Elliot Mann opened the Building-Development Commission (BDC) meeting at **3:06 p.m. on Tuesday, July 19th, 2011**.

Present: Ed Horne, Travis Haston, Elliot Mann, Jonathan Wood, Zeke Acosta, Rob Belisle, Bernice Cutler, Harry Sherrill, Hal Hester and Buford Lovett

Absent: Jon Morris, Will Caulder and Kevin Silva

1. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES
The motion by Travis Haston seconded by Jon Wood to approve the June 21th, 2011 meeting minutes passed unanimously.

2. BDC MEMBER ISSUES AND COMMENTS
Rob Belisle, the newest member of the BDC, gave a brief introduction of himself. Rob is the past president of the Professional Engineers of North Carolina South Piedmont Chapter and has been with Terracon for 10 years as a Construction Services Department Manager.

Travis Haston asked if the Auto Notification for the inspections request is currently up and running because he has not had access for three weeks and has had his internal staff working on it to no avail. Travis said it is not working at all right now that he has had 10-15 inspections in the past week. Inspectors don't want to be bothered as to what time they are coming so he would like to get that under wraps or determine a way to handle it. Travis went on to say that when he calls they don't respond back until they are on site and then it is too late.

Gene Morton shared that we have had a couple of issues with it occasionally going down and asked that you call us and let us know you are having problems we'll make sure you are taken care of.

Jim Bartl asked if the department has had a lot of complaints from customers.

GM: We've had no complaints.

JG: We have had some in the past but it does go down every now and then.

JB: Of the people that have called in for inspections from the BDC, how many have troubles with it lately?

EM: We haven't heard complaints about it but it is a tool we have put in place to help people from having to call inspectors and ensure they are on the job.

JB: Is this a wide problem or is it isolated to something we need to drill down to what the problem is.

ZA: We tried internally to resign up for it because before it had dropped off and we're not getting it and didn't know exactly who to contact.

JB: There is at least two places you can call when you have problems, one is the Trade Clerks who will try and figure out what the problem is and the other is CE Tech Triage.

Sandra Broome-Edwards explained how the CE Tech Triage works. We've got a group of email accounts that Sandra will email to all BDC Members. It is CE Tech Triage mailbox for any issues you are having with Code Enforcement applications, if you'll have them email that issue to that mailbox it's manned by several people and we triage it to see who can resolve the issue and distribute it to the appropriate areas to get the issue resolved.

EM: How do we get that out to the general public that probably doesn't know this as well?

JB: We have broadcast it out through Notify Me and are happy to do it again. Generally when you run into a problem if you can let CE Tech Triage know immediately or call into the Code Administrators or call Rebecca and if we have particulars about what happened then they can start chasing it from the back end. It's just the same as when we troubleshoot something new we installed and there's a blip, then as much data as we can get on when the blip happened and where, they research it backwards to try and determine what went wrong.

EM: When we've had the issues is it usually for everybody or is it isolated individuals?

GM: We have customers that say it is working right now. Its isolated events that unless we get that date, time and what is wrong, we don't have a way to back into the system and check it out.

JB: We can look for a wide pattern but it sounds like this may be more isolated and if it is then as many examples as you can get of it not working the quicker we can get to the bottom of the issue.

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

4. TECHNOLOGY REPORT ON BAR CODE TOOLS

Sandra Broome-Edwards gave a brief overview of the Bar Code Tools. We are trying to gauge interest from the industry as to whether or not this type of technology would be beneficial. Catawba County is currently using the QR Technology. It gives you access to information that you specify on any type of data. You can encode URLs and additional data sets into the QR Bar Code. In Catawba County the building permit information, the parcel information, and some of the other permit data are captured in the QR Codes on the actual building permit. Does the BDC have any interest in this type of technology in Mecklenburg before we pursue it?

EM: Who benefits? Who is the user? Do you capture the information with a smart phone?

SBE: Primarily the contractors will be the person that will be using this; we don't see where the Architectural community would be using it a lot. The benefit it would give them is the ability to take their smart phone or any smart device and read the QR Code rather than having to key in a URL or go to the web site manually. Catawba County has implemented it and it was met w/ mixed reviews. I think primarily because it is such a new technology for them. Some inspectors/people like it some don't but it is there and relatively simple to implement and it's very inexpensive.

BC: Do you anticipate being able to keep inspection results updated using this technology?

JB: All this is going to do is connect them to their contractor dashboard. It's another way to get to their contractor dash which is where all their data is.

SBE: The data sets would be kept up based on how we maintain those. This would just be another access mechanism rather than having to key in the URL or actually key in a set of data, they can point it at that QR code and it would redirect them to that point. If it's an area that has to be credentialed into then it would take them to a spot where they can log on, actually credential into that area but it can also be coded to point directly to certain data sets as well.

JB: We don't anticipate this driving us to prepare new screens because we've already taken all the screens you folks have helped us design and the only change we made on the screen was when we redesigned them for. We simply connect them to the dashboard which would be designed by you folks and then you get the information of what you wanted and then they'd get to that point and start drilling down the information the same way as if they were working on a computer.

BC: Do you know what the negatives were from Catawba County?

