

**BUILDING DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION**  
**Minutes of October 19, 2010 Meeting**

Elliot Mann opened the Building-Development Commission (BDC) meeting at **3:04 p.m. on Tuesday, October, 19<sup>th</sup> 2010.**

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

**Absent:** Jon Morris and Will Caulder

### **1. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

*The motion by Harry Sherrill seconded by Dave Shultz to approve the September 21, 2010 meeting minutes passed unanimously.*

### **2. BDC MEMBER ISSUES AND COMMENTS**

Dave Shultz thanked Mr. Bartl and staff for attending the seminar held by his firm. Ed Horne gave his thanks to the department for their assistance and support. Harry Sherrill pointed out that we need to change the web page reflecting Accessibility and change the reference to Chapter 11. Jonathan Wood thanked staff for attending the Environmental Policy Coordination presentation. Elliot Mann asked where we are on the SF residential design; any action? Mr. Bartl shared that there has been no action on our side. A stakeholder's meeting will be held the first week in November; Tim Taylor will forward information to BDC members.

### **3. PUBLIC ATTENDEE ISSUES AND COMMENTS**

No public attendee issues or comments.

### **4. SNAPSHOT of FY11 REVENUE and EXPENSE STATUS as of 9/30/10:**

See attached handout.

- **Revenue:** Total revenue projection of \$13,328,353 breaks down into;
  - permit fees; \$11,328,781
  - other revenue; \$1,749,572
  - tech surcharge transfer; \$250,000
- Status at 9/30/2010;
  - permit fee revenue; \$2,930,364 vs. projection of \$2.832M (see note 1)
  - other revenue; \$577,039 vs. projection of \$437.4k (see note 2)
  - tech surcharge collected; \$59,596

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

Note 2: this includes amounts billed in the system not yet received (CMS Plan Review @ \$59k).

- **Expenses:** original budget was \$13,328,353
  - Status at 9/30/2010
    - encumbrances; \$608,933
    - actual amount expended; \$2,918,396
- **Conclusions:** see attached graphic charts
  - Revenue: other revenue is strong enough to raise us close to the target (26.28%)
  - Expense: while total is above projection at 9/30/10, expense amount without encumbrance is only 22.1% of projection or 2.9% below target.
  - Note that charts project year end revenue slightly above total budget projection
    - including decreased revenue projection in Jan. (100k), Feb. (200k) and Mar. (100k)
    - and expenses running 3.4% below projection

## 5. OnSchedule and AE Pass Rate Update

### 5.1. AE Pass Rate Posting Status After 3 Months

Patrick Granson reported that after three (3) quarters of data, AE grades have shown a positive growth in the Superior Performance category, while Successful performers are either moving up to Superior category or leveling off in numbers with little growth or negative growth; the Not Yet Graded category continues to grow as new AEs enter our program; overall, we now have only one (1) poor performer.

Improvement to note, since the start of the programs:

- Architects have an increase of 70 % in the superior performing category
- Electrical Engineers have an increase of 45 % in the superior performing category
- Mechanical Engineers have an increase of 58 % in the superior performing category
- Plumbing Engineers have an increase of 48 % in the superior performing category

We believe these figures relate directly to how strongly the Plans Examiners and staff have embraced the tools incorporated the program, specifically the following.

- **Interactive Review** - has been the best tool in helping negotiate and resolve issues during review. While the review detail level remains the same, we are using the option to communicate with the seal holders to gain code compliance on items identified on the drawings. This may take more time for Plan Reviewers as they work to keep up with emails and phone calls but, as of now, it's still working with our current volume.
- **Walk Thru's** - We have had three (3) projects successfully complete their review through the CTAC area.
- **Approved as Noted (AAN)** - This is working well with Interactive Review. Due to feedback from our last meetings with the PRTF and BDC, we are putting a group together to review AAN expansion, studying if there are any items that could be added to the list. We will advise the BDC accordingly.
- **Failures not a Failure (FNF)** - FNF is being utilized in the Plan Review process. The current list will be reevaluated in early summer, 2011 to see if any additional items should be added.

Elliot Mann asked about using Walk Thru's as a premium service.

Bernice Cutler asked if customers even know Walk Thru's are available.

Harry Sherrill made a pitch promoting AE Pass Rate success especially to AIA.

In addition, Superior Team Performance;

- Has shown a steady increase; a 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter 29% increase; a 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter 19% increase; overall up 42%.
- Customers appear to recognize the benefits of having a Superior Performing team, taking advantage of Review Schedule Preference and Priority Review.

