg:</u>	Dec. – 93.25%
	Jan. – 89.57%		Jan. – 93.06%

- Elec and Mech up 1%+/-; Bldg down 1.5%; Plbg down .2%
- Overall average position slightly below (<.1%) Dec 2011.

CFD Inspection Pass Rate for January, 2012

- CFD overall inspection pass rate of xx% for December, compares to xx.xx% in December

OnSchedule and CTAC Numbers for January, 2012

CTAC:

- 68 first reviews
 - Projects approval rate (pass/fail) – 75%
 - CTAC was 33% of OnSch (*) first review volume (68/68+136 = 204) = 33%
- *CTAC as a % of OnSch is based on the total of only scheduled and Express projects

OnSchedule:

- 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
- 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
- May, 11: 196- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 98.5% all trades, 85.5% B/E/M/P only
- June, 11: 251- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 95.5% all trades, 94.2% B/E/M/P only
- July, 11: 175- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 92.25% all trades, 93.75% B/E/M/P only
- August, 11: 238- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 95% all trades, 94.75% B/E/M/P only
- Sept, 11: 219 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 95.25% all trades, 96.5% B/E/M/P only
- October, 11:176-1st rev'w projects; on time/early–96.75% all trades, 96.25% B/E/M/P only
- November, 11:184 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–91.75% all trades, 93.25% B/E/M/P only
- December, 11:143 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–95% all trades, 96% B/E/M/P only
- January, 12:136 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–78% all trades, 87% B/E/M/P only

Possible Reasons why on time early dropped significantly:

- a) The overall % was thrown off by a very low County Zoning number. Still checking on that.
- b) Posse/ EPS and EPR migration effected about 230 projects; could have change some of the times.
- c) Training of staff for the new EPM and EPR system; a lot of time to make this come out of the shoot ready to go.
- d) New Code Training
- e) Holidays
- f) Staff was advised to get the old stock (Paper) out of the system by use a “high” level of Interactive review so we can be ready for the transition.

Patrick suggests monitoring this to see if the above assessment is correct. JNB concurs with that.

Booking Lead Times

- OnSchedule Projects: **for reporting chart posted on line**, on January 31 showed
 - 1-2 hour projects; at 2work day booking lead time, except MP at 5 days
 - 3-4 hour projects; at 2work day lead time, except B-E-M/P & County Fire at 4-5 days
 - 5-8 hour projects; at 3-5 days lead time, except bldg at 10 days and M/P at 7 days.
- CTAC plan review turnaround time; 3 work days lead time, except building at 5 days.
- Express Review – booking lead time was 6 work days for small projects and 6 days for large

Status Report on Various Department Initiatives

January Meeting Follow-up

- The BDC Quarterly Bulletin from the January BDC meeting is still going through final draft and is in the hands of the Chairman; once he gets it back to us we'll get it posted and e-blasted to customers. This was delayed due to work clarifying the 2012 Code transition strategy with the County Attorney.

Update on BDC Budget Subcommittee Work

- The BDC Budget Subcommittee held their 1st meeting on Feb 10; next scheduled meeting will be on Feb 29th, Wanda Towler and Trent Haston accepted an invitation to join the effort. The March meeting is typically only budget. We try to finalize the report and send to you a few days ahead of the next meeting to include charts. We will field any questions that you have at the end of the meeting. Hopefully culminating in the BDC at large a vote of support for the budget that the subcommittee and the department agree on.

Status of Preliminary Code Review Policy Change

Patrick Granson talked with you last month about Preliminary Code Review Policy changes. Since we last spoke, they've continued meeting with your A/E representatives. Harry Sherrill had an idea he proposed that we've accepted on a tentative basis that we either accept a code analysis or an Appendix B as a form that has to be

loaded 48 hours before the scheduled meeting date. I have concern that sometimes A/Es fill out the Appendix B and that doesn't mean they understand it; they are just filling it out because it is required. Plan Reviewers will really have to be conscientious about checking it when it arrives to see if it makes sense and if it doesn't we will have to send it back and reschedule the meeting. The Appendix B is not an easy form to understand and confuses a lot of people.

BC: Part of me thinks that if you have to review it when it first comes in that's exactly what we are looking for. We are looking to weed out the people that are not ready for that preliminary review and if their Appendix B doesn't make sense then they are apparently not ready. It would seem the solution to your issue is to make a simplified form that has the information you know needs to be correct in order to have a successful preliminary review.

JB: It may be solved long term. The department's goal is to have an Appendix B that's drilled down where you are not dealing with questions that have nothing to do with your project because that is really what confuses people. When we get there and we are probably a year from being there, that might simplify it.

PG: In order for these things to be productive we want our customer to leave with good information, make sure they got what they wanted from us in a service and an expectation. We will have to be more accountable of looking at the sheet and if it's not we'll have to say you fell short of the mark, please refill out the form and address the form in a way we can understand; this being productive in what you do.

Manager/CA Added Comments

Lon McSwain – The CA's met concerning the turnaround time for the formal interpretations and we've come up with 10 working days to get back to the client for formal written interpretation based on the operation of DOI. Jim pointed out that the vast majority of the Code Administrator's work is informal it's not formal.

Chuck Walker – Two of our Building Plans Examiners David Gardner and Jeff Vernon spent 2 afternoons at UNCC with the architectural class and did a code review with some of the students on their senior project giving feedback from a code aspect. Response letters from the instructors of the classes stated that our folks did a great job working with the students.

7. Adjournment

The February 21st, 2012 Building Development Commission meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Note: The next BDC Meeting is scheduled for 3:00 p.m., Tuesday, March 20th, 2012.