Jon Morris opened the Building-Development Commission (BDC) meeting at **3:10 p.m. on Tuesday, November 15th, 2011**.

Present: Jon Morris, Zeke Acosta, Bernice Cutler, Hal Hester, Harry Sherrill, Rob Belisle, John Taylor, Kevin Silva, Ed Horne, Jon Wood and Travis Haston

Absent: Elliot Mann and Tim West

1. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES
The motion by Jon Wood seconded by Harry Sherrill to approve the October 18th, 2011 meeting minutes passed unanimously.

2. BDC MEMBER ISSUES AND COMMENTS
JT: Asked if meeting minutes could be sent out electronically.
ZA: Some inspectors are requesting carbon monoxide detectors on mechanical inspections and not passing the inspections. Are you still enforcing this?
JB: There are two sides to this; one on the health ordinance side and one on the building code side. The commercial requirements applying to daycare and apartments stay as is. In the residential requirements, where there is a variance between the residential code and the health ordinance; the residential requirements take precedence.
LMc: Carbon monoxide detectors are required to be outside each sleeping area on new construction.
JG: The BOCC proposed to add the same language as in the residential building code. Multi-trade inspectors that are certified in multiple trades are using that building code that says it's required. The language didn't get picked up in all the other codes.
JB: This is strictly a residential issue w/in the 2009 version of the code.
JG: The 2009 version of the code was modified effective January 1, 2011; the other codes will not become effective until January 1, 2012.
JB: This language is in the building code and is still moving into the M/E/P codes January 1, 2012.
HS: Can you enact a local ordinance without Building Code Council approval?
JB: With a health ordinance the local government has latitude to enact. We will make this a topic in the consistency meeting and if you want to attend to discuss you are welcome to. We will work with our staff and customers on this issue.
EH: Do we do anything on the web site when something new comes up so the contractors can access it and find out that this is now a part of the requirements?
JB: We typically do.
JG: We have announced this in the consistency meetings with the public. We've actually given them all the amendments that went into effect; we gave copies of that out and reviewed each one of them the first of this year so the industry was advised of those issues.
JB: We separated the Notify Me email system by specific interest groups. Each Code Administrator has their own groups; Joe has lists for Electrical and Willis has lists for Mechanical/Plumbing and Lon has his for Building. We can use this for advising customers of what's going on. And we will do that.
HS: The carbon monoxide warning requirement was published in the October 11, 2011 Quarterly Bulletin.
EH: Why did the fire in the garage do $800k worth of damage to the house and why did the fact that Duke Power said it could have been from charging station and Duke Power has recommended to not connect anymore at this point and time. I have not talked w/ Joe or Gary about this but I'm curious will the Department continue to issue permits for charging stations in light of what has happened?
JB: We are still collecting data from the Fire Marshall's office on what happened. We'll certainly discuss with Duke but we also want to hear what the Fire Marshal in Iredell County has to say about what happened and once we have collected all information we will decide what to do. If something is submitted and complies with the code then technically we can't refuse a permit. Now if the utility company says they are not going to connect it or disconnect it, brings up some areas that we haven't gotten into before. Will discuss further once we receive the

feedback from the Fire Marshall's office in Iredell County through Mark Auten and find out what Duke is going to do then we'll sit down with Marvin and talk about what we can and cannot do.

JW: I did talk with the EV Rep from Duke and they said it was only a precaution that they sent out a notice to everyone not to use them; they can still use at their own risk. It was only for precaution and not conclusive. Mark Auten said all the big players are involved with the investigation they just haven't finalized the reports yet.

3. PUBLIC ATTENDEE ISSUES AND COMMENTS

No public attendee comments.

4. SUCCESS STORY CASE STUDY FEEDBACK

Patrick Granson revisited the "success story case study feedback" since we ran out of time last meeting and asked the BDC for their feedback. Patrick recalled the two example case studies that were presented to the BDC; one being the ABB Plant in Huntersville (Field example) and the other being the Electrolux Headquarters (Plan Review example). It is our intention to slowly develop a library of these case studies both emphasizing services we offer to paint a positive image. The case studies will be used in customer meetings, periodic/quarterly emails emphasizing various services available to our customers. Patrick asked BDC members for suggestions and/or comments.

BC: I like a vertical layout vs. horizontal and I like the Code Enforcement logo but suggest a consistent template format (pics/pic location).

JM: I think it would be a great flyer for the chamber to have.

JB: The department spent some time working on examples and came up with some ideas, packaged them the way they thought best for office/field successes and chose two. We're trying to determine if we are close to what you are looking for and if we are, will move forward to develop more case studies.

BC: The information is good and it's good to vary it because it depends on what the story is and what the content needs to be. I like that you didn't force information that's not relevant just to make them the same.

