Jon Morris opened the Building-Development Commission (BDC) meeting at **3:02 p.m. on Tuesday, November 16th, 2010**.

Present: Jon Morris, Ed Horne, Buford Lovett, Will Caulder, Kevin Silva, Harry Sherrill, Bernice Cutler, Travis Haston and Zeke Acosta

Absent: Dave Shultz, Elliot Mann and Jonathan Wood

1. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES
The motion by Buford Lovett seconded by Harry Sherrill to approve the October 19th, 2010 meeting minutes passed unanimously.

2. BDC MEMBER ISSUES AND COMMENTS
Ed Horne spoke briefly about EV and the fact that we still haven't heard anything on the UL certification process and classes in Raleigh. Jon Morris discussed the meeting/presentation with Jim Bartl, Tim Taylor and Ruth McNeil regarding the electronic permitting fee ordinance modification which is contained in the RFBA to be discussed later in the meeting. BDC Members received electronically, all information that was provided in Tim Taylor's presentation.

3. PUBLIC ATTENDEE ISSUES AND COMMENTS
No public attendee issues or comments.

4. DECEMBER BDC MEETING STRATEGY
The December 21st BDC meeting will be held at 2:30 p.m. at the home of Jon Morris. Agenda will be provided at meeting. Rebecca Simcox will complete public posting announcement of the time change for our December meeting.

5. JOURNEYMAN'S PROGRAM CHANGES and SUPPORTING RFBA
Joe Weathers gave a brief update on the status of the Journeyman's program indicating all systems are go; pending the actions taken here today and the outcome of the RFBA. Joe shared that we will probably go through a couple of test cycles and if all works well, will consider expansion into other trade areas. The next obvious use is on the plumbing side.

Jim Bartl reminded members that he sent around an electronic copy of the RFBA early last week; describing two changes that Marvin Bethune suggested in the Building Development Ordinance; one in 107.5 which gives us the discretion to proceed and then in section 109 on certificates, licenses and examinations. It states that examinations will be conducted under the general supervision of the department and we added the language "or a qualified industry representative agreed upon by both the BDC and the Department". This change will allow us authority to utilize the NCAEC for this program. Jim then asked if the BDC would provide a formal motion of support on the RFBA as well as your show of support for the program change as well.

The motion by Ed Horne (seconded by Zeke Acosta) to endorse the journeyman's changes and supporting RFBA passed unanimously.

- Update on status of preparation for change of exam administration (by Joe W)
    - 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 was held on October the 21st.
- Presentation of RFBA and request for vote of support (by JNB)

- o Electronic copy sent to you by e-mail early last week
- o Described two changes M Bethune suggests to Bldg-Dev't ord
  - ▪ 107.5 on BDC/Dept authority; giving us the discretion to do this.
  - ▪ 109 on Certificates/Licenses/Examinations; stating that "examinations shall be conducted under the general supervision of the Department, *or a qualified industry representative, agreed upon by both the BDC and Department."*
- o Dept now request formal motion of support, <u>which also will show your support of the program change on electrical Journeyman's Card examination procedures</u>.

6. PROPOSED WEBSITE CHANGES

Gene Morton, Jeff Griffin and Gary Mullis gave a brief presentation of the proposed web site changes that have been discussed with a focus group apprised of 15+ people noting that some changes have already been implemented.   They also reviewed modifications to site as well as shared customer feedback issues we are focusing on to better accommodate our customers and maintain a more simplified web site. Below is the Q & A between staff and BDC members.

Q&A:

Jon Morris: As a commercial property owner, do I select the homeowners tab as well? If I want to check on my project as a developer, what menu item do I select?

(JB) Contractors tab or the architectural page will provide more commercial options. Homeowner's page is geared more toward residential.

Harry Sherrill suggested a "house" icon for residential navigation.

Jon Morris: Code Enforcement acronyms and internet permits aren't understood by every user. If I wanted to obtain a commercial permit do I select HIP or is that just for home internet permits. Jon suggested using the wording Home Internet Permits instead of HIP.

Jon Morris: What does *department* mean right under notify me?

