

# BUILDING DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

## Minutes of October 15, 2013 Meeting

Jonathan Bahr opened the Building-Development Commission (BDC) meeting at 3:05 p.m. on Tuesday, October 15, 2013.

**Present:** Rob Belisle, Zeke Acosta, Bernice Cutler, Jonathan Bahr, John Taylor, Elliot Mann, Ed Horne, Chad Askew and Melanie Coyne

**Absent:** Travis Haston, Hal Hester, Kevin Silva and Jonathan Wood

### 1. MINUTES APPROVED

*The motion by Bernice Cutler, seconded by Zeke Acosta, to approve the September 17, 2013 meeting minutes passed unanimously.*

### 2. BDC MEMBER ISSUES AND COMMENTS

**Elliot Mann** asked if the Department was having issues w/ permit issuance running behind. He went on to give an example of a plan approval on 10-3 and the permits weren't issued for 10 days after plan approval. **Bernice Cutler** thanked Gene, Jeff and Gary for their assistance on some recent challenges in permitting. **John Taylor** asked when a placard is printed for temporary utilities, nowhere on the document does it state what the temporary utility is used for, and nothing prints out as far as the description of the work. **Jonathan Bahr** introduced our two (2) new BDC Members. Chad Askew employed by Housing Studio as our new AIA Representative and Melanie Coyne a Real Estate Broker serving as our new Public Representative. Welcome aboard.

### 3. PUBLIC ISSUES AND COMMENTS

No public issues and/or comments.

### 4. CODE ENFORCEMENT 2014 SERVICE DELIVERY ENHANCEMENT

**Jim Bartl** opened his presentation noting evaluating and improving process is ongoing for us. Looking back at past years; OnSchedule introduced in 2003; 2008 Proposed Commercial Plan Review Revisions; 2010 was our reorganization where we switched to a team based project centric service delivery method implementing North and South side managers. Today is no different, except we are responding to a massive shift in how projects are delivered especially on commercial projects and for customers who own large fleets of buildings or campuses. All BDC members are invited to attend a special presentation to staff on this topic, Wednesday, Oct 16<sup>th</sup>, at 8 a.m.; delivered by Rogers Builders, RPA Design and Robins-Morton. Tomorrow we are laying ground work on the current proposal of the Code Enforcement 2014 Service Delivery Enhancements. This includes Hybrid Collaborative Delivery team; PM/CEM Support Pilot and the Customer Service Center Design Project. If you have no reservations; we will prepare an RFBA on the Hybrid Collaborative Delivery team, and a project for customer service and how we will support our CEMs and Project Managers for delivery to the BDC, in the November meeting. The Hybrid Collaborative Delivery team proposal creates new cultures and creates new opportunities to work more efficiently and effectively for time management. We are currently working on three (3) projects within the CHS-BIM Pilot; CHS-Morrocroft, CHS-Davidson Behavioral Health, and CHS-Core Lab. We also have two other projects requesting similar status; Boulevard Homes – Phase II and the VA Hospital by RPA Design. So both demand and momentum for working with BIM-IPD is building. Other work by the Department supporting this change in commercial project delivery includes: BIM-IPD code change in NC Administrative Code, initiated in 2011; which keeps BIM-IPD delivery from being buried in permitting paperwork; the NC AE Licensing Board approved pilot testing AE seal use in BIM-IPD delivery process narrowly focusing on CHS-BIM projects and the Virtual Inspections pilot. This is going to be a different team and service approach. May operate similar to the Rehab Code Team where no FTE's are designated exclusively as plan reviewers or field inspectors; instead, a team of code officials, handling projects from start to finish to include 2 BIM navigator code officials; a PM/CEM, as the leader, managing a self directed work team w/ a project coordinator. We think we need to start building this team now. Along with supporting big room space as we did with the Rehab Code Pilot we see the possible

team composition; 12-16 FTE positions total made up of 8-12 code officials, 2 BIM navigator code officials, 1 CEM/PM (leader) and 1 project coordinator.

**PM/CEM Support Pilot:** This addresses an oversight in the 2010 Reorg design. Both CEM's and PM's have support needs not included in the original design. Our idea is to run a 6 month pilot with temporary support; evaluate and describe in detail what works then will create new positions and reassign staff accordingly. This is not about giving the PM/CEM's secretaries. It will be modeled after "Project Assistants" used by both AE's and GC's probably operating as a pool. Initially it will be 5 people; 2-trade clerks + 3 temp reassignments. For now, we are not proposing to add positions for the pilot; we are just making you aware of it.