SBE: Catawba County just the fact that it was a new technology some of the people that were used to using the old technology had to get used to using the new technology. Here the old doesn't go away. This is just another access to the existing. With the QR technology as opposed to the older symbologies for bar codes you can embed links, you can embed data sets. These can hold (standard bar code would hold 496 bits) 177 X177 X those sets; you can go into the thousands of data sets. Primary complaint that Catawba had was the new technology so it was slow to catch on but they have implemented it. The city of New York implemented it last year. They had 975,000 permits they were converting but every permit in New York City now has the QR Codes on them. There are lots of different ways you can utilize it but before we pursued it as a project we wanted to find out if it was going to be beneficial to the community or if you saw where it might be something that the contracting community would want to use we would pursue trying to see about adding that technology. Does the BDC want us to pursue this technology?

JB: We were thinking that you folks already have pretty good access to all the information due to all the work we've poured into the dashboards for you, all you have to do is get to your dashboard. This was a referral that came to us from the County Manager's office asking us if there was any interest in it and we agreed to find out. What we're not certain about is having to devote some staff time and resources to chase it down and are happy to do it. What's involved in bring something like this online; what's it going to cost us? And then we would prioritize it everything else we are doing as we have a lot on our plate but before we started to spend time on this we thought we'd simply ask if you had any interest.

TH: What are some of the examples it would be placed on?

SBE: typically they are placed somewhere on the placard. In lots of instances you'll have multiple QRs on a placard, different ones pointing to different types of data. In Catawba County it points to the permit information, the parcel information and some project owner information. You can have multiple QRs on a permit placard but they would access different information or one set of information and that is some of what we'd have to look at if we undertook it as a project. What type of data would be beneficial and where that would be placed. Typically it's just in the corner of the placard.

TH: So it's really not going to help administration from a contractor's standpoint, it's going to be geared toward the field really as technology evolves.

JB: It's going to save you one click.

EM: All of our construction managers have a smart phone, so they go up to a home and they are covering multiple communities and they want to find out the status on that home they

SBE: They simply point their smart phone or whichever Q reader they are using is and it reads it going to the dashboard or web site

JB: I'm assuming that most of your people save the spot in our home page on favorites so they probably click right to that and then they would enter in the building permit number. The difference is they wouldn't have to enter the building permit number it would take them right to that project's page.

EM: The question is it worth even researching at this point and that's what you are looking for an answer from the BDC, correct?

JB: Correct.

EM: From a home builder's perspective onsite construction management the technology is in most of the people's hands, the smart phones and I could see where there would be a benefit and I can see where there would be some residual things that we could implement along that same line that could be beneficial.

HS: On the other hand, with all the things we have to do already with limited resources, how much would that cost?

JB: We would probably have Geri collect enough information on it. Have her dig into it to determine what we are faced with in terms of time and IST and staff resources and approx. cost to bring it on line and come back with something. Then also come back with a statement of where it fits in priority. If it's something that IST would do for us that's entirely different. It wouldn't compete with EPM. If it requires some work by Computronix then it could get complicated.

TH: From my standpoint I could only see the people benefiting from it would be the field and all Elliot's guys have smart phones, but people that I work with are still 2 – 3 years away from setting everyone up with iphones that has a bar code reader on it.

SBE: It works on Blackberry, iphone; any phone with a camera for this type of bar code technology can read it.

EM: Code failures, put that sticker on it take a picture of it and reference right to it.

TH: What's the difference, they are writing it on a sticker right now.

EM: what that item is and maybe reference points on how they could do it differently.

TH: Are you going to have to revamp the whole placard creation?

JB: The placard is quickly moving towards being fully electronic anyway. The way we do placards now is going away in the next 2 years. From that standpoint we'd just write that into the program of when we redesign it. That isn't a big burden. I think we know what we need to do. We'll do more homework and will come back to you in a couple of months.

ZA: Did you say the placard is going away?

JB: No what I said is what we know is the placard now is going away and will be replaced by something that is electronic. Don't forget what we are trying to do is to get people to not have to come downtown. So it will be replaced by an electronic printout placard. We'll do more research.

EM: We've set ourselves up from a cutting edge technology perspective in comparison. Catawba County is doing it, not saying that means we have to do it but our people are already accustomed to getting things online and going online to do their business already.

5. REPORT ON STATUS OF RALEIGH-MECKLENBURG TECHNOLOGY ILA

Jim Bartl gave a status of the Interlocal Agreement between the City of Raleigh and Mecklenburg County to develop software technology jointly. Before I get too deep in the water I wanted to point out that we think this is a benefit to the project. We think what's going to come out of this is going to focus the contractor more on the completion of our project and while it is a challenge to myself and the County Attorney to work through the details; we are optimistic about the change. We've been advised by the City of Raleigh that they would like to exit the Interlocal Agreement to develop permitting software with us. Right now that request is informal; not in writing but it sounds like they are very serious about doing it and there's been a lot of email exchanges about exactly what this means and we've had some hard meetings about it and at the same time they would like to transfer the contract that they hold to the software developer Sages who we are working with through the Interlocal Agreement. They would like to transfer it to us so we can finish the project. It gets really complicated because of the way that Appendix 3 in the ILA was written, there's a clause written into it that they could opt out of the agreement by June 2010 or certain things happen and they stayed in and they are obligated to deliver a common site component that we can build out site submittal platform on top of. We're obligated to deliver the building submittal component to them which we are running hard and will not have any trouble delivering. We had been working on a calculation with the City of Raleigh on a onetime payment to Mecklenburg to cover their obligation under Appendix 3. We've agreed the numbers twice on a preliminary basis of, the Contractor has agreed that if payment is made they will be able to finish the Raleigh foundation part that we need to be able and bring up the site submittal component. It requires three agreements that have to be drafted by the attorneys. There's Interlocal Agreement Appendix 4 between the City and the County that includes the agreement to terminate the Interlocal and then to transfer the contract so that we can complete the project and then there's the 3 party agreement among the City the County and the Contractor that covers a number of things including the retention of intellectual property rights and then there is an amendment to the Sages contract that would be executed immediately upon transfer that releases all the projects that are involved in Electronic Plan Submittal/Electronic Plan Review and also the money amount that we are going to pay; it restates all that. The reason I am saying this to you is because there is an RFBA that went over to the County Manager's office yesterday to be on the agenda on August 2nd to deal w/ this. It does 2 things, it recognizes the payment that the City would give us and it also passes a resolution giving the manager authority to execute the Interlocal