(JB) it's a heading; the BDC link is located under "about us".

BC: I really like the staff directory link on the front page.

Jon Morris: Do you think we'll start to become so web based and do you think this new web site offers a better portal for all the electronic permitting to come? Is that the purpose? Or is electronic permitting two separate things?

(JB) You'll certainly be able to get to it through this; we will heavily publicize what the address is for the portal.

Jon Morris: So the portal's different?

(JB) Most people that use it will go directly to it because they have it bookmarked. This is designed more to be the front face of the department for anybody that's doing business with us or trying to get information out of us. We are reworking the web site based on answers to customer comments and to help you understand the reorganization better.

Buford Lovett: It looks a lot better than the one that's up there now and is not as cluttered; much neater.

Will Caulder: Does it allow you to get more information on the front page if you take the pictures off altogether with possible less maintenance of trying to keep an up to date photo of each town; that is if you need more space.

(JB) The change in strategy of the front page has made space less of an issue. We will locate the point of interest on the front page and get customers where they want to go.

Will Caulder: Say you're a new resident that just moved to Mint Hill and are not familiar with the terms and have questions about a permit; how do you know to check Mecklenburg County's web site to discuss permitting or find out about permitting in Mint Hill; even if you land on this it doesn't say Mecklenburg County, North Carolina, Davidson, Mint Hill, Matthews, etc…

(JB) If you go to the town's website it will refer you to our website by providing a link to meckpermit.com.

Zeke Acosta: When you have the department as a header and you click on it; the department tab is not going to have a drop down menu.

(JG) At the top right of the web page when you click on departments you'll get the entire departmental directory

Jon Morris: "Department" should have a different heading if it does not contain a drop down box.

Jim asked members to email the Department with any further comments they may have and reiterated the board's positive response as we proceed with proposed changes; members concurred.

- Customer and focus group feedback;
    o Eight customers participated in focus group reconvene on Sept 24;
    o agreed on changes customers would like to see;
    o reviewed staff's initial ideas on changes to support the 2010 Reorganization Plan.
- Overview of changes
    o Main page design layout-theme keeping it simple (focus on first time user).
    o Website page template-standardization throughout the site.
    o Specific examples of how it supports;
        ▪ 2010 Reorg Plan
        ▪ "web tools for contractors"
        ▪ Code Administrators work

7. UPDATE on ELECTRONIC PERMITTING

Jim reviewed and stated that no action would be taken on this initiative today. This will be brought back to the members in January. The two issues are; expanding tools used in the office to permit electronically; TIP is being enhanced and moving to elevate the CTAC (Commercial Technical Assistance Center) and also the RDS (Residential Drawing Submittal) side so that they have both electronic review capacity and electronic direct permitting capacity. The goal is to have that up and running the same time that our Electronic Plan Submittal, Electronic Plan Review tool comes up next summer. Sandra Broome- Edwards will go over this next on the agenda. We've decided to run 2 parallel tracks and when we do that, the office will be paperless if you are trying to get a permit out of us. What we propose to you today is that the fee funded baseline be the electronic self permitting process. We're not dictating drawing convention, or that you have to do it this way but we should have the tools in the Fee Ordinance to collect the cost difference between manual permitting or permitting that requires staff intervention. Outlined in one of the attachments sent to you last week was a series of changes that will go into the LUESA Fee Ordinance which will automatically add a charge to the base cost of a non-electronic permit. This charge is to recapture real costs for conversion of drawings into an electronic medium. Below is the Q & A between staff and BDC members.

Q&A:

Jon Morris: You've always compared (or maybe Elliot) has compared this to buying an airline ticket online. So if you don't buy the airline ticket online, they are going to charge you $25 more; which is what you hope they would do first is lower the airline ticket price for everybody and for those customers that don't apply then charge them a premium. Has there been any thought to lowering the fee schedule and charge for only those customers that don't comply? Does this mean my cost of doing business with the Department will go down if I comply and those that don't will pay a premium?