**Customer Service Center Design Project:** Builds on a dialogue with the Chamber that started in August 2012 continuing through February 6<sup>th</sup> and August 6<sup>th</sup> meetings. Our process is 98% paperless with some of the most advanced supporting technology in the US. It is highly designed for AE use (with strong AE input) as well as highly designed for contractor use (with strong contractor input). We believe there is a growing gap between customers who are well schooled in our process, and those who are either new to it, or use it infrequently enough that understanding the "ins and outs" is not intuitive, or are uncomfortable with electronic medium. We are concerned about how to help the latter groups of customers, no matter which form of the process difficulty their particular situation presents. What we're thinking of is a design project reconfiguring the AST with a customer service center. Focusing on 5-10% of our customer service events who can't recall how to ride the technology bicycle; or need help using a particular technology screen; or who don't like technology & want a phone in or face-to-face service. The August 6 Chamber rep meeting indicated this should be a "no cost" service. The process will consist of research including a BofA contact; surveying other agencies such as Brit Columbia Natural Resources, Jefferson County, CO, Bellevue, WA, Portland, OR; the technology resources to be used are Computronix, Selectron, et al; who could offer tools once we confirm a design. Our plans are to form a novice/infrequent customer focus group to include agency reps, BDC public reps, as well as street persons. This group will design a fix and present proposal to BDC with any related org changes, proposed performance measures and an RFBA for/if any added positions.

Rob Belisle asked:

- 1) How the client pays for the Hybrid Collaborative Team?
- 2) How do you keep from solving the A/E's problems?
- 3) How many staff have you thrown into the CHS project?

John Taylor asked

- 1) Have you talked w/ other entities that utilizes this method to determine what worked and what didn't?
- 2) How do you market this in the industry?
- 3) How many years will it take to break even with this process?

Elliot Mann asked

- 1) How long is the pilot going to run?
- 2) Are you hiring right out of the shoot?
- 3) Do you think there will be additional revenue in the future?

## 5. Quarterly Reports

### Technical Advisory Board Quarterly Report by Willis Horton

**Overview:** held 6 TAB meetings this past quarter; 2 general, 2 Residential and 3 Commercial - New & Existing Buildings. Topics addressed on each date included the following.

- TAB General meeting -August 20, 2013; discussed how the Dept should handle plan review and inspections on the 2012 NC Energy Code.

- TAB General on sustainable design – July 23; discussed the IgCC and how utility incentive plans might mesh with the new code requirements.
- TAB Commercial New & Existing Building - July 17; discussed final actions list of objectives required for Green Building Design and the construction program to function properly.
- TAB Commercial New & Existing Building – Sept 18; members reported on the 5 objectives they volunteered to research, including a) leadership, b) education, c) recognition, d) benchmarking, and e) government regulations.
- TAB Residential - July 7; discussed how green build programs affect the real estate market, and considered the affects energy programs and sustainable design will have on future real estate sales.
- TAB Residential – August 8; discussed the master list of energy saving items that could be installed by the homeowner to include a list of items needed by a contractor.

### **Consistency Team Report by Lon McSwain**

- Building: there were 6 consistency meetings this quarter 3 residential and 3 commercial, with counts of topics discussed as follows.
  - Residential; 17 Q&A's, with an average of 13 contractors at each meeting.
  - Commercial; 26 Q&A's, with no contractor attendees at the meetings.
- Electrical: held 2 meetings with 23 questions addressed. 5 contractors attended the Sept meeting. In addition, Raymond Sanders presented on UL Field Investigations and Evaluation.
- Mechanical/Fuel Gas: 29 Mechanical Code and Fuel Gas Code questions, with 6 contractor attendees. In addition, David Keys of Thermal Ceramics presented on Fire Protection of Ductwork and Penetrations.
- Plumbing: 27 Plumbing Code questions, with 6 contractor attendees. In addition, Bob Torbin of Counter Strike presented on Bonding for Lightning Protection in CSST Gas Piping Installations.