Agreement Appendix 4 as well as a transfer agreement as well as an amendment to the Sages contract. The City of Raleigh has committed to us that they are going to have an item on their August 2nd agenda doing their side of it as well. Do you have questions?

EM: Are they just going to trash everything they have so far and go a totally different direction? What's behind their decision?

JB: We're not certain what they are doing. A number of things that have happened in Raleigh they have had a evacuation of leadership at the top of their development team, they have had a change in terms of their organization, what we worked with was the office of development services which was inside of the City Manager's office and that was moved underneath planning and economic development. There's now a different set of priorities about what's important and I don't know that permitting and inspections is as high a priority in the new location as it was under the old location, so that's mixing into it and is about as much as we know right now. They believe that they can find an off the shelf module that will take care of them, we think that might be true on the planning side, we're fairly close to absolutely certain that's not the case in what we do because we have benchmarked the heck out of this stuff and what we're after on our side which is a very complicated process with a lot of service things for 7 different local governments. It's not out there. For those of you that were around when we brought Posse up which was a off the shelf product Posse by Computronix out of Alberta, Canada was heavily modified and the Outrider component which is the work horse of our system supporting the inspectors in the field, we almost completely redesigned it. In fact Outrider is a custom tool. You can find off the shelf models but the first thing you are going to do is start modifying them to work flow. Raleigh's approach to services is somewhat similar to ours, they have a lot of special service programs, they have express review and they have other special things like that, pony express and they have special services in the field. Those just aren't in the can of anything we've seen so far.

EM: Do you see that this as the end of partnering with them moving forward?

JB: No, I have to emphasize that in these negotiations they were very quick to say we want to do whatever we have to be sure that you complete your project and we don't want to lose our working relationship with you. For example, the two teams have invested a tremendous amount of energy historically on the Residential Electronic Submittal and having common review criteria. Lots more energy was invested in creating a common Commercial Review criteria so keeping that in place is very important to both authorities for a number of reasons one of which if we are going to have any kind of commercial prototypical review program between the two it has to be built on common review criteria so we've agreed on that and we've also had this vision that both of our jurisdictions will be heavily impacted by BIM in project delivery down the road and we're trying to figure out how it will be impacted, but again, one of their key people, my counterpart has been off line for awhile and that has been crippling. We'll be working again together; it's just that right now they want to look in a different direction. We can't wait while they do it. Again, we think this will help us because Sages will be able to focus on one thing, delivering the Building Submittal component and delivering our Site Submittal component.

EM: And they are covering their proratta share financially? So we have no exposure there correct?

JB: Yes. We've gone over the numbers from 17 different directions, I've gone over them with Ruth McNeil, our Business Manager and we believe that it is well covered. We wanted you to know about this before it hit the public. One footnote on this is it will not impact the e-plan NC web site that builders submit to. Raleigh has agreed they want to keep that up and running and they will continue to manage both sides of it. For those of you that don't recall that is a common site. People that submit residential electronic drawings to us actually they go to a Raleigh site that we access and that will continue. We have an agreement with them that they will give us 4 – 6 months notice when they want to stop it but now it's in their interest to keep it running. On the site side there has been a slight change to the original delivery schedule on the Site Submittal component it has been pushed back to align more closely with the Building Submittal component so we can bring them both up at the same time which helped us on some of our programming schedule.

TH: Do we lease that site from them that we access?

JB: We have a cost-share agreement with them. There is actually a memo of understanding between the City of Raleigh and Mecklenburg County that stays in place on reciprocal review inside that is covered cross-sharing 60/40 we pay 60% of the cost and they pay 40% because at one time we studied the numbers and it was about

that. No formal action is required. This is one of those rare RFBA's you never have to vote on. The RFBA's that have to do with Interlocal Agreement. I confirmed with Marvin this morning that you don't have to take a formal position on this; we just wanted you to be aware of it.

6. RFBA ON ADDED INSPECTOR POSITIONS

JNB sent the RFBA to all BDC Members last Friday and I understand if you are surprised. Originally we had planned to give you a heads up today and bring you details in August but the more we looked at the numbers the more we thought about losing a month hiring time and that was ill advised and was agreement between Gene Morton, Cary Saul and JNB. Handouts were sent you electronically that support this RFBA. There was Inspection Service Demand since our last RIF it showed the last 12+ months went back to May of last year. The Permit Revenue Chart and the RFBA we submitted the RFBA on Friday and then we had to resubmit it with some supplemental documentation yesterday. It's on the agenda for August 2nd, 2011. It is to recognize $320,000 in added revenue and to add five (5) Inspector Level III positions and at the conclusion of this presentation and discussion we will ask you to support the RFBA with a formal vote.