(JB) Annually the BDC Budget Subcommittee reviews the fee structure in context of the next budget. I can't remember a time that we changed the fee structure in the middle of the year. One of the ways we got to where we are is through some significant staff reductions. Some of the largest staff reductions were on the clerical side and the administrative support team which Wendell manages. We were fortunate that TIP was coming up at the same time. TIP is now handling 25,000 permits per year and has allowed us to manage our budget process effectively.

Jon Morris: You emailed a bar chart showing 30,000 permits processed under TIP, 65,000 processed using paper and 10,000 were processed elsewhere. You're trying to take the paper processes and move them into one of the other two stacks in the chart? Correct?

(JB) Yes

Bernice Cutler: We should bear in mind as we market moving ahead; is to focus on the concept of saving time and money; increasing sustainability for the whole process and saving money for the owner and design

professionals when generating that much paper. We should focus on the aspect of not just saving the department but also saving the owner and professional time and money.

(JB) The contractors, the owners and the design professionals will now be able to do this process directly from their desk.

Jon Morris: It's very irritating that you have to submit…how many sets of plans and you get a reimbursable cost of $1,000-$10,000 per job hopefully a lot of that reimbursable expense will go away.

Bernice Cutler: We should focus on the benefit and not just that this is more efficient for the Department but that we are trying to save the customer, then hopefully there'll be less customers go to "what do I get for making you more efficient?" We are making us all more efficient.

Harry Sherrill: Resources, we're saving paper, we're saving people's time, which is all part of the resources.

Will Caulder: Jim, you are really following the industry model and that's what we're seeing now. Designers, especially the larger designers, we don't send them paper anymore. We don't send them submittals, we used to send 4 copies of shop drawings to an architect, they would review them they would make notes to each copy, ship them back to us, and we would then ship them back to subcontractors. Everything now is electronic, they submit to us electronically, we submit them electronically there's no paper trail of a project.

Zeke Acosta: My concern is (although I agree) but when we talk to contractors in other areas they talk about how hard it is to do business with Mecklenburg County. If they're not aware of it they are going to come in and say it's a penalty that they have to do all this to work in Mecklenburg County because how many other counties are going to be doing this? Instead of penalizing them for not having the electronic, come up with a fee structure for the regular and then discount it to the ones that do electronic.

(JB) We could turn it upside down, raise all the fees and then just give people a cut in fees. Typically most business people are either becoming astute in this direction or they are going to be pushed in this direction pretty quickly so I don't think this is new business. We could wait, do a major overhaul in connection with the end of the year budget proposal for next year; literally turn the proposal upside down, increase all the fees and give people discounts. It's your choice.

Jon Morris: We are not actually going to lower our permit cost. This is already the baseline. I look at this less as a permit fee increase and more like a cost recovery system.

Bernice Cutler: That's the downside of flipping is that you can't specifically say, I don't have to charge you all these entry fees but I do have to charge you for converting your drawings to digital. You can't only charge people for what they need.

Will Caulder: In this meeting 5 years from now are we going to be talking about where to store all this data? Is that handled by the County data storage? Every big business we are dealing with now is talking about where they are going to build their data center to store their data. What happens to us in 5 years when we're getting 140,000 permits electronically? Who stores that data?

(JB) The posse system and the electronic plan submittal are two separate issues. The storage for the data in posse would be managed by the county. We pay for servers to hold all of it and we pay for system redundancy.

Will Caulder: Are we going to be paying for servers? There's still a bill that comes back. So you are paying to store 10 or 100 times the data you are used to storing now?

(JB) It's part of the cost of doing business.

Will Caulder: Down the road are we going to be faced with a budget we can account for as we're making some of these significant changes?

(JB) You already are. It is part of the discussion in the budget subcommittee. The technology costs, part of those are ongoing and parts of those are costs that we have to pay to keep our side of it ongoing. Some of those are server costs.

Will Caulder: And the City handles their side separately for now?

(JB) How the City's computer system works is a separate discussion but the plan is to integrate them in a single portal with us; a virtual co-location. It's not insignificant. It has to be redundant and it has to be off site.