JM: I like the pictures; I think people will look at the pictures more than the words. When we try to do our little case studies we try to put it together for architects and contractors; and the pictures are great showing footings, rebar work, etc. Do more with pictures and limit the words. I think a new company coming to town will see a company logo such as "Electrolux"; having that logo is great. Also, if you can get a quote (one liner) from the CEO of these companies to say, "Mecklenburg County, great to work with"…; the logo, the picture and the quote are the three things that I'm going to look at as I am glancing over it; for the corporate audience. For your existing customer base they will spend more time reading the text.

HS: I am looking for the value added. What are you going to bring to the table that's going to give me an advantage? It's easy to list the things we've already talked about but I'm looking for what is being added for the success of the project.

PG: Competing interests; you don't want to load too many pics but want to get to the meat of the project and the successes of the project. You also want to include the services used that benefited the project; so we're trying to strike a balance.

JM: We created a pamphlet that we hand out that's got all the words; very similar, a detailed explanation and case study; what did we do for Husqvarna when they came to town; what were they looking for (a lot of words). You've got to want to read it. And we have PowerPoint presentations that have the seven bullets.

PG: When we started this we were more focused on going after new businesses and bringing them to Charlotte.

JM: We're on the right track.

5. EPS-EPR TRANSITION STRATEGY

The user acceptance testing start up is scheduled for early December on a phased in basis; scheduled to go live on Friday, January 27th, 2012. Our transition strategy on how we roll this out will be; industry education, electronic plan intake, staff education and logistics/action items.

a) **Industry Education**

o Develop presentations on using Blue Beam and Adobe to format and package drawings, plus a presentation on uploading drawings at initial submittal and subsequent submittals
o Post the presentations on the E Services home page, including FAQ list
o Hold brown bag luncheons; some geared towards AE's (with CEC's), some to contractors
o Business meeting presentations; AIA, PENC, and architectural/engineering firms as requested
o Load concise presentation to Hal Marshall Lobby monitors on transition, further info at, etc.
o Other details;
  o Explain possible project delays/response time impact
  o Outlining difference between OnSchedule/Mega submittal CTAC -EPS.

b) **Electronic Plan Intake**
  o For EPS drawings, move required submittal date back 24 hours to assure correct packaging.
  o For paper submittals, move required submittal date back 48 hours to support offsite scanning.
  o Provide two PTE controllers to ensure electronic plans are packaged and formatted correctly.
    ▪ Will also provide education/training to customers on correct EPS packaging & EPS use.
    ▪ Will also verify Appendix B and seal holders, two areas with high review defect rates.
  The two added PTE controller positions have significant benefits.
  o Provides assistance to customers unsure of the new process, plus education and training to industry.
  o Will ensure a proper submittal is provided to the plans examiners.
  o The plans examiners will be under stress from the transition, so by delivering a complete and review ready product, their work is easier, allowing focus on their primary plan review responsibility.

c) **Staff Education**
  1. Develop Blue Beam training on: opening and reviewing plans, measurement tools, choosing a profile, Tool bars/Menu bars/Status bars, saving file
  2. Develop EPS/EPR training on: navigating the dashboard, managing the My Work tab, entering comments, uploading documents, Managing projects in and out of the system
  3. Develop training on the process
  4. Develop field inspector trainings, to look for sheet index and how it relates to any paper drawings that may be on site.
  5. Conduct a survey to measure how quickly contractors will go to paperless sites.

d) **Logistics/Action Items**
  • Commercial Plan Review/Permitting staff working in EPS to have (2) 24" monitors
  • After Commercial-Residential counter redesign, the existing RDS intake cubicle will support a controller/customer area to provide customer assistance.
  • Modify EPM will need to be modified to reflect the new submittal deadlines
  • Research and develop options for outside scanning agencies.
  • Publicize archival access procedures
  • Dual systems, both electronic and paper will run from January through April 15, 2012
  • Request to industry, general contractors, paper drawings be on site for 90 days
  • Determine how to approach a paperless construction site with no reception or limited reception

JM: Are the architectural and engineering communities fully aware of the format they are suppose to submit in?
MS: I don't think they are aware of it now. We've talked with the PRTF several times about how to package the drawings.
HS: When you said develop scanning options for paper users; does that mean that you'll send me back a .pdf of that scanned review?
JB: If you don't want to submit electronically (bringing paper into the office) you have a couple of options. You can take it to Duncan Parnell and have them turn it into a digital file then give it to us or you can give the

drawings to us which at that point we will need more time to send it off to a vendor that will turn it into a digital version.

HS: If you scanned them then how are you going to categorize the file numbers and the table of contents to agree with the sheet files?

PG: If you do go to Duncan Parnell; how we are going to convey that to the customer is either we're going to scan it or you are going to scan it, but this is how you are going to mark your sheets.

JB: We changed the fee ordinance back in May so that if we offer an electronic process and you don't want to use it then it gives us the ability to recover the administrative costs of getting you set up to operate inside the system; and one of those have to do with the index.

