Jon Morris opened the Building-Development Commission (BDC) meeting at **3:08 p.m. on Tuesday, May 18, 2010**.

Present: Jon Morris, Ed Horne, Wanda Towler, Dave Shultz, Harry Sherrill, Bernice Cutler, Will Caulder and Elliot Mann

Absent: Zeke Acosta, Trent Haston, Barry Hanson, Jonathon Wood and Buford Lovett

1. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES
The motion by Dave Shultz seconded by Bernice Cutler to approve the April 20, 2010 meeting minutes passed unanimously.

2. BDC MEMBER ISSUES AND COMMENTS
Will Caulder remarked on the Fox news report indicating inspection response times were behind. Mr. Bartl shared the correct inspection response times and explained that the information presented by Fox news was grossly inaccurate. All BDC members agreed the information presented by Fox news was incorrect as well as very unprofessional journalism when presenting these gross inaccuracies to the public.

3. PUBLIC ATTENDEE ISSUES AND COMMENTS
Lee Howard with Salem Builders remarked that their business has taken a hard hit due to economic downturns. Mr. Howard commented that they have no problem with the new fee increase implemented by Mecklenburg County. He did ask that Code Enforcement find a way of maintaining our current service levels. He suggested a higher fee structure for expedited inspections 1 day vs. 3 days to be used in Residential as well as Commercial. Conversation ensued regarding our current programs; IBA, OTI and others that will assist those needing expedited inspections.

4. CSS SURVEY REPORT
An advance survey report was sent to BDC members and a one page summary was handed out to all BDC members. Mr. Bartl indicated in closing that we are happy with the response rate (638 and 15.4%). This is the highest response rate since the first survey. The basic trend is positive, but we will not rest on that. We are working harder to get the word out about the Reorg. Going forward, will determine why some focus areas are still a problem (reach the right person, etc.) and will identify a new set of challenges to roll into the Balanced Score Card for the next two years.

5. PERFORMANCE GOAL AGREEMENT
The 2010 Code Enforcement Department Performance Goals chart was emailed to BDC members prior to meeting. A discussion of Department performance goals and an agreement between the BDC and the Department of said goals ensued. Mr. Bartl discussed past goals that were agreed to by the BDC, the impact on projects; post RIF and begun to summarize new performance goals to be agreed upon in our next meeting.

5.1. Key performance measures agreed to with BDC
- Inspection response time: 90% in 1st day
- Inspection pass rate: 80% and striving toward 85%
- Commercial Permits booking lead
    - Small projects at 10-12 work days
    - Medium to large projects at 15-20 work days
- CTAC review turnaround time: at or below 5 days
- Residential Plan review turnaround time: at or below 5 days

5.1.1. Other performance measures

- OnSch plans reviewed on time or early: 90% (eventually to change to pass rate similar to inspections)
- Residential permits issued in 1st 24 hours: 90%
- Admin support calls answered rate: 90%
- ISO rating; goal of 1for both residential and commercial

5.2. Projected impact of RIF on performance measures; assuming workloads stay close to FY10 levels; 65k permits, 180k-190k insp, CTAC 1st rev'w 1250+/- OnSch 1st rev'w 1400+/-.

5.2.1. Inspections: dropping 30 inspectors to 60 total, would av'g perform at about FY07 levels
  - 24 hour inspection response time at or near 90% goal, *vs. 98% now*
  - Inspection failure rate increasing to above 20%, *vs. 13% now*
  - In both cases, electrical likely to be key (most challenging)

5.2.2. RDS/RTAC: no change in staffing; doesn't appear to be an issue w/new CTAC backup.
  - Currently performing at 680 reviews/reviewer/year
  - With 96% of reviews turning around at 5 days or less

5.2.3. CTAC: no changes in staffing; doesn't appear to be an issue.
  - Currently working at 416 rev'ws/reviewer/yr
  - With a 65% pass rate, w/ 3 day turnaround

5.2.4. OnSchedule & CMS/Mega booking lead times: staffing down from 29 to 22 reviewers.
  - OnSch small project booking lead time could climb to 8-10 days booking lead on average
  - OnSch mid-large project booking lead could climb to 15-20 days on average
  - CMS/Mega impact uncertain, but if they aren't buried with a large influx of projects all at once (highly unlikely) they should be ok, and may be able to back OnSch, as they do now