Travis Haston: Once 80-90% of everyone is submitting electronically, for those that choose to submit manually, is there still going to be the same turnaround time, will it lessen or will personnel try to keep up with that rate? Do you just make it to where the turnaround time is a lot greater therefore pushing them towards electronic?

(JB) The Department has always taken the position that we don't dictate drawing convention, nor do we dictate how they do their business. What this is about is collecting the difference in cost. When someone wants to bring in a paper set of drawings, we won't turn them away, but we will charge them the cost. Inevitably, they're not going to be able to get into the system as fast as those that submit electronically. I'm sure we'll have to come up with adjustments in our performance criteria. We're trying to construct this umbrella change to the Fee Ordinance in that you only have to go in once, do it and be done with it.

Travis Haston: Will you be jumping through hoops to have to keep up with the pace for the manual submittals?

(JB) Manual submittals have become a very small part of the OnSchedule side. Currently we have less than 5% and on the CTAC side non-electronic drawings are already becoming the minority.

Will Caulder: Jim, you do plan to outsource the transfer of those documents?

(JB) Yes, that's the way the language I sent you is written. We're going to ship it out and keep to those estimates based on what was quoted from Duncan-Parnell.

Harry Sherrill: On Special Inspections, do I have an option to get it through a paper route or is it always electronic?

(JB) No paper; electronic is the only way with Special Inspections.

Harry Sherrill: Do we capture the cost of our Special Inspection through the permitting process at all? When I submit a plan you are basing it on the type of building and square footage but does it take into account seismic zoning or anything else that is site specific?

(JB) Through the licensing of the Special Inspections, we recapture roughly $20,000 per year in fees. The total cost for the system in terms of a contract with Peak-10 and the maintenance from the Revere Group is about $45,000 per year, but we pay that and run it. We don't turn around and charge projects individually for using it. It is part of the cost of us providing service.

Harry Sherrill: Do we want to consider that in the future as we get more into Special Inspections since there are fewer and fewer quality sites available?

(JB) Do you mean in terms of how much volume they take up in their submittals?

Harry Sherrill: Yes, because it becomes a lot more intense for the field inspector to come out when he knows he's looking at seismic with all the bracing and everything else required on site.

(JB) I'm fairly confident we picked that up on the plan review side because most of the projects are big enough that they are charged by the hour.

- This presentation follows up an e-mail sent to BDC members on Thursday, November 11.
- This regards two issues:
  a) Technology development to both expand TIP, and elevate RDS & CTAC to have all projects capable of fully electronic plan review and permitting.
     o Goal is to have this operational at approximately same time as EPS-EPR, or sooner.
     o Certainly by December, 2011, all P&I services will have fully electronic capacity.
     o At that point, the only question is "will customers use the most efficient process?"
  b) Beyond technology, need to revise Department policy and LUESA Fee Ordinance;
     o Establishing the electronic self permitting process as the fee funded base line,
     o And collecting added "cost of service" fees for customers who still use manual permitting with staff intervention.
- Department staff met with BDC Chair Jon Morris on Nov 9.
  o Proposed a number of changes to the LUESA Fee Ordinance, all of which would be automatically added to the base cost of the permit
    ▪ HIP & TIP; customers not using these would pay an application entry charge.
    ▪ Electronic drawings; customers not submitting drawings in electronic medium would be charged the cost of conversion;
       o No charge if they bring in drawings which they converted themselves.
    ▪ Permit application and project data; customers not electronically submitting permit applications and project data are charged the cost to manually enter data in the system.

- **None of these would be refundable if permit is cancelled**
    o This Fee Ordinance change will also clean up some other areas of our work, where customers do not use the electronic processes we've established as the baseline, such as;
        - Electronic billing; on accounts requiring manual statements, would add monthly charge.
        - Other agency fees; where collection requires a manual process, a service charge per event will be added to the permit.
        - Services not covered in P&I fees: for example AST project research, or plan review verification of revised occupancy calculations
    o Next step is review with County Attorney; think we're on solid legal ground, but wanted to confirm with BDC before engaging his time.
- As the November 10 e-mail emphasized, this is basically about;
    o **Creating a new policy, saying when electronic service is available, it's the budget baseline.**
    o **When electronic service is available, and customers choose to use non-electronic service delivery, we're allowed to recover the added cost of service.**
- Tentatively plan to deliver final RFBA (with County Attorney ok) to BDC in January meeting.
    o Follow up work also needs to include a background meeting with Commissioner Cooksey.