Other to note:

- Regarding appeals, at this time, I have had four (4) appeals requested and three (3) have been granted. Some of the appeals dealt more with FNF rather than actual code issues.
- The BDC should note we're still having Electronic Plan Management (EPM) problems, wherein one seal holder is listed on the application, but when the drawings are submitted, a different seal holder has sealed the drawings. As this situation is discovered, we correct it.

### 5.2. Last of 2008 Proposed Commercial Plan Review Changes and how they are working out (interactive, collaborative, team review, conditional permitting, etc.)

- The 2008 Proposed Commercial Plan Review Changes have helped find tools to meet industry needs. These changes now provide tools allowing owners and AE's to work with their projects, tackling different needs or challenges in order to meet certain deadlines.
  - Conditional permitting may assist a project to get started early when there is equipment that is being provided by the owner.

- Team Plan Review is available to work out issues for a project that has specific job site code compliance issues that needs confirmation from a Plans Examiner perspective and the Inspector.
- All the changes recommend by the PRTF and the BDC are now in place, along with changes in the philosophy of how we do business. We have more far reaching processes then we have ever had before that can be used in a wide array of project challenges to everyone's benefit.

### 5.3. Status of grouping RTAC-RDS-CTAC

- RTAC/RDS has completed the move to the CTAC area. The focus of this move was to help shore up some resources in the RTAC area and provide cross training to all within the unit.
- During the process merger, we recognized that there was room for improvement in some of the business workflows. These include scope reviews and merging of the phone system to help bridge RTAC and CTAC customers. We are still looking at the processes regarding other necessary or appropriate changes.
- So far, a very good transition; credit goes to management and staff in making a seamless conversion.

## 6. Quarterly Reports

### 6.1. Commercial Plan Review Report

#### Part I:

- 80% of projects pass on 1<sup>st</sup> rev'w; 96% on 2<sup>nd</sup> rev'w
- pass rates on 1<sup>st</sup> review by trade:  
Bldg – 73%; -Elec – 89%; -Mech – 81%; Plbg – 77%;

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

Bldg: AE seal, egress, structural dsn, fire protection, hardware

Elec: load calcs, wiring methods, overcurrent protection, service eqpt location, conductor types

Mech: ventilation/exhaust, eqpt approval, eqpt accessibility, duct constructionl, gas piping

Plbg: venting, minimum facilities, drain pipe inst'l, water pipe req'ts, backflow

#### Part III: 1<sup>st</sup> rev'w use of approved as noted at 29% by all trades on the average (up from 27%)

biggest users; Fire (83%)

critical path users; Bldg (24%), Elec (11%), Mech (8%), Plbg (12%), Zoning (6%)

### 6.2. Code Compliance Report: now have over 12 ½ years of this report

- “Not ready” up a little, but still relatively low; (5.13%), Elec(4.12%) & Mech(5.09%); Plbg is up to 8.53%
- Rough/finish % split varies, some up, some down
  - Bldg; rough @ 36.7% (same), finish @ 24.36% (same)
  - Elec; rough @ 14.44% (down), finish @ 68.6% (up)
  - Mech; rough @ 21.41% (down), finish @ 69.57% (up)
  - Plbg; rough @ 22.8% (down), finish @ 51.2% (up)

### 6.3. Consistency Team Report

#### • Front end:

- customer letter on Session Law 2010-177
- customer letter on Code Compliance summary

Note: we typically also include a customer letter on temporary utilities in the Fall Consistency Team Report. However, that is being revised to match past NC Electrical Code changes, and we will e-mail something directly to customers in the next two-three weeks.

- Building: held 3 meetings; addressed 21 new consistency issues.
- Electrical: held 3 meeting; addressed 39 new meeting agenda topics, including com'l consistency issues
- Mechanical/Plumbing: addressed in FAQ format, including commercial consistency issue discussions.
  - Mechanical, 12 new Q&A topics
  - Plumbing; 9 new formal interpretation, and 6 new Q&A topics

- Commercial Plan Review: building commercial consistency issues are included at the end of the building consistency team section (14 building topics noted), in an FAQ format. EMP are included in above.