### **Code Compliance Report by Joe Weathers**

- Note comparative format; you can compare how topics and their standings change, quarter to quarter.
- "Not ready"; Bldg – 5.95% (was 5.68%), Elec – 7.17% (was 7.29%), Mech – 5.97% (was 4.47%), plbg – 9.64% (was 9.18%)
- Rough/finish % split varies, some up, some down
  - Bldg; rough @ 35.45% (up from 35.27%), finish @ 20.05% (up from 19.39%)
  - Elec; rough @ 20.74% (down from 23.02%), finish @ 56.92% (up from 55.08%)
  - Mech; rough @ 31.27% (down from 31.52%), finish @ 57.30% (same as 57.27%)
  - Plbg; rough @ 31.78% (up from 27.36%), finish @ 36.14% (up from 33.1%)
- Most common topics repeating %; bldg-87%, elec-93%, mech-80%, plbg – 80%

### **Commercial Plan Review Report by Chuck Walker**

Part I: 63% of projects pass on 1<sup>st</sup> rev'w; 80% have passed after 2<sup>nd</sup> rev'w (with 1<sup>st</sup> review down slightly from last qtr when the pass rate was 65% and the 2<sup>nd</sup> review pass rate was 81%).

- pass rates on 1<sup>st</sup> review by trade:  
Bldg–80% (was 82%); Elec – 81% (was 80%); Mech – 80% (was 81%); Plbg – 81% (was 80%);

Part II: most common defects: examples

- Bldg: Appendix B, egress related (2), UL assembly, energy req'ts, opening protection
- Elec: general, services/ feeders, branch circuits, grounding & bonding, motors, AC-ref'g eqpt
- Mech: fresh air req't, eqpt location, exhaust, duct systems, energy compliance, fire/smoke dampers
- Plbg: plbg syst inst'l, drainage piping, venting system inst'l, water distr piping, water heater inst'l

Part III: 1<sup>st</sup> use of "approved as noted" (AAN) at 38% by all trades on av'g (up from 35% last quarter)

- biggest users; CFD (91%) and MCFM (73%)

- critical path users; Bldg (36%, up from 25%), Elec (20%, up from 14%), Mech (17%, up from 13%), Plbg (23%, up from 21%)

## 6. Quarterly BDC Bulletin Exercise by Jim Bartl

### Previous bulletin topics:

<p><b>October, 2011</b></p> <p>Carbon Monoxide alarm requirements</p> <p>Cost Recovery Work Group status</p> <p>2012 NC Building Code transition</p> <p>Changes in temporary utility process</p>	<p><b>January, 2012</b></p> <p>2012 NC State Building Code transition</p> <p>CRWG final report</p> <p>EPS-EPR startup</p>	<p><b>April, 2012</b></p> <p>NC Res'd Code transition</p> <p>2012 NC Building Code commercial project transition rules</p> <p>Code Enforcement Fy13 budget proposal</p>	<p><b>July, 2012</b></p> <p>Fy2012 yearend work load summary</p> <p>Cost Recovery Work Group changes approved by BOCC</p> <p>RDS program challenges</p> <p>Dept available for early project meetings on process</p>
<p><b>October, 2012</b></p> <p>Democratic National Convention success</p> <p>RDS Master Plan change</p> <p>Cost Recovery Work Group changes approved by BOCC</p> <p>CSS Customer survey focus group follow up work</p>	<p><b>January, 2013</b></p> <p>ISO commercial score of '1'</p> <p>BOCC approves 21 position betterment</p> <p>Racking permit process discussions</p> <p>Revisions to inspections auto notification</p>	<p><b>April, 2013</b></p> <p>Change of BDC leadership</p> <p>Lien agent legislative change</p> <p>Status of 12/4/2012 betterment</p> <p>Trends considered in Fy14 budget development</p> <p>CTAC-EPS installation takes dept to 98% paperless</p>	<p><b>July, 2013</b></p> <p>Fy14 Code Enforcement budget proposal</p> <p>Economic data trends and betterment proposal</p> <p>POSSE upgrade announcement</p> <p>Fy14 budget technology enhancements</p>
<p><b>October, 2013</b></p> <p>New BDC Members</p> <p>Code Interpretation Web Search Engine Goes Live</p> <p>Owner-Developer Web Page</p> <p>"Starting A Small Business" Web Page</p> <p>BIM-IPD and Future Department Challenges</p>			