Gene Morton discussed the EOY statistics and gave a quick review and update on how we got to where we are now with our staffing levels. In June of 2009 we went through our first RIF. At that time it closely aligned us with the service needs that we had at that time but as the economy continued to dive it wasn't too long before we realized we were going to have to go through another RIF and that occurred in May 2010 which we feel like aligned us with what our bottomed out economy service demands are and we realized that even during the budget talks that when things did start to turn around and pick up we would be in front of you just as we are today asking for support in going to the commissioners for a betterment to add staffing levels back to cover our service demands that we are expecting to see. Because the process is slow, we can't decide to add staff today and have interviews tomorrow. It takes time and planning as well as coming to you folks asking for your support before we go to the Commissioners and then we have to align with their schedules, get in front of them to ask for permission to add the staffing levels. It's very critical that we keep a close watch on this because if we don't the increased demand could sneak up on us and over power us. We're already struggling with staffing levels that we have now anytime we have a vacation or an unexpected sick leave it really hits us hard more so than it ever did in past years. We've seen steady increases in plan review and permitting activity. We're now seeing a significant increase in inspection requests and it is really challenging us. In reviewing the statistics and the activity we are definitely seeing an upward trend and it seems to be fairly steady. If this continues as expected we will be overcome w/ service demands very soon. Because these levels are getting to the higher levels than they've been in quite some time, we think now is the time that we need to move forward with that and staff to cover our service demands in the next few months. The big question is how many should we add? Since it is a cumbersome process, we want to go before the County Commissioners and ask for a number of staff that we think will cover us at least for the next several months so that we're not back next month trying to get permission to add more. As Jim indicated we will watch this and continue to monitor it and make sound decisions. The last thing we want to do is to add staff, and we have a slight downturn and we see a need to do something with that added staff. The last thing we want to do is go through another RIF. We will be very careful in adding staff. Our intentions are to go before the County Commissioners to add five (5) Level III Inspector positions.

JB: We already talked about the lag time that is involved when you look at revenue charts and you try to compare them to inspection service demand charts and that chart that you have is inspections requested not inspections performed. Gene already talked about the 2009 and 2010 RIF cut our inspection staffing in half from 120 down to 60. One thing that we've noticed and we've got this from looking at some of the problems that Patrick and his managers have wrestled with in the last couple of months that you folks are aware of that the smaller staffing has made us much more vulnerable to bumps in service demand. It has a disproportionate impact on us now. The analogy I have been using as I discuss this with staff is when we had 120 people it was a pretty big lake of inspectors and if you throw a rock in it (some bump that is a service demand) would make a certain size splash and when the lake is much smaller and you throw the rock in the splash is a lot bigger and that is what we are wrestling with on Patrick's side. Patrick has done an excellent job with Chuck, Melanie and Tim to marshal resources and they are still working on getting the right resources marshaled up so we can deal with that

but we're really concerned that if we don't get in front this on the inspection side that we could have a problem. So while we are asking for five positions, we know that immediately if they are approved by the BOCC if you support this and then it's approved by the BOCC we would immediately move to fill two of the positions. We think we can put our fingers on a service demand issue that we need two inspectors to address. We'd hold the other three until such time as Gene, Cary and JB felt there's an indication that we need to release one or two more positions. It would be a very measured approach to filling the positions. Do you have any questions that Gene or JB can answer about the proposal?

HS: If the BDC said yes we agree, what is the timeframe from now until that person is on board. Are you thinking about hiring from new experience or are we going back to look at some of the staff that are no longer with us?

JB: There was a period that we were committed by HR rules to go into the RIF pool first before we hired. That ended on June 1st, 2011. Now we are back to a formal interview process and the pool is open to anybody, people that worked for us before, other people that have worked for other authorities and certainly we stay in contact with the people that we RIF'd especially the people we really didn't want to RIF but because of where they were in the pecking order they went. So we'll have to go through an interview process and it's slower than when somebody left us in the last year, somebody retired, (we had a number of retirees) it was a call back process. It was call back and get them slotted into the right start date according to HR and it was that simple. We did always sit down in the field with the managers, Gene, Cary and I to talk about where do we need the resource just because we had a building inspector leave does that mean we need a building inspector? Where is the demand? We've looked very carefully at the demand. We'll still do that but it is a much longer process. In terms of the time frame in getting these approved? One of the reasons we wanted to get it in front of you today is because the board meets on August 2nd and then they don't meet again until September 7th so we would lose a month. If the board approves it on August 2nd and this is one of those things that can be approved in one reading then it becomes an HR issue and you told me today of the lag that they advised you of? Gene Morton said HR's lag is somewhere between 20 and 30 days from the time the Commissioners approve the positions until we can get all the positions set up in the HR process and have those interviews

A request of formal vote was presented to the BDC in support of the added inspector positions. Ed Horne made the motion to approve this proposal with Buford Lovett seconding it. Vote passed unanimously.