5.2.5. Admin Support Team: staffing reduced by 5 slots
  - If TIP can be expanded to assume 55% of permit workload, should be able to maintain goal of 24 hr turnaround on residential applications (exclusive of City Zoning issues)
  - Calls answered currently running at 97%; likely falls to 85%-90%

5.2.6. ISO Impact
  - Three possible problems:
    - Training budget
    - Commercial plan review population; capacity falls to 69% of ISO benchmark
    - Inspector population; capacity falls to 78.5% of ISO benchmark
  - So Com'l likely falls to ISO #3; *#2 possible if trng budget increased + 1 plan rev'w tm + insp staff*
- Residential falls to an ISO #2, *with a #1 possible if trng increased + insp staff*

5.3. Revised agreement with BDC on performance measures (tabled for June meeting)

Performance topic	pre-RIF goal	pre-RIFservice	post-RIF goal
- Insp resp 1st day	90%	97%+	_____
- Insp pass rate	80-85%	87%	_____
- RDS review	5 days	3-5 days	_____
- CTAC review	5 days	3-5 days	_____
- OnSch'l book'g days	10sm/15-20m-lg	1sm/3-5 m-lg	_____
- Res permit 1st day	90%	90%	_____
- Calls answered %	90%	98%	_____

5.3.1. Formal motion that BDC concurs with these performance goal (tabled for June meeting)

6. TECHNOLOGY UPDATE

Discussion of the below technology update was tabled until the June 22nd meeting.

6.1. Success of TIP: very brief, with hard numbers on permit use (2009 – 10,400, 2010 – project 15,000)

6.2. How RDS-EPS is working (volume, changes, challenges, etc)

6.3. Note that EPS has three parts: EPM, EPS & EPR

6.4. What EPM is about, what it consists of and how it works
   o Commercial Online applications - allow users to submit online applications for commercial plans including: OnSchedule; Express; Mega; CTAC; RTAP; Prelims and; CMS schools.
   o Architect Dashboard - links the AE and designer to project by e-mail and key events notice.
   o Internal staff dashboard – work plate for staff; allow users with admin privileges to manage lookup tables; with extensive reports; with integration of LD plan review outcomes.\
   o Electronic Sign Off - allows user to load sheet index with sheet generation & revision date.
   o Workflow Management – converts process to Windows Workflow technology, and tracks/logs all events. Key steps are: Plan receipt; estimation; scheduling (review scheduled, accept, cancel or abort); paper plans receipt (receive plan or return plan); review outcome; close review (if plan disapproved); check for abandoned plans; online payment for abandoned or review aborted fees.
   o Online payment - ability to credit card pay abandoned plan and review aborted fees online.

6.5. Where are we on the design of EPS; how to describe where we are w/ Sages?

6.6. Where are we on the design of EPR; design criteria to be complete in 40 days, brief description of how it will work.

6.7. Other initiatives we tucked in around the edges, while advancing the above
   o *Contractor Website Dashboard:* redesigns existing contractor application; intuitive design, reduces excessive clicks; keeps existing features/functionality; adds graphs to view key metrics; adds graphical project view of project status; includes "My Project Summary" tab, collecting all the information & showing contractor the complete project status at a glance.
   o *WAP service expansion:* new mobile service tool, modifying Wireless Application Protocol (WAP, allowing contractors to schedule inspections and to monitor progress from a mobile phone, but also allows any contractor to keep their project's momentum going with help from their BlackBerry or iPhone.

6.8. What's next in the big picture:
   o Single Portal with Charlotte: pending agreement with City on advancing proof of concept work by Sages and City's plan review vendor, Accella.
   o BIM-IPD: 3 part strategy as described in Fy11 budget handout

6.9. Timing:
   o Sages will tentatively deliver Scheduling (replaces office tracker) by next December-January.
   o Into Beta testing on EPS-EPR in early 2011; acceptance testing March –April 2011.