## 7. Department Statistics and Initiatives Report

### Permit Revenue:

- September permit (only) revenue- \$1,610,117, compares to August revenue of \$1,960,638
- Fy14 budget projected monthly permit revenue;  $\$17,008,928/12 = \$1,417,411$
- So September permit revenue is \$192,705 above monthly projection
- At 9/30/13, YTD permit rev of \$5,306,365 is above permit fee rev projection (3 x \$1.4174M = \$4,252,233) by \$1,054,132, or 24.8%

### Construction Value of Permits Issued:

- Sept total - \$313,344,048, compares to August, 13 total - \$359,568,055, & Sept, 12 total - \$156.133M
- YTD at 9/30/13 of \$918,025,205; 45.8% above constr value permit'd YTD at 9/30/12, of \$629.53M

**Permits Issued:**

	August	September	3 Month Trend
<b>Residential</b>	4150	3720	4877/5110/4150/3720
<b>Commercial</b>	2744	2293	2558/2534/2744/2293
<b>Other (Fire/Zone)</b>	477	424	419/540/477/424
<b>Total</b>	7371	6437	7852/8184/7371/6437

- Residential down 10.4%; commercial down 16.4%; total down 12.7%
- Note; after 3 months, SF new construction permits total 804; almost same as 801 at 9/30/12

**Inspection Activity: Inspections Performed:**

Insp. Req.	August	Sept	Insp. Perf.	August	Sept	% Change
<b>Bldg.</b>	6681	6174	<b>Bldg.</b>	6611	6084	-8%
<b>Elec.</b>	7351	6502	<b>Elec.</b>	7380	6524	-11.6%
<b>Mech.</b>	3963	3753	<b>Mech.</b>	3985	3776	-5.2%
<b>Plbg.</b>	3179	2833	<b>Plbg.</b>	3123	2880	-7.8%
<b>Total</b>	21,174	19,262	<b>Total</b>	21,099	19,264	-8.7%

- Insp performed totals down 8.7%
- All BEMP inspections down, from 5%+ (Mech) to 12%- (Elec)
- Insp performed were 100% of inspections requested

**Inspection Activity: Inspections Response Time (IRT Report)**

Insp. Resp. Time	OnTime %		Total % After 24 Hrs. Late		Total % After 48 Hrs. Late		Average Resp. in Days	
	Aug	Sept	Aug	Sept	Aug	Sept	Aug	Sept
Bldg.	96.7	93.5	97.7	94.8	99.3	98.1	1.07	1.14
Elec.	83.2	87.3	89.2	90.0	95.7	96.0	1.33	1.28
Mech.	83.1	83.4	89.4	87.3	95.7	93.4	1.34	1.39
Plbg.	94.3	91.3	95.8	92.6	99.2	96.6	1.11	1.20
<b>Total</b>	<b>89.0</b>	<b>89.1</b>	<b>92.9</b>	<b>91.4</b>	<b>97.4</b>	<b>96.2</b>	<b>1.22</b>	<b>1.25</b>

- Elec up 4%+; Mech up <1%; Bldg & Plbg down 3%
- Overall average within the 85-90% goal range.

**IRT Comparison to POSSE Insp Efficiency Report (IER)**

1 <sup>st</sup> - 24 hr average	IRT Sep rate	IER Sept rate	% difference	insp resp in days	IRT Sept av'g	IER Sept av'g	difference in days
<b>Bldg.</b>	93.5	82.4%	-11.1%	<b>Bldg.</b>	....1.14	1.33	-.19
<b>Elec.</b>	87.3	56.7%	-30.6%	<b>Elec.</b>	....1.28	1.62	-.34

<b>Mech.</b>	83.4	41.7%	-41.7%	<b>Mech.</b>	....1.39	1.78	-.39
<b>Plbg</b>	91.3	77.1%	-14.2%	<b>Plbg.</b>	....1.20	1.38	-.18
<b>MT.</b>	na	93.0%	na	<b>MT.</b>	Na	na	Na
<b>Total</b>	89.1%	73.1%	-16.0%	<b>Total</b>	1.25	1.53	-.25

- So there appears to be variance between IRT & IER as follows;
  - IER is 16% lower on percent complete in 1<sup>st</sup> 24 hours.
  - IER av'g days per inspection are .25 days (2 hours) longer.
- Computronix completed dashboard installations on Sept 13 and it is currently in UAT. When UAT is complete, the new IRT report will be available. See item 7.2.2.1 for related BDC-IRT subcomm work.