7. PRELIMINARY END OF YEAR NUMBERS REPORT

Jim Bartl shared a handout of the preliminary end of year numbers. This covers many things in the summary but it does not cover permit revenue and I'll touch on that as well. We do not have end of year total fee revenue and total expense figures and we will not have those until September because we have to wait until the Business Office in the Government Center closes out the expense side and gives us the final figures on expense but right now we know that our permit revenue in FY11 was very healthy. Later in the stat report when we look at the stats you'll see that our June revenue for permits was 1.419MM and that meant for the year we took in 12.187MM and that was above our projection by about 860k or 7.6%. You'll recall that three times this year we reported to you that we were below our projections on expenses, we believe we finished the year that way. We won't know until we get the final numbers so if you put those two together we are in pretty good shape ending the fiscal year. On permit counts, total counts were just shy of $70k they are up about 5% from FY10. If you look at the top two lines of the handout that I just gave you can see that. If you'll drop down to total inspections, you'll see that total inspections were 161,623. It's down about 9.8% from last year but one thing you have to keep in mind that in FY10 we had 91 inspectors working for us through May 4th so if the response times in FY10 look healthier than in FY11 that's because in some respects we were over staffed and then on May 4th those 31 positions fell off the table and we went down to the staffing that we are at right now which we are going to be talking to you about in a second. The rest of this chart, I won't go over it in great detail except to point out that they are performance goals; inspections completed in the first 24 hours, inspection pass rate, plan review on time/early, booking lead times, residential permits completed in the first 24 hours and our documents call answer rate and of all those performance goals we met or exceeded our goal even though we shrunk our staffing and renegotiated the goal in June of last year with 2 exceptions our OnSchedule on time/early dropped from 94% down to 87% that shows at the bottom line of the first page and our documents call answer rate dropped from 94% down to 85% and we predicted that our documents call answer rate would drop at least into the mid 80's and perhaps

down to the low 80's maybe even the high 70's so we predicted that. I will talk later on in the next topic about some things that we've looked at very closely in the movement of the OnSchedule on time/early numbers and the booking lead-time numbers because that is telling us a story that is not just related to OnSchedule. Do you have any questions on the end of year data that is represented on this chart showing the 10 year history giving you the ability to not just compare FY11 to FY10 but go all the way back to on some things where we didn't even keep data.
EM: It looks like our revenue graph will actually start to take a blip in the upward direction with FY10 being the bottom.
JB: Let's talk about the charts I sent you in connection to the next topic. There were 2 charts. Ann and Geri did a good job putting this together. It's a 4 year history of revenue and you can see where the revenue fell off the cliff after August of '08 and then I was going over this with Harry before the meeting and you start to see in the last 5 months there is a different trend, it starts to go up. The bottom was in February 2009. There were some blips up in June of 2009 but our revenue level of $1.4MM in June of 2011 is the highest revenue level that we've had since the crash August of 2008.
EM: Inspections performed being at that all time low is a trailing indicator.
JB: Harry and I talked before the meeting started about our ability to make a correlation between revenue and inspection demand and it is really tough to do and we've always tried to study those two separately as large trends in their own graph and the reason for that is that inspections typically follow revenue both up and down in a lag that can be anywhere from 3-5-6 months later. You issue the permit and things start to happen later on so that if we issued permits in June they don't impact us on the inspection count in June they begin to impact us maybe in July depending on how big the project is they may not really hit us until later on so it's hard to connect those two. That's why we always try and look at the big trend as opposed to honing down on something happening in a month. The other thing is you can get one big project going out in a month and it can warp your revenue and you have to keep that in mind.

- Revenue: Fy11 EOY permit rev total $12.1887M, above projection ($11,328,780) by $860k or 7.6%
- Permits: comparison of Fy11 to Fy10 end of year data
  - Residential permits total 40,097, up 3.1% from Fy10 (38,889)
    - Includes SF new construction permits total 1,914, down 11.1% from Fy10 (2152)
  - Commercial permits total 24,807, up 11.2% from Fy10 (22,296)
  - Total permits at 69,886 up 5.2% from Fy10 (66,417)
- Inspections: comparison of Fy11 to Fy10 end of year data
  - building – 48,079, down 8.66% from 52,639 on June 30, 2010
  - electrical – 58,907, down 8.32% from 64,251 on June 30, 2010
  - mechanical – 32,571, down 7.1% from 35,060 on June 30, 2010
  - plumbing – 22,064, down 19.2% from 27,298 on June 30, 2010
  - total-161,621, down 9.84% from 179,248 on June 30, 2010
- Inspection complete 1st 24 hours: 93.31% compared to 95.22% in Fy10
- Inspection pass rate: 86.9% compared to 86.99% in Fy10
- Plan review: overall OnSchedule averaged 87.3% on time or early, compared to 94.32% in Fy10.
- B-E-M-P Plan Review Fy11 booking lead time averages:
  - 1-2 hour projects; averaged 1.94 work day booking lead time; compares to 1.12 in Fy10
  - 3-4 hour projects; averaged 3.43 work day booking lead time; compares to 2.6 in Fy10
  - 5-8 hour projects; averaged 5.86 work day booking lead time; compares to 4 in Fy10
  - CTAC plan review turnaround time averaged 3.36 work days; compares to 3.36 in Fy10
  - Express Review booking lead; av'g of 9.4 days on small and 9.26 days on large projects
    - Compares to Ex Rev Fy10 av'g of 7.6 work days for both small and large projects
- Residential permitting complete in 1st 24 hours: 92% (5454/5916 detached SF permits processed)
  - Compares to Fy10 totals of 88.78% (4074/4589 detached SF permits processed)
- Documents calls answered rate: 85% (on 33,392 calls) vs. 94% (37,368 total calls) in Fy10

8. QUARTERLY REPORTS
8.1. Technical Advisory Board 2nd Quarterly Report
- No sustainable project issues submitted to TAB in April, May or June

- TAB met in June discussing;
  - Getting the word out on TAB
  - IgCC; BCC demeanor, possible impact on TAB; final adoption by ICC in March 2012
  - Envision Charlotte
- CMC pilot; project seems on track again, so beginning to discuss how Green Build Team plugs in.
  - CHC staff making presentation to Code Officials Wed, July at 8am on CMC Lincoln. BDC members welcome.