7. DEPARTMENT STATISTICS & INITIATIVES REPORT

7.1. Statistics Report

7.1.1. Permit Revenue

<u>Noting</u> that we recaptured $247,338.63 worth of credits in the contr pass rate overpayment issue
April - $1,141,393 – 247,338 = $894,055, so Fy10 YTD is $8,303,393 – 247,338 = $8,056,055
Fy10 projected at April - $12,310,220; so below projection by $4,254,312 or 34.56%

7.1.2. Construction Value of Permits Issued

<u>Noting</u> that we recaptured $247,338.63 worth of credits in the contr pass rate overpayment issue
April - $1,141,393 – 247,338 = $894,055, so Fy10 YTD is $8,303,393 – 247,338 = $8,056,055
Fy10 projected at April - $12,310,220; so below projection by $4,254,312 or 34.56%

7.1.3. Permits Issued

	March	April	3 Month Trend
Residential	3245	3753	2676/2533/3245/3753
Commercial	2233	2243	1714/1763/2233/2243
Other (Fire/Zone)	503	529	429/408/503/529
Total	5981	6525	4819/4704/5981/6525

- Residential up 15.6%; Commercial same; total up 9.1%.
- Note: after 10 months, new SF detached permits are up 24.6% (1844 FY10 YTD vs. 1479 at April 2009)

7.1.4. Inspection Activity: Inspections Performed

Insp. Req.	Mar	April	Insp. Perf.	Mar	April	% Change
Bldg.	4875	5116	**Bldg.**	4795	5050	+5.3%
Elec.	5990	5823	**Elec.**	5897	5738	-2.7%
Mech.	3000	3258	**Mech.**	2985	3257	+9.1%
Plbg.	2505	2728	**Plbg.**	2468	2739	+11%
Total	16,370	16,925	**Total**	16,145	16,784	+3.96%

- For April: total inspections requested up 3.4%, total inspections performed up 3.9%
- Inspections performed were 99.17% of inspections requested

7.1.4.1 Inspection Activity: Inspections Response Time

Insp. Resp. Time	OnTime %		Total % After 24 Hrs. Late		Total % After 48 Hrs. Late		Average Resp. in Days	
	Mar	April	Mar	April	Mar	April	Mar	April
Bldg.	98.7	98.0	99.0	98.1	99.6	98.9	1.04	1.06
Elec.	96.6	88.3	96.7	91.5	99.6	96.1	1.07	1.26
Mech.	99.2	98.3	99.3	98.5	99.8	99.3	1.02	1.04
Plbg.	99.3	97.1	99.3	97.5	99.8	99.2	1.02	1.07
Total	98.1	94.6	98.3	95.8	99.7	98.1	1.04	1.13

- All down; Bldg, Mech & Plbg a little; Electrical down 8%
- Average still well above 90% goal

7.1.5. Inspection Pass Rates for April, 2010
OVERALL MONTHLY AV'G @ 86.58%, compared to 87.14% in March

Bldg:	March – 80.52%	**Elec**:	March – 87.16%
	April – 77.43%		April – 88.2%

Mech:	March – 90.19%	**Plbg:**	March – 93.35%
	April – 90.74%		April – 93.62%

- Elec, Mech, Plbg improved slightly; Bldg down 3%
- Average total still at close to historic highs

7.1.5.1 CFD Pass Rate for April, 2010
- See handout; shows overall rate of 76.34% for April, up from 80.53% in March.

7.1.6. OnSchedule and CTAC Numbers for April, 2010
CTAC:
- 111 first reviews
- Projects approval rate (pass/fail) – 72%
- CTAC was 41% of OnSch first review volume (111/111+138 =249) = 44.58%

OnSchedule:
- January, 09: 132 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 92.8% all trades, 91.4% B/E/M/P only
- February, 09: 142 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 93.2% all trades, 91.7% B/E/M/P only
- March, 09: 143 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 90% all trades, 89% B/E/M/P only
- April, 09: 112 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 93.46% all trades, 93.23% B/E/M/P only
- May, 09: 123 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 92.31% all trades, 89.83% B/E/M/P only
- June, 09: 130 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 93.88% all trades, 93.77% B/E/M/P only
- July, 09: 124 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 95.12% all trades, 94.36% B/E/M/P only
- August, 09: 114 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 95.27% all trades, 94.27% B/E/M/P only
- Sept, 09: 115 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 93.17 % all trades, 90.62% B/E/M/P only
- October, 09: 131 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 95.04% all trades, 93.67% B/E/M/P only