## 7. Quarterly BDC Bulletin Exercise

### Previous bulletin topics:

<p><b>July, 2008</b></p> <p>Contractor pass rate improvement            2009 Code change and printing schedule all codes            United Way seminar on 2009 code changes            Most common A/E plan review defects on web            OnSchedule service enhancements            Selected success stories</p> <p>New positions filled</p>	<p><b>October, 2008</b></p> <p>Residential Electronic Plan Submittal            Introduction of Trades Internet Permits</p> <p>Homeowner Internet Permits            Review of technology initiatives on the horizon            AE Pass Rate Incentives development progress            Selected success stories</p> <p>New positions filled</p>	<p><b>January, 2009</b></p> <p>Residential Drawing Submittal changes</p> <p>Utility transformer draft policy            Changes to <a href="http://www.meckpermit.com">www.meckpermit.com</a>            Progress in OnSchedule process revisions            Development of future single portal for permit submittals</p> <p><b>January, 2009</b>            Residential Drawing Submittal changes</p>	<p><b>July, 2009</b></p> <p>Dept Reorganization</p> <p>Low voltage permits</p> <p>Self-Gatekeeping transition</p> <p>Accessibility Code transition            AE Pass Rate Incentives Program status &amp; timeline            GPR program status</p>
<p><b>October, 2009</b></p> <p>Dept Reorganization</p> <p>Low voltage permits            Self-Gatekeeping transition</p> <p>Accessibility Code transition            AE Pass Rate Incentives Program status &amp; timeline</p>	<p><b>January, 2010</b></p> <p>Reorganization focus on customer centric service</p> <p>AE Pass Rate Incentives Program</p> <p>Trades Internet Permits (TIP)</p>	<p><b>April, 2010</b></p> <p>Customer Fy11 budget presentations available</p> <p>New commercial Plan Review tools:            -conditional permitting            -collaborative review            -team plan review</p> <p>TAB startup</p> <p>GPR suspension</p>	<p><b>July, 2010</b></p> <p>Expanding Trade Internet Permits Program</p> <p>AE Pass Rate Incentives Program update            Web tools for Contractors</p> <p>Current ins service levels</p> <p>Reorg Plan impact on field</p>
<p><b>October, 2010</b></p> <p><b>AE Pass Rate Success</b></p> <p><b>Reorg:</b>            -Inspection response time improvement            -Presentations available            -RTAC/CTAC compression</p> <p><b>Service Improvements</b>            -Team based delivery &amp; brochure link</p> <p><b>Why are we a project asset</b>            -Proactive services            -Not adversarial            -1<sup>st</sup> cycle pass is important            -Communication skills</p> <p><b>EV "Best Practice"</b></p> <p><b>Presentation Offers</b>            -Complete to date</p>			

## 8. Department Statistics and Initiatives Report

### 8.1. Statistics Report

#### 8.1.1. Permit Revenue

September- \$961,032, with Fy11 YTD at 2,713,628

Fy11 projected permit revenue at \$11,328,781, or \$944,065/mo;

- permit fee projection at September = \$2,832,195
- so at September 30, we were \$118,567 or 4.19% below projection

#### 8.1.2. Construction Value of Permits Issued

- September total - \$128,586,942, with YTD amount \$350,098,248
  - With Sept total being up \$16.12M from August, 2009 total of \$112,468,412
- Fy10 Total at September– \$393,073,983
- So YTD figure is down \$43 or 11% from YTD at September, 2009

#### 8.1.3. Permits Issued:

	August	September	3 Month Trend
<b>Residential</b>	3405	3255	4224/3504/3405/3255
<b>Commercial</b>	2134	1784	1837/1827/2134/1784
<b>Other (Fire/Zone)</b>	468	479	420/422/468/479/
<b>Total</b>	6007	5518	6547/5753/6007/5518

- Residential down 4.4%; commercial down 16.4% %; total down 8.14%
- Note on SF detached permits
  - Issued 141 SF permits in September 2010, down from 153 in August, 2010 & 212 in Sept 2009
  - Fy11 YTD issued 482 SF permits, vs. Fy10 YTD at 9/30/09 issued 544; so down 11.4%

#### 8.1.4. Inspection Activity: Inspections Performed

Insp. Req.	Aug	Sept	Insp. Perf.	Aug	Sept	% Change
<b>Bldg.</b>	4394	4175	<b>Bldg.</b>	4360	4134	-5.2%
<b>Elec.</b>	5081	4786	<b>Elec.</b>	5071	4816	-5.03%
<b>Mech.</b>	2980	2678	<b>Mech.</b>	3004	2675	+5.85%
<b>Plbg.</b>	1918	1835	<b>Plbg.</b>	1944	1840	-5.35%
<b>Total</b>	14,373	13,474	<b>Total</b>	14,379	13,465	-6.36%

- B/E/M/P inspections all down 5% +, across the board
  - total inspections requested down 6.26% \_\_, total inspections performed down 6.36% \_\_
- Inspections performed were 99.9% of inspections requested