8. TECHNOLOGY UPDATE
Sandra Broome-Edwards gave an overview of the Technology Initiatives as well as the five year technology strategy. Below is the Q & A between staff and BDC members.
Q&A:
Bernice Cutler: Will the intelligent PDF process allow the users to save the PDF locally so that the information is consistent every time such as their contact information?
(SBE) That is exactly what that does. It allows customers to store their replicated information so they don't have to enter it every time.
Bernice Cutler: Will they be able to save multiples?
(SBE) Yes, there will be standard PDFs and fillable PDFs that they are able to archive locally on their systems for their own use.
Travis Haston: If one of my staff pulls a permit in Huntersville or Cornelius even though they submit it through Mecklenburg County electronically; don't they still have to provide in person? Is that going to change?
(JB) Yes, and it is going to change. That's part of what we're working on with the towns. We are meeting with the town's planning staff to ensure they understand how all the tools work to include how we can convert for electronic fee collection. If we work it out the way we hope to it will automatically know from your description of the project what we are suppose to charge on the town's behalf; we charge it to your account and you pay us.
Travis Haston: Is that all surrounding counties at one time or would that be one city at a time? How will it take place?
(JB) We have already begun to negotiate the six different deals. The three north towns have conceptually agreed to it we just have to agree on the fee they want to charge for different project descriptors. We need to make sure the software is written so that it will recognize the description to include the right charges to the right spot.

8.1. Historical reference
- Meck's technology development since 1982 (graphic – handout #1)
- The Raleigh-Mecklenburg 5 year tech development strategy (graphic – handout #2)

8.2. Status; today and moving forward
- Things in place:
    o HIP & TIP
    o RDS-EPS
    o EPM; 1st of three components making up 2D EPS

- Large scale, next things up are:
    o Commercial Plan Submittal & Review (EPS-EPR)
    o Single Portal
    o BIM-IPD
- Components in immediate development;
    o EPM fine tuning: holds dashboard__, intelligent PDF__
    o Smart scheduling; in January 2011
    o EPS-EPR; in summer, 2011
    o CTAC-RDS fully electronic permitting; in summer, 2011
- Longer term
    o Single Portal; up to bat after EPS-EPR, see below
    o BIM-IPD; development starts in 2012

8.3. Drive towards paperless; made up of various parts
- EPM-EPS-EPR in place (see handout 3)
    o Note our pending agreement with Raleigh for their hosting of the Com'l EPS site
    o Builds on success of www.e-plan.nc.org; discussing rolling that into umbrella site,
- Expanding electronic self permitting to CTAC-RDS (see handout 4)
    o Note management decision to speed up development, parallel to EPS design
    o Using array of tools simpler than EPM-EPS-EPR, hope to introduce at roughly same time.
- And the Single Portal

8.4. The single portal
- Components
- How it might work

9. DEPARTMENT STATISTICS and INITIATIVES REPORT
Mr. Bartl pointed out the revenue level for October was $124MM, which puts us at $3.7. If you look at straight permit fees and the way we record them, it's just a shade below the target or about 1.1% below the projection. If you look at our overall revenue and expense status after four (4) months our "other" revenue (at 4 months we're 33% into the year) is at 41.82%. It's running ahead of the 33% which is good. Our expense side was at 30.82% of the projection, running about 2% under which is good also. As we sit here today we think the conclusion is that depending on how you look at it; our revenue is running ahead of our projection mostly because of the other revenue and our expenses are running about 2.5% below the projection. When you put those two together we're not in bad shape. Obviously; we are going into the winter; how November looks is going to say a lot to us.