### Inspection Pass Rates for September, 2013:

OVERALL MONTHLY AV'G @ 81.81%, compared to 81.99%, in August

**Bldg:** August – 74.3%                      **Elec:** August – 82.56%  
 September – 74.94%                      September – 82.36%

**Mech:** August – 85.37%                      **Plbg:** August – 89.7%  
 September – 83.22%                      September – 90.34%

- Bldg and Plbg up <1%, Elec down <1%, Mech down 2%+
- Overall average down .18%, and still above 75-80% goal range

### On Schedule and CTAC Numbers for September, 2013:

#### CTAC:

- 109 first reviews, compared to 162 in August.
- Projects approval rate (pass/fail) – 75%
- CTAC was 39% of OnSch (\*) first review volume (109/109+169 = 278) = 39.2%  
 \*CTAC as a % of OnSch is based on the total of only scheduled and Express projects

#### On Schedule:

- April, 12: 151 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–92.25% all trades, 95% B/E/M/P only
- May, 12: 195 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–94.5% all trades, 97% B/E/M/P only
- June, 12: 235 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–98.63% all trades, 98.25% B/E/M/P only
- July, 12: 166 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–94.88% all trades, 97.5% B/E/M/P only
- August, 12: 199 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–89.5% all trades, 96% B/E/M/P only
- September, 12: 118 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–96.38% all trades, 97.25% B/E/M/P only
- October, 12: 183 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–97% all trades, 98.75% B/E/M/P only
- November, 12: 141 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–92.4% all trades, 97% B/E/M/P only
- December, 12: 150 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–93.25% all trades, 96.75% B/E/M/P only
- January, 13: 140 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–89.12% all trades, 94.25% B/E/M/P only
- February, 13: 142 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–81.125% all trades, 94.25% B/E/M/P only
- March, 13: 137 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–87.5% all trades, 91.5% B/E/M/P only
- April, 13: 149 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–94.375% all trades, 94.5% B/E/M/P only
- May, 13: 216 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–96.375% all trades, 96.25% B/E/M/P only
- June, 13: 191 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–96.88% all trades, 97.5% B/E/M/P only
- July, 13: 197 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–90.375% all trades, 92% B/E/M/P only
- August, 13: 210 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–89.4% all trades, 93.5 B/E/M/P only

- September, 13: 203 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early—89.88% all trades, 92.5% B/E/M/P only

#### Booking Lead Times

- On Schedule Projects: **for reporting chart posted on line**, on September 30, 2013, showed
  - 1-2 hr projects; at 2-3 work days booking lead
  - 3-4 hr projects; at 2-4 work days lead, except Bldg at 13 work days
  - 5-8 hr projects; at 3-4 work days lead, but B-15, MP-13, and City Zoning at 16 work days
- CTAC plan review turnaround time; BEMP at 2 work days, and all others at 1 day.
- Express Review – booking lead time was; 10 work days for small projects, 10 work days for large

### **Status Report on Various Department Initiatives**

#### **Follow up on BDC member comments in September meeting:**

**Zeke Acosta**; notification of not being the contractor on a project doesn't work well for them.

- Current status:
  - The request was submitted to CE-Tech Triage to be installed on 9/5/13 and was installed Oct 14.
  - We completed a revised contractor letter which should address this; that change is pending.
  - So now when a contractor has been assigned to a permit we will provide a letter with detailed options for contractor to unassign the company from the permit, to include the option for contractor to process the change electronically.
  - Those step-by-step instructions are available for both customers and staff use.

**Travis Haston**; residential plot plan submittal options other than fax.

- Current status:
  - The system uses pdf submission for building plan review, but plot plans reflecting the building house locations and setback are faxed to the City of Charlotte Zoning Department located in LUESA.
  - We are currently working on a technology enhancement which would allow both permit application, building plans and plot plans to be uploaded online. This should be online in November or December.