- November, 09: 114 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 92.07% all trades, 91.09% B/E/M/P only
- December, 09: 106 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 94.72% all trades, 95.18% B/E/M/P only
- January, 10: 104 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 93.79% all trades, 93.28% B/E/M/P only
- February, 10: 119 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 94.49% all trades, 93.3% B/E/M/P only
- March, 10: 161- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 97.51% all trades, 97.16% B/E/M/P only
- April, 10: 138- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 95.87% all trades, 94.07% B/E/M/P only

Booking Lead Times
- OnSchedule Projects: **for reporting chart posted on line**, on March 24, showed
  - 1-2 hour projects; at 1 work day booking lead time, across the board
  - 3-4 hour projects; at 2 work days booking lead time, across the board
  - 5-8 hour projects; at 3-4work days booking lead time, across the board
- CTAC-BEMPFp running 3 work days on plan review turnaround time, across the board
- Express Review – booking lead time was; 7 work days for small projects, 7 work days for large

7.2. Status Report on Various Department Initiatives
7.2.1. BDC April Meeting Follow Up
7.2.1.1: Various RFBA Status
- Fee Increase; approved by BOCC on April 20
- GPR suspension; approved by BOCC on April 20
- Technology Surcharge: approved by BOCC on May 5
- Customers notified of all by web posting as well as e-mail customer notice from JNB

7.2.1.2: Technical Advisory Board (TAB) Nominations
On the nominations:
- Dept sent letters on March 23 soliciting TAB nominations by; AIA, PENC, ASHRAE, IES, Duke, Carolinas AGC, USGBC, UNCC (Charlotte Research Institute).
- To date, three nominations received (plus two utility reps assigned), however, the invitation requested a response by the end of May, recognizing that some Boards only meet monthly.
- Plan to have all nominations collected for BDC action in June meeting

On the TAB startup:
- Code Administrators starting to outline the detailed mechanics of how the TAB will work, for review with the BDC perhaps at June meeting.
- This will address details outlined in the RFBA changes to the Building-Development Ordinance
- As well as; a) initial meeting steps, b) regular meeting regimen, c) web support tools (both for TAB members and the customers at large), and d) initial topics (immediate action required, IgCC development status, Meck peculiar/focused issues, etc)

7.2.1.3. Code Enforcement Reorganization Startup Plans
- Transition to 2010 Reorganization Plan made on May 5
- Brief update from Gary & Jeff on status of transition prep

7.2.1.4. BDC Quarterly Bulletin
- New quarterly bulletin complete, e-mailed to customers and posted on www.meckpermit.com

7.2.2. Customer Budget Presentations
- Presentations (8) delivered to 89 customers
- Presentations scheduled with HBA on May 26,
  - Plus customer BB lunch presentations scheduled on May 21, May 28 and June 11 (tentative)
- Have requests /offers out to PENC, SFPE, AIA, NAIOP, et al

7.2.3. Dept has two position changes to formally announce
7.2.3.1. Building Code Administrator position filled
- Lon McSwain selected to fill Bldg Code Administrator position
- Background: 25 years with Dept as line inspector, Ass't Chief and Com'l Plan Reviewer. Inspector repo on BCC. Depth of technical code knowledge, and passion for researching code problems, makes Lon an excellent choice to take on the Department's new vision for the Building Code Administrator position

7.2.3.2. Interim Director of Permitting and Plan Review announcement
- Patrick Granson elevated to Director of Permitting and Plan Review on an interim basis.
- Fills ESP vacancy until such time as revenue is strong enough to address permanent fill.
- In Interim, Willis Horton will lead OnSchedule, CMS & Mega work