9.1. Statistics report
9.1.1. Permit Revenue
October- $1,024,208, with Fy11 YTD at $3,737,836
Fy11 projected permit revenue at $11,328,781, or $944,065/mo;
- permit fee projection at October = $3,776,260
- so at October 31, we were $38.4k or 1.1% below projection

9.1.1.1. Revenue/Expense status after 4 months
- Permit Revenue: at 32.99% of projected Fy11 permit revenue (as reported to BDC monthly)
- Other Revenue: at 41.82% of projected Fy11 other revenue (see note 1)
- Expenses: at 30.82% of projected Fy11 expense level (see note 2)
- **Conclusions:**

- Revenue: depending on how you looks at the numbers, even conservatively we're in pretty good shape
  - Manual revenue counts show YTD permit and other revenue totals of $4.486M or up$ 163k
  - Accounting system totals project overage of $445k at year end (note 3)
- Expense: shows 2.51% <u>below</u> projection.

Note 1: this includes amounts billed in the system not yet rec'd (CMS Plan Rev'w, etc)
Note 2: reflects a percentage of expenses after adjusting for encumbrances deducted in July, 2010.
Note 3: 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

9.1.2. Construction Value of Permits Issued

- October total - $141,420,631, with YTD amount $491,518,879
- Fy10 Total at October – $522,723,705
- So YTD figure is down $31.2M or 6% from YTD at October, 2009

9.1.3. Permits Issued:

	September	October	3 Month Trend
Residential	3255	3150	3504/3405/3255/3150
Commercial	1784	2194	1827/2134/1784/2194
Other (Fire/Zone)	479	374	422/468/479/374
Total	5518	5718	5753/6007/5518/5718

- Residential down 3.23%; commercial up 22.9%%; total up 3.6%
- Note on SF detached permits:
  - Issued 140 SF permits in October, 2010, down from 158 in Sept, 2010 & same as October, 2009 (141)
  - Fy11 YTD issued 622 SF permits, vs. Fy10 YTD at 10/31/09 issued 702, so down 11.4%

9.1.4. Inspection Activity: inspections performed

Insp. Req.	Sept	Oct	Insp. Perf.	Sept	Oct	% Change
Bldg.	4175	4413	**Bldg.**	4134	4354	+5.33%
Elec.	4786	4886	**Elec.**	4816	4792	- .05%
Mech.	2678	2696	**Mech.**	2675	2677	same
Plbg.	1835	1830	**Plbg.**	1840	1814	-1.4%
Total	13,474	13,825	**Total**	13,465	13,637	+1.28%

- Bldg up 5%; Mech same, Elec & Plbg down a little
  - total inspections requested up 2.6% __, total inspections performed up 1.28%__
- Inspections performed were 98.64% of inspections requested

9.1.4.1 Inspection Activity: inspections response time

Insp. Resp. Time	OnTime %		Total % After 24 Hrs. Late		Total % After 48 Hrs. Late		Average Resp. in Days	
	Sept	**Oct**	**Sept**	**Oct**	**Sept**	**Oct**	**Sept**	**Oct**

Bldg.	96.3	92.8	96.8	96.7	98.9	98.8	1.09	1.13
Elec.	81.2	86.8	87.4	90.4	93.1	97.7	1.41	1.26
Mech.	97.3	94.1	97.5	95.1	99.2	98.4	1.06	1.14
Plbg.	97.1	97.8	97.3	98.2	99.1	99.8	1.08	1.04
Total	91.2	91.6	93.6	94.3	96.9	98.5	1.2	1.17

- Electrical: 1st day response improved significantly and in target range
- Plumbing: improved a little, very high
- Building & Mechanical: down about 3% +/-, but still well above top end of goal range
- Overall; still above high end of (85-90%) goal range.

9.1.5. Inspection Pass Rates for October, 2010:
OVERALL MONTHLY AV'G @ 87.6%, compared to 87.23% in September

Bldg:	September – 80.35%	**Elec**:	September – 88.2%
	October – 81.89%		October – 87.96%
Mech:	September – 89.77%	**Plbg:**	September – 93.31%
	October – 89.27%		October – 94.37%

- Overview of results: improved slightly (3 ½%) over September
    - Building and Plumbing up 1% plus
    - Mechanical and Electrical down slightly (1/2%)

9.1.5.1 CFD Inspection Pass Rate for October, 2010
- See handout; shows overall rate of 73.39% for October, or the same as September (73.39%).