### **Updates on Other Department Work**

#### **BDC-IRT Subcommittee**

- Computronix installed the programming change for this on September 13. The program is currently in UAT. As soon as UAT is complete, we'll crank out the report push the subcomm's work forward
  - Need some program refinements to run annual and historic reports; should have November.
- Our plan is to run a report to recreate historic data going back, maybe to July, 2011.
  - The Subcomm will review the data to see if it's useful.
  - If so, it will be compared to old IRT-IER data.
  - Consideration will be given to time dating when the work environment is "normal", or identifying abnormal impacts, in trying to evaluate meaningful trends, and staff sufficiency
- Based on the data run, the subcomm will address three questions;
  - a) Does the new report meet the BDC's need?
  - b) Is the current staffing level sufficient to achieve performance goals agreed to with the BDC?
  - c) Does the related performance goal (85-90% of inspections complete in 1<sup>st</sup> 24 hours) still "feel right"?
- BDC-IRT subcomm volunteers include Rob B, Kevin S, John T, Ed Horne and Harry Sherrill

#### **Chamber/NAIOP Feb 6 meeting follow up**

- The management team continues to work on two topics from this meeting;
  - Jon Morris & Natalie E solicited articles for the Chamber weekly newsletter
  - Web links to process "stop sign" graphic and a new section emphasizing PM-CEM value thru case study success stories. Can build on recent favorable Meck Times article about MSC-Direct, et al.
- This work will also be rolled into the CSS Report wrap up strategy, discussed in item 7.

## **Other**

### **Industry presentation at HMC, Wednesday October 16<sup>th</sup> at 8:00 a.m.**

- All BDC members should have received an October 7 Dept e-mail, inviting you to this event.
- Three members of the design and construction community will present to all staff on how and why a large part of commercial work is changing the project delivery process.
- Presenters include; Rodgers Builders, RPA Design and Robins & Morton.
- All BDC members are invited to attend if interested.

### **Small Business Advisory Board Webpage**

- On July 24, at the request of Commissioner Ridenhour, the Department presented to the Small Business Advisory Board, reviewing the P&I process and supporting technology
- Based on comments in that meeting and design sessions with the LUESA Director, we added new features to the new Owner-Developer web pages, focusing on small businesses, including;
  - New button in the "Getting Started" column, entitled "Starting a Small Business?"
  - Links on regulatory requirements to license & tax requirements, permits, zoning, CTAC
  - Resource links, including; Chamber, Charlotte Business Resource, CPCC, SBA, et al
  - Department summary page on the benefit of using NC licensed AE's and contractors.
- Patrick & Gene will present these changes to the Small Business Advisory board and receive comment on November 20.

### **Work in Opposition to BCC's Proposal to Change Commercial Code to a 6 Year Cycle**

- As mentioned to you in the September BDC meeting, on Sept 10 the NC Building Code Council (BCC) received lengthy public comment on the idea of changing the family of NC commercial codes to a 6 year code change cycle.
  - At the end of the meeting, BCC members considered a formal motion (made by the BCC's general contractor representative) to make this change, debating the issue at length.
  - In the end, the BCC agreed to include this topic in the December 10 public hearing, to receive more stakeholder input on the proposal.
- On October 9, the Department participated in discussions with representatives of AIA-NC, NCBIA, the NC Fire Code Committee, ICC and others, regarding how to convey the significant long term problems and costs this will pose for both commercial customers and local government.

### **AE Seal BIM-IPD Pilot 6 Month Report**

- Per the Pilot Program Proposal (3/12/2013, rev 4/5/2013), the proponents committed to reporting every 6 months on two topics;
  - a) the current status of the specific projects in the program, and
  - b) observations made to date by CHS and Meck on what "pilot program activity to date indicates regarding special BIM-IPD provisions which may be appropriate within the Board Rules".
- On October 2, the CHS & Meck jointly submitted the first report;
  - Noting the pilot now has 3 projects; Morrocroft ED, Davidson Behavioral Health & Core Lab.
  - Inviting AE Board representatives to attend Core Lab Lean 3P "Report Out" sessions, offering 3 dates (Oct 18, Nov 15, and Dec 6).

### **Manager/CA Added Comments**

- There were no additional Manager / CA comments.

## **8. ADJOURNMENT**

The BDC Meeting adjourned at 5:03.

The next BDC meeting is scheduled for 3:00 p.m., Tuesday, December 17th, 2013.