8.2. Consistency Team Report

- <u>Front end</u>:   a) JNB customer memo on 2012 NC State Building Code family transition dates
- <u>Building</u>: 3 meetings, 18 QA topics developed/ issued (includes com'l rev'w issues)
- <u>Electrical</u>: 3 meetings addressed 27 issues in QA format,
- <u>Plumbing/Mechanical/Fuel Gas</u>:
  Plumbing; 22 new Q&A topics__; Mechanical; 23 new Q&A topics__; Fuel Gas; 2 new Q&A topics__

8.3. Code Compliance Report

- Note this is now done in a comparative format, so you can see how the topics and their standings change, as well as the % change from quarter to quarter.
- "Not ready" up 1-.5% in Bldg and Elec; Plbg same; Mechanical down ½%
- Rough/finish % split varies, some up, some down
  - o Bldg; rough @ 33.34% (up 1%+), finish @ 22.14% (down 1.5%)
  - o Elec; rough @ 16.51% (down 3%+), finish @ 63.48% (up 1%+)
  - o Mech; rough @ 22.22% (same), finish @ 67.97% (same)
  - o Plbg; rough @ 26.07% (down 3%), finish @ 46.39% (up 2.5%)
- Items repeat top fifteen defects noted in each trade, 85-90% of time, on average.

8.4. Commercial Plan Review Report

<u>Part I</u>:
- 80% of projects pass on 1st rev'w; 88% have passed after 2nd rev'w
- pass rates on 1st review by trade:
  Bldg – 88%; -Elec – 93%; -Mech – 87%; Plbg – 83%;
<u>Part II</u>: most common defects: examples
- Bldg: egress, bath fixt, accessible route, hardware req'ts, passive fire
- Elec: load calcs, overcurrent protection (service and branch), service eqpt location, sealed plans
- Mech: ventilation/exhaust, eqpt approval, eqpt accessibility, gas piping, kitch exhaust and makeup air
- Plbg: oil-grease-sand interceptors, water pipe req'ts, fixt req'ts, materials, backflow
<u>Part III</u>: 1st rev'w use of approved as noted at 34% by all trades on the average; up from 32% last qtr.
- biggest users; City Fire (85%)
- critical path users; Bldg (34%), Elec (19%), Mech (15%), Plbg (17%), Zoning (9%); **all improved**

9. Quarterly BDC bulletin exercise…………………………………….…..JNB
Previous bulletin topics:

July, 2009	October, 2009	January, 2010	April, 2010
Fy10 budget impact on customers	Dept Reorganization	Reorganization focus on customer centric service	Fy11 budget presentation available
AE Pass Rate data collection	Low voltage permits		Green Permit Rebates suspension
Self-gatekeeping	Self-Gatekeeping transition	Nissan ID's Meck process as best practice	

NACO award on RDS-EPS Accessibility Code format change CFD single family review delay	Accessibility Code transition AE Pass Rate Incentives Program status & timeline GPR program status	Trades Internet Permits (TIP)	Technical Advisory Board startup
July, 2010	**October, 2010**	**January, 2011**	**April, 2011**
			BIM-IPD code change public hearing
		TAB purpose and customer participation	Cost Recovery Work Group startup
Expanding TIP	Why Meck County is a project asset	Technology development and budget baseline	Website redesign
AE Pass Rate update	Nissan ID's Meck process as best practice	Status of EV introduction	EPM development status
Web tools for contractors	AE Pass Rate success	Elec J-man Program Pilot	Permit activity and related inspect response times
Current inspection service levels	Progress on reorg Plan	Changes to wwwmeckpermit.com	Impact of Senate Bill 22
2010 Reorg Field impact	Field Service improvements		

Possible new topics:

- Fy12 budget proposal approved by BOCC   - Process and Fee Ord changes for
TU/LCU/CC/CO/TCO
- NACO Awards   - Credit refund policy changes
- TAB work and availability of intro presentation   - Website orientation presentation available

10. DEPARTMENT STATISTICS & INITIATIVES REPORT
10.1. Statistics Report
10.1.1. Permit Revenue
- June- $1.419M with Fy11 YTD (yearend) at $12.1887M
- Fy11 projected permit revenue at EOY, $944,065/month x 12 = $11,328,780
- so at June 30, we are above permit fee revenue projection by $860k or 7.6%

10.1.2. Construction Value of Permits Issued
- June total - $278,036,986, with YTD amount $1,708,841,763
- Fy10 Total at June 30 – $1,653,529,026
- So finished Fy11 ahead of Fy10 by $55.31M or 3.345%

10.1.3. Permits Issued:

	May	June	3 Month Trend
Residential	3876	4251	3294/3396/3876/4251
Commercial	2168	2139	2483/2326/2168/2139
Other (Fire/Zone)	463	384	539/412/463/384
Total	6507	6774	6316/6151/6507/6774