9.1.6. OnSchedule and CTAC numbers for October, 2010
CTAC:
- 130 first reviews
- Projects approval rate (pass/fail) – 65%
- CTAC was 45% of OnSch first review volume (130/130+158=288) = 45.14%

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
- October, 10: 158- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 92% all trades, 90% B/E/M/P only

Booking Lead Times
- OnSchedule Projects: **for reporting chart posted on line**, on November 1, showed
  - 1-2 hour projects; at 1work day booking lead time, across the board
  - 3-4 hour projects; at 2-3 work days lead time, across the board
  - 5-8 hour projects; at 3 work days lead time, except
    - Bldg-12 days, Elec -5 days, M/P-10 days, and CFD-6 days
- CTAC plan review turnaround time; 3 work days across the board
- Express Review – booking lead time was;6 work days for small projects, 6 work days for large

9.2. Status report on various Department initiatives
9.2.1. October meeting follow up
9.2.1.1: BDC Quarterly Bulletin
- New quarterly bulletin complete, e-mailed to customers and posted on www.meckpermit.com.
Harry Sherrill raised a question about meck-permit.com code references. This has now been corrected.

9.2.1.2: meckpermit.com code references
- Code Administrator Phil E made the changes to the pages requested by H Sherrill

9.2.1.3: Booking lead time qualifying statement
- Received last of comments from BDC members, loaded to and began using on the website with the November 1 posting of weekly booking lead time status.
The booking lead time qualifying statement that we worked out with Dave Shultz, Bernice Cutler and Harry Sherrill has been finaled and loaded on the web site.

9.2.1.4: Promoting AE Pass rate Incentives success
- Draft AIA/PENC e-mail sent to Harry, Bernice and Dave S on November 1.
Jim Bartl asked for BDC member comments to the email sent to them on 11-1-10.

9.2.2. NC Building Code Council updates
The following items will be added to the Part D agenda in the BCC's Dec 13-14 meetings in Raleigh.
- Townhouse sprinkler outcome: BCC voted on Sept 14 to reconsider this in their December meeting
- 2012 NC Energy Conservation Code status: on Oct 5, on recommendation of the NC AG, the BCC rescinded their Sept 14 vote and voted to 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.
Building Code Council is going to reconvene on Dec 13th and 14th.

9.2.3. NC BCC BIM-IPD Ad Hoc Committee progress
As reported in the last BDC meeting, the Ad Hoc Committee met on October 5, receiving lots of constructive input from private sector reps. The participating code officials are scheduled to meet on November 19 to address the following points raised on October 5.
- 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 process strategy for, 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
- Rewrite language in 106.2.3.1e, moving away from using "as built" to 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 committee members.

Thereafter the Ad Hoc Committee will meet to hopefully concur and send on to a joint Admin-Building standing Committee meeting.

The BIM-IPD Ad Hoc committee is managing a code change proposal that Raleigh and Mecklenburg put together and submitted. Once the ad hoc committee concurs it then goes to the standing committee. We are hoping to get it on the Building Code Council's public hearing agenda for March.

9.3. Other

9.3.1. PRTF Revisit of Approved as Noted (AAN) criteria

- A volunteer group of PRTF members (three AE's) met with staff on Nov. 4 to review current AAN criteria.
  - o Discussions included changes suggested in BEMP, as well as Fire, Zoning, CMUD and Env't Health.
  - o Changes under consideration include clarifying selected items, and adding approximately 10 items.
- The list will be circulated again to all volunteering PRTF (AE) members for final comment, after which we will advise the AE community and begin using.
  - o Tentative change date; December 1.

At the request of Harry Sherrill, volunteers from the Plan Review Task Force revisited the Approved as Noted Criteria, evaluated it, received comments and proposed changes. There were a total of 6 changes and 3 adjustments. The information will be uploaded by Friday, 11-19-10.