7.2.4. Report on Contractor Pass Rate Incentives overpayment
- As mentioned in March, on Feb 2, the Dept discovered a programming error on credits only.
- The error involves over 150 accounts and approximately $600k in excess credit
- On April 1, County & Dept management and County Attorney reviewed both our authority and responsibility to collect the overpayment. All agreed we have both the authority and responsibility.
- BOCC was advised on April 20, as well as BDC.
- On April 21, Dept sent letters to impacted customers advising of our intention to collect overpayment.
- On April 28, $247,338 moved from contractor accounts with outstanding credits.
- In general, contractors were approached as follows:
  - The contractors were given 30 days (to May 28th) to pay or contact us to set up payment plan.
  - The contractors that contact us to set up a payment plan were given 90 days to pay with no interest or finance charges accruing – basically no penalty to them.
  - On the contractors who don't pay or don't contact us to set up a payment plan at the end of the 30 days; or if there is still a balance on the account after 90 days for those contractors that do set up the payment plan, approach was;
    - Leave all balances in "Q" accounts until end of August (90 days after 5/28); then transfer all remaining balances back to regular accounts and start 90-day process.
- Every effort being made to work with customers.
- So far, KB reports most customers with questions understand when details outlined.
- Questions.

7.2.5. AE Pass Rate Incentives update
- Reminder on the history on the program
  - Started in 2000, w/ Dept & PRTF pursuing goal of raising AE pass rates to at least 75% on 1st reviews (had been as low as 21% in 1999 audit).
  - Changes in 2000 & 2003 raised the pass rate to 50%, but it slid back to around 45% by 2006.
  - At that point the BDC, PRTF & Dept concluded needed to work on again.
    - Conclusion was needed a stronger incentive on the AE's part, like AE Pass Rate.
    - Going back to 2000, discussions on AE Pass Rate idea have always included public posting of AE Pass/Fail rates.
  - The strategy developed by the PRTF and Department from 2007-2009 included several changes to be made by both parties.
    - The Department would expand the CTAC net (complete)
    - The Department would expand Approved As Noted criteria (complete)
    - The Department would post booking lead time status weekly (complete)
    - The Department would initiate Interactive Review at least 4 months before starting the AE Pass Rate Program (Interactive Review was initiated in September 2009)

- ▪ The AE's would support initiating AE Pass Rate Incentives Program, including the public posting of AE Pass/Fail rates
- Received request from AIA Charlotte to give AE's access to grades via EPM, and restrict public access to thru staff. Doesn't work for us or Marvin Bethune.
- Met May 6 with AIA Charlotte Code Comm; they support the Department's position.
- Response sent to AIA Charlotte on May 12, indicating;
  - o Why we intend to post: a) equity, b) process efficiency, c) received requests, d) consistency
  - o Requested audience with Board by JNB and Code Comm Rep
  - o Department remains committed to public posting of AE Pass/Fail rates on website on 7/10/10
  - o However, we are willing to work with AIA, PENC and a public representative appointed by the Building Development Commission, to shape the posting format in a manner that works well, both for AE's and the public at large (similar to process followed with GC's)
- <u>Recommend BDC request Greg Austin</u> serve as public rep for effort, to provide continuity.
- Harry S: anything to add?

7.2.6: Status of BIM-IPD code change proposal to NC Admin Code
- Last meeting reported that DOI requested Dept prepare BIM-IPD Admin Code change proposal for BCC June 14 & 15 meetings.
- Submitted same to DOI on May 3
- Invited RBI, Little and Freeman White reps to participate in draft evaluation on may 27 at 2pm.

7.3 CPM Added Comments
- No additional CPM comments.

8. FUTURE BDC AGENDAS
- June BDC meeting tentative topics
  - o Technical Advisory Board (TAB) review of nominations and formal vote on appointment
  - o Report on experiment - web tools for contractors (tentative)
  - o Review draft "14 years of change" document
- July, 2010 BDC meeting tentative topics
  - o BDC Quarterly Bulletin exercise\
  - o Quarterly Reports
  - o Report on experiment on web tools for contractors
  - o Other

9. ADJOURNMENT

NOTE: The next **BDC Meeting** is scheduled for **<u>3:00 p.m., Tuesday, June 22nd, 2010</u>**. Please mark your calendars.