- Residential up 9.6%; commercial down 1.34%; total up 4.1%

10.1.4. Inspection Activity: inspections performed

Insp. Req.	May	June	Insp. Perf.	May	June	% Change

Bldg.	4374	4736	**Bldg.**	4341	4654	+7.2%
Elec.	5328	6110	**Elec.**	5339	6019	+12.7%
Mech.	2791	3245	**Mech.**	2798	3210	+14.72%
Plbg.	2014	2201	**Plbg.**	2024	2141	+5.78%
Total	14,507	16,292	**Total**	14,502	16,024	+10.5%

- All trades up; ranging from Plbg at 6%- to Mech at 14%+
- total inspections requested up 12.3% __, total inspections performed up 10.5% __
- Inspections performed were 98.35% of inspections requested

10.1.4.1 Inspection Activity: inspections response time

Insp. Resp. Time	OnTime %		Total % After 24 Hrs. Late		Total % After 48 Hrs. Late		Average Resp. in Days	
	May	June	May	June	May	June	May	June
Bldg.	96.0	97.7	96.6	98.1	99.1	99.8	1.09	1.04
Elec.	92.8	94.8	94.0	95.8	98.4	99.4	1.16	1.10
Mech.	96.6	97.4	96.9	97.9	99.0	99.8	1.09	1.05
Plbg.	94.1	90.2	94.9	92.4	98.1	97.0	1.14	1.21
Total	94.7	95.5	95.4	96.4	98.7	99.3	1.12	1.09

- Performance up in Bldg, Elec and Mech; Plbg down 4% __; All still well above 85-90% goal range __

10.1.5. Inspection Pass Rates for June, 2011:
OVERALL MONTHLY AV'G @ 85.74%, compared to 86.03% in May

Bldg:	May – 77.44%	**Elec**:	May – 85.98%
	June – 77.59%		June – 86.06%
Mech:	May – 89.63%	**Plbg:**	May – 94.92%
	June – 88.52%		June – 94.22%

- Bldg & Elec up a little; Plbg down .2/3%; Mech down 1.1%
- Overall average just above Department goal

10.1.5.1 CFD Inspection Pass Rate for June, 2011

- CFD overall inspection pass rate of 80% for June, or up 5.5% from April (74.51%)

10.1.6. OnSchedule and CTAC numbers for June, 2011
CTAC:
- 94 first reviews
- Projects approval rate (pass/fail) – 61%
- CTAC was 44.1% of OnSch (*) first review volume (94/94+176 = 270)) = 34.8%

*CTAC as a % of OnSch is based on the total of only scheduled and Express projects

OnSchedule:
- June, 10: 153 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 89.71% all trades, 91.59% B/E/M/P only
- July, 10: 140* - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 87% all trades, 90% B/E/M/P only
- August, 10: 159* - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 87% all trades, 90% B/E/M/P only
- September, 10: 148* - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 85% all trades, 83% B/E/M/P only
- October, 10: 158- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 92% all trades, 90% B/E/M/P only
- November, 10: 154- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 94% all trades, 94.25% B/E/M/P only
- December, 10: 149- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 74.5% all trades, 80% B/E/M/P only (1)
- January, 11: 137- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 82.65% all trades, 83.5% B/E/M/P only
- February, 11: 136- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 86.6% all trades, 88% B/E/M/P only
- March, 11: 185 (*)- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 85.75% all trades, 84.5% B/E/M/P only
- April, 11: 147- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 78.37% all trades, 84.8% B/E/M/P only
- May, 11: 196- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 98.5% all trades, 85.5% B/E/M/P only
- June, 11: 251(**)- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 95.5% all trades, 94.2% B/E/M/P only

*Indicates numbers restated from previous month to correct error in transferring #'s from report
** note that pool reviews this month were very high, at 60-1st reviews

Booking Lead Times
- OnSchedule Projects: **for reporting chart posted on line**, on June 27 showed
  - 1-2 hour projects; at 2 work day booking lead time, except MP -8, CMUD-3 & CFD-6 days
  - 3-4 hour projects; at 2 work day lead time, except B-4, MP-8, CMUD-6, CFD-9 days
  - 5-8 hour projects; at 2-4 days lead time, except B-13, MP-9, CMUD-7, Zon'g-11, CFD-10 days
- CTAC plan review turnaround time; 3 work days lead time, except bldg a 5 days & CFD at 1 day
- Express Review – booking lead time was; 6 work days for small projects, 6 work days for large

10.2. Status Report on Various Department Initiatives
10.2.1. June meeting follow up
10.2.1.1: Follow up on CMPC Presentation on SF Exterior Plan Review
Jim reported that in the June meeting Debra Campbell and the Planning Commission made a presentation to BDC members on single family exterior plan review. A meeting was held on July 18th to go over with us and city zoning staff about the final version of the ordinance changes. Tim Taylor shared the outcome of the meeting saying the group mapped out the processes to find out where we need to interact and what needs to be accomplished to pull this off. Some concerns were the effect this would have on staffing levels. The City will handle it within their current structure due to the fact that the Architectural features in the proposed ordinance were thrown overboard. There will be some modifications in the application to make it easier for the customer to use (explaining building height and site conditions). We are working through other details and will bring more information back to members in the next BDC meeting.