### 8.1.4.1 Inspection Activity: Inspections Response Time

Insp. Resp. Time	OnTime %		Total % After 24 Hrs. Late		Total % After 48 Hrs. Late		Average Resp. in Days	
	Aug	Sept	Aug	Sept	Aug	Sept	Aug	Sept
Bldg.	96.1	96.3	97.1	96.8	99.2	98.9	1.09	1.09
Elec.	84.7	81.2	88.7	87.4	96.4	93.1	1.31	1.41
Mech.	94.8	97.3	95.4	97.5	98.9	99.2	1.11	1.06
Plbg.	96.4	97.1	96.7	97.3	98.8	99.1	1.09	1.08
Total	91.8	91.2	93.7	93.6	98.1	96.9	1.17	1.2

- Same: Building
- Up: Mech up 2.5% and Plbg up ½%
- Down: Electrical down 3.5%
- Overall: average is still above high end of (85-90%) goal range.

### 8.1.5. Inspection Pass Rates for September, 2010:

OVERALL MONTHLY AV'G @ 87.23%, compared to 87.04% in August

<b><u>Bldg:</u></b>	August – 81.36%	<b><u>Elec:</u></b>	August – 87.73%
	September – 80.35%		September – 88.2%
<b><u>Mech:</u></b>	August – 87.82%	<b><u>Plbg:</u></b>	August – 94.03%
	September – 89.77%		September – 93.31%

- Mixed results, but overall average up a bit (<1%)
  - Bldg <1%, Plbg < 3/4%
  - Elec >1/2%, Mech >2%-

### 8.1.5.1 CFD Inspection Pass Rate for September, 2010

- See handout; shows overall rate of 73.39% for September compared to 74.79% for August.

### 8.1.6. OnSchedule and CTAC Numbers for September, 2010

#### CTAC:

- 89 first reviews
- Projects approval rate (pass/fail) – 72%
- CTAC was 49.7% of OnSch first review volume (99/99+100 =199) = 49.7%

#### OnSchedule:

- 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

- May, 10: 95 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 97.43% all trades, 97.61% B/E/M/P only
- June, 10: 153 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 89.71% all trades, 91.59% B/E/M/P only
- July, 10: 110 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 87% all trades, 90% B/E/M/P only
- August, 10: 154 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 87% all trades, 90% B/E/M/P only
- September, 10: 100 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 85% all trades, 83% B/E/M/P only

#### Booking Lead Times

- OnSchedule Projects: **for reporting chart posted on line**, on October 4, showed
  - 1-2 hour projects; at 1-2work day booking lead time, across the board
  - 3-4 hour projects; at 2 work days lead time, except; bldg-10 days, MP-11 days,CFD-9 days
  - 5-8 hour projects; at 3 work days lead time, except Bldg-13 days, M/P-13 days, CMUD-5 days. and CFD-10 days
- CTAC plan review turnaround time; 5 work days across the board
- Express Review – booking lead time was;13 work days for small projects, 13 work days for large

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

### **8.2.1. BDC September Meeting Follow-up**

#### **8.2.1.1: Work on qualifying statement for web posting of OnSchedule booking lead time chart**

- In September 30 PRTF & AE Pass Rate Subcommittee meeting, Dept presented draft qualifying statement, received comments from the 7AE's attending.
- Developed a new qualifying statement, and plan from here is;
  - a) send new draft to Jon Morris, Harry S, Dave S and Bernice C for final comment
  - b) Receive BDC comments, revise accordingly and start to use on the website.

#### **8.2.1.2: Review of OnSchedule Approved As Noted (AAN) criteria**

- PRTF & AE Pass Rate Subcommittee also discussed Harry's suggestion to revisit the AAN criteria. Five AE's volunteered for the effort and meetings will begin in late October or early November. We anticipate identifying any changes and confirming same in two meetings, at most.

#### **8.2.1.3: Web tools for contractors**

- Revisions proposed in the August and September meetings are live on the web now. Trying to setup follow up meeting with Zeke, Elliot and Jon to go over Phil E's 9/21 presentation to pickup any final comments.

#### **8.2.1.4: EV car qualified list of engineers and contractors**

- Staff met with BDC electrical rep and he is working on pulling together a list of contractors. Also contacting other contractor groups to gain their interest.
- Staff will make a presentation on TIP to the Charlotte Area Association of Electrical Contractors, either this month or next. Same available to other interested groups.
- Studying certification program, offered by UL, as possible vehicle to qualify both designers and contractors.