9.3.2. EV Car Qualified List of Engineers and Contractors

- CAAEC developing a short list of CAAEC Contractors to be considered in building a list of electrical contractors available to perform the electrical charging station installations.
- Any contractor recommended must have someone from their team attend a UL certification course
- Also must have someone attend Meck County's TIP seminar

See Ed Horne's comments in item #2.

9.3.3. Web tools for Contractors Work

- Nov 10, Phil E gave 2nd "**web tools for contractors** ", presentation to BDC members Z. Acosta and J Wood.
- ZA and JW are satisfied with the new format used to locate interpretations, but agreed that it may be difficult for electrical to comply completely and a hybrid format should be studied/developed.

In the presentation that Gene and Jeff gave, we are working on the web site redesign to be sure that web tools for contractor changes will plug in to the web site appropriately. Phil Edwards met w/ Zeke Acosta and Jon Wood on 11/10/10. The big challenge is solving the electrical issues as the electrical code is written differently. We've had two changes in the Green Build Team that have now been filled. We are currently trying to find opportunities to familiarize the team on where sustainable design is heading so that when we are finally hit by it we will be prepared.

9.3.4. Meck-SI licensing

- FYI, in discussions with City of Raleigh regarding licensing use of Meck-SI.
- May also have interest from other jurisdictions outside NC.

9.3.5. Green Build Team inspector-plan review status; with changes necessitated by staff turnover *in italics*

- Mech/Plbg plan review: Tom Smith
- Mech inspector: Jeff Rosman
- Plbg Inspector: Tom Shoupe
- Electrical Plan Reviewer: Andy Scoggins
- Electrical inspector: Travis McCall
- Building plan reviewer: *Jeff Vernon replaced by Kevin Fulbright*
- Building inspector: Andy DeMaury, *Randy Newman replaced by Harold Sinclair*

9.4. Manager/CA added comments

- *Gary Mullis: We are scheduled to do an EV presentation for Ed Horne's association in January. Gary suggested passing the invitation to others so that more people are aware of what is going on with EV. Ed Horne stated that they will also contact contractors outside of their association.*

10. FUTURE BDC AGENDAS

- December BDC meeting tentative topics
  - BDC 2010 attendance authentication
  - other
- January BDC meeting tentative topics
  - RFBA votes
    - Electronic permitting
    - LCU/TP/TCO/CO
  - IRT goals on 2nd and 3rd days
  - BDC Quarterly Bulletin exercise
  - Quarterly Reports
  - TAB initial quarter report to BDC
  - Other

Harry Sherrill: Now that we've begun electronic plan submittal review; how much longer does it take to review electronically as opposed to a paper review?

(JB) Every study that's been done indicates that electronic reviews in the CAD format or the PDF format take longer. We don't have a benchmark on how much longer it takes but the studies that have been done by other authorities indicate that it does take longer.

Harry Sherrill: Do you have the ability to print the table of contents sheet so that you know which sheet to go back and click on w/in the PDF to open?

(PG) We can go in and print documents off drawings; it's a philosophy change on how to navigate the drawings when using electronic medium.

Harry Sherrill: Even with a learning curve it still will take you longer to complete an electronic review than it will a paper review.

(JB) That's our guess. We don't expect pay back on this until we get into the BIM-IPD work.

Harry Sherrill: Provided they use the same format you're familiar with and that works with the system.

(JB) Raleigh is close to agreeing to tackle this together with Mecklenburg County which has a significant impact on us. Once we have the 2D system up and running next summer then we'll agree to work together and tackle how we're going to modify that to work in a BIM IPD "projectshpere".

Harry Sherrill: All I see is as we get more electronic it's going to overload our folks that understand how to work in electronic medium and will take longer

(JB) The technology will continue improving, it will pick up speed and we'll be able to get speed and capacity for a lot cheaper. Eventually, a new generation of reviewers will come in here that are far more adept at it than you and I are.

11. Adjournment

NOTE: The next BDC Meeting is scheduled for 2:30 p.m., Tuesday, December 21st, 2010. Please mark your calendars.