10.2.1.2: Continuing Startup Steps for Cost Recovery Work Group
Jim reported that briefly on the Cost Recovery Work Group we are continuing to solicit private sector participants and we are doing better now. Rebecca Simcox has been working with the AGC Director and with Kate Shelton, with AIA as well as sending out a number of e-blasts and we have eight private sector representatives so far
- We continue to work on soliciting private sector participants, with the assumption that we have to have most of them on board before we can start. Specific steps taken in last month include;
  - Chris Urquhart, Intercon Building Corp.
  - Gail English Craig, PE, LEED-AP, Engineering Design Collaborative, LLP
  - Wayne Carter, W.B. Carter Contracting, Ltd.
  - Robert Wayne, Wayne Sims, Inc.
  - David Schweiman, D.R. Schwieman, Inc.

- Eric Seckinger, PE, MBA, HNTB Corporation
- David Gieser, AIA, LEED-AP BD+C, Perkins+Will
- Ross Westall, RJ Leeper Construction

10.2.1.3: Success Story Development into Case Studies
Jon Morris mentioned that he would like to see some success story development into case studies and we talked about how that might happen. The success stories in the field are different from the success stories for the office so we think that we would have different types of success stories maybe on the same project. We brought you an example of the Elevation Church last year and it was a short synopsis, two pages and we are thinking of doing something like that would be in electronic form but printable to a handout that would be a page or maybe a two sided page that would summarize the successes of the project. The purpose would be so that the office can emphasize services that we have available to customers as well as the field. We will develop a couple more examples one for the office, one for the field and bring them back to you in a future meeting to see if we are close to what you were thinking and if we are then the managers would move forward when they see a success story to draft and develop it.

10.2.1. 4: Follow-up Stat Report Pass Rate Discussion
Gene Morton mentioned the trend that building continues to lower with its staff rate and we are monitoring that. We expected it and thought when the workload increased and we saw inspectors with less time that we would see that pass rate climb which seems to be holding true. We are relying heavily on the Pass Rate Incentive Programs that we have in place to keep that in check and it appears to be working. The first quarter we had 38 contractors that failed on the high failure contractor list; which means their failure rates were 40% or higher. The second quarter (these folks will be on the high failure rate contractor list for the next three months) we only had three. So that's dropped from 38 to 3 high failure contractors. That tells of how many people that have 40% averages or greater in their fail rates. We think that program is still working when things get really bad and we have a lot of contractors that aren't paying attention to their work; they wake up and try hard to get off of that program. We'll continue to watch this, as we said, the numbers for building slightly improved this past month in June.

10.2.1.5: Revised Credit/Refund Policy
Gene Morton shared that we do have the Revised Credit/Refund Policy in place. It is working and we've had some customers that have already used that and we think that will be a large improvement over what we were using before and it will mean that we will start retaining some of the monies that we need to keep. In the past we were giving back money that we had already spent in service delivery.

10.2.2. Promoting Website Redesign and Organization
Gene Morton shared that in promoting the web site redesign and organization of that we have presented the new web site changes in all of the consistency meetings which seems to be working well. We are receiving positive feedback from customers on our new web site design. Anytime we see a problem or hear of a problem we try to take immediate action to make necessary corrections.

10.2.3. Mobilize Public Info Strategy on the TP/LCU/TCO/CC/CO RFBA
Gary Mullis shared that we completed all emails through the notify me e-blast, we have posted the notice at the CO counter as well as posted the notice on meckpermit.com to include a tutorial PowerPoint walking the customer through the process. This went into effect on June 12th and we haven't seen any big changes in what's going on in the marketplace. We've got a backlog of what was on our plates that we are gradually cleaning up which is why we asked for your help so we don't have that backlog. The continued relationship in spreading the word; we've attended three outside association meetings, have spread the word in the consistency meetings as well as presented to two trade groups and we are hoping to present to more.
Jeff Griffin shared that we've also presented to our staff and we are going to get in front of the HVA also.

10.2.4. EV Car Qualified List of Engineers and Contractors
Joe Weathers continues to work with Ed Horne and the CAAEC to build interest in having a certified list of engineers and contractors as proficient in EV supply as well as multiple commercial installations.

10.2.5. Electronic Permitting Home Page Development

Jim shared that we are currently developing the electronic permitting home page and think we have a strategy to work on that and will try and bring something back to you maybe in October in hopes to finalize something in November because the part of the tools are going to come up the first of the year so we'd like to get some agreement in late fall or early winter. Melanie, Tim, Rebecca, Kathleen, Patrick and I are working on this and wanted to know if there are any BDC members that are particularly interested in working on how an electronic permitting home page might look/work, i.e. design meetings.

HS: How much time do you think that will take Jim?

JB: What we hope to do is have a couple of 90 minute meetings with folks and do all the crunching work outside of it and be able to agree on something quickly. Maybe two meetings.

Harry Sherrill kindly volunteered.

10.3.   Other – No other added comments

10.4.   Manager/CA Added Comments

Jeff Griffin shared that we've got auto notification and a couple of test customers that we utilized to sample that program's working. We had the supervisors run those tests during this meeting and it is down. We've already turned the notification to CE Triage for IT to begin working on it.

Lon McSwain the Building Code Council meeting has been moved from September to August 21st, BIM-IPD is when we offer final vote and there will be no public hearing this time.

11.   Adjournment

The July 21, 2011 Building Development Commission meeting adjourned at 4:56 p.m.

NOTE: The next **BDC Meeting** is scheduled for **3:00 p.m. on Tuesday, August 16, 2011**.