#### **8.2.1.5: Fourteen Years of Change Document**

- Changes requested in August meeting incorporated in draft and now loaded to web.
- So now have two versions;
  - a) Unabridged, with description of each bullet
  - b) Short form with bullet points and link to unabridged
- Where short form is used as handout in presentations, web address of unabridged is included, so customers can look up bullet descriptions.

## **8.2.2: Status of Electrical Journeyman's Program Changes**

- Background: the Department's response to the economic downturn, included considering changes in our work strategies which would both maintain a high service level, but also help maintain cost effective service delivery. One such change is the outsourcing of the of the Electrical Journeyman exams' administration. The cost of administering these exams currently far exceeds the application fees generated. The North Carolina Association of Electrical Contractors (NCAEC) indicated a willingness to handle administrative

responsibilities, with the Department continuing to maintain the Journeyman Card Certifications and collecting the annual fees for card renewals. That is the relationship strategy we've been pursuing since June, 2010.

- Current status: we are on track for a smooth transition on January 1, 2010. IST is in the process of testing the computer system. NCAEC is in the process of loading the new information on their website. As soon as that is complete we will update our website to link application information to the NCAEC site. The Department's final Journeyman Test will be held on October the 21<sup>st</sup>.
- Formal action: the County Attorney advised we will need an RFBA to revise language in Building-Development Ordinance Section 109. We'll prepare a draft RFBA over the next couple of weeks, run it by Marvin Bethune, and have it ready for a formal BDC vote in the November meeting.

### **8.2.3 NC Building Code Council Update**

The December 13-14 BCC meetings in Raleigh should be lively, because;

- Townhouse sprinkler outcome: BCC voted on Sept 14 to reconsider this in their December meeting
- 2012 NC Energy Conservation Code status: on Oct 5, the NC AG representative assigned to the BCC advised the Sept 14 motion was flawed, consequently the BCC rescinded that vote and will reconsider the petition again in December. In the interim, the standing Energy Code Committee is studying the discrepancy between proponent cost estimates and opponent cost estimates.

#### **8.2.3.1 NC BCC BIM-IPD Ad Hoc Comm progress**

- Held first face-to-face Ad Hoc Comm meeting on October 5 in Greensboro, with 7 private sector reps attending.
- Big issues are
  - Discussed need to define the BIM-IPD approach in wide enough language that can handle any kind of team based delivery that will be delivered using virtual construction tools.
  - Need to think through, in the event BIM-IPD project has multiple contractors, how this will work in compliance with NCGS requirements.
  - Need to define what is a model
  - Revise wording on item 106.2.3.1e, moving away from using the term "as built" to perhaps saying "at conclusion project team gives you validation document that demonstrates the project complies with the code."
  - Need to define what BIM-IPD means (to plug into NC Admin Code definitions section) for review by Ad Hoc Comm members.
- Schedule: will try to wrap this up in one or at most two Ad Hoc Comm meetings. From there it goes to a joint Bldg-Admin Code Standing Comm meeting, so probably won't be into a public hearing until March BCC meeting.

### **8.3. Other**

#### **8.3.1. ICC Codes Forum Coming to Charlotte**

- Final action hearings on adoption of the 2012 Int'l Energy Conservation Code, will be held at the Charlotte Convention Center, from 1pm Wed Oct 27 thru 12pm on Sunday October 31.
- Opportunity for BCC members and others to see the ICC code adoption process in action.

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

- Jeff Griffin and Gary Mullis introduced the Inspection Services Guide; a booklet/proactive guide to give contractors in the field. Gary noted that page 28 provides steps to expedite successful inspections. Willis Horton commented that staff is currently being trained in the transition from LD to Posse as well as Electronic Plan Review. Gene Morton commented that web site work continues and hopes to bring provide snapshots of what the web site looks like at the next meeting. He also noted that Jeff Griffin was awarded



the Customer Service award in Mecklenburg County. Patrick Granson commented on an accolade letter received from Glen Stevens on a 1.6MMsf project that was handled expertly by the Code Enforcement staff.

## **9. Future BDC agendas**

- November BDC meeting tentative topics
  - Formal BDC vote on Electrical Journeyman's Program RFBA and policy change
  - Proposed website changes
  - Report on progress in customer electronic self permitting (expanding TIP)
  - Technology update
  - Other

## **10. Adjournment**

The October 19<sup>th</sup>, 2010 Building Development Commission meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

**NOTE:** The next BDC Meeting is scheduled for 3:00 p.m., Tuesday, November 16th, 2010. Please mark your calendars.