HS: How are you figuring the time that it takes to handle electronic plan review vs. a paper review?

JB: We know from pilots that have been done in other authorities that it takes longer. Certainly there is a learning curve working on two terminals rather than a paper medium. We think as our staff does it more and more they will improve but no doubt this process initially is going to take longer.

HS: It gets more difficult than that because if you lay out a drawing that you know you are going to do half size (11 X 17) the height of your lettering is such that when you reduce it you can still read it. If an A/E doesn't do that and you take something at half size to 11 X 17 that will fit on your screen you can't read the verbiage. It gets complicated and this starts to drive the time factor because you can't read the drawing and you have to keep blowing up small segments all the time.

JB: This is not a simple issue. When we first did a report for the BDC in 2002 we decided the technology wasn't there and it wasn't time to push forward with this. One of the reasons is that pilots that have been done around the country (San Diego) found out that it did take substantially longer. No one has committed themselves long term to do it to see that it's longer initially but once you get the learning curve behind you; how long is it going to take? This is one of the few initiatives that we've done that we know is going to make us change our process. Typically when you automate something we like to believe that we have the process as efficient as possible. This sets us up for a lot of upheaval.

TH: Do we perceive this as a tool going down the road for field inspectors to have the capability to pull plans up in the field and if so do they have to have the Bluebeam software?

JB: We are planning for the day with construction sites are completely paperless and the inspectors work with electronic medium as well; and we'll do this using whatever means it takes to set them up. We are working on a pilot with Carolina Health Care on their Psych hospital in Huntersville where we will actually work inside the model with them. The information that we input in the model will be exported back to Posse and part of that is that the inspectors will be working inside the model in the field using iPads. How we set those up is peculiar to the CHC Pilot. We are going to survey contractors to find out how quickly they are going to go to completely web sites so we get a sense for the timeframe we have on this transition which will tell us how much we have to pick them up and lay them down.

EH: What about when the contractor has to keep a stamped set of drawings on site at all times. Does the GC have to keep a laptop there?

JB: Gene and the CEMs have some idea how we are going to make this transition and things that you know you are going to need in the field for awhile as we try and move from one medium to another; in the interim are we going to need two types of medium out there?

GM: Initially we expect to see paper drawings on the site. We have talked to Jon about how quickly they will have more sites that are paperless; as they are the forerunner for the industry. The survey will help us understand how soon we have to prepare for that and when we do have to convert to electronic plans at the site.

HS: To download a set of drawings from a site currently is very slow.

TH: If we are going to incur these costs when we say the archives are there all the inspectors now need to have access to Blubeam is that going a la carte to every single laptop or is it going to iPads or do you even know?

RB: Have you done the math on scanning a full set of drawings? It seems very expensive?

JB: Tim's done the most work on it; we think that Tim will have to deal with this more than OnSchedule will because a lot of the OnSchedule submittals are electronic already whereas a lot of his aren't. He did most of the rewrite of the Ordinance that we pushed through last May. The basic idea here is if we have to do it we just pass the cost along by adding it to the permit fee.

TT: It is roughly $1.00 per page for scan. Met w/ Duncan Parnell which is just one resource for converting files and it's typically $1.00 per page to convert from paper to electronic and then it's $15.00 additional to burn it to a CD.

RB: So someone in your department will have to touch it three times to do that?

JB: Not necessarily; we'll give the customer the option; they can go to Duncan Parnell and bring us an electronic medium or they can give it to us and yes we will handle it and will add the cost (not just the paper but includes the

administrative time) will all be added to the Building Permit because when we wrote the change in the fee ordinance we didn't just write in the cost of scanning; we also wrote in an hourly charge for the administrative cost.
RB: Which is what; typically?
TT: $31.60
RB: $31.00 per hour to do administrative work around here? That seems very low to be compiling someone's drawings and making sure they are right.
JB: This is work by administrative assistants and the number we developed with the Business Manager and reviewed with the County Attorney; we can ask for reasonable reimbursement of charges.
BC: Have you considered making up an information page/email that you can distribute to Duncan Parnell and Richa Graphics (and others) saying if your customer is submitting their documents this is what they require? So when the customer comes in and asks what is needed; the print house already knows what they need. I think that will go a lot further than trying to explain it to the customers.
JB: Good idea. We still have a lot of homework to do on how we are going to handle the scanning side of it. We think that Tim's actually going to take the point on it as he has done most of the research so far on it and worked the most with the outside vendors.
BC: Those places are going to market to the Design Professionals that way; we already know what you need; just bring it to us.
HS: When you scan it you still have to organize the sheet titles with the tables of contents.
JB: We'll have tools that the customers can do it themselves and give it to us electronically or we can do it at an added cost. It was the idea behind the May fee ordinance change that we pushed through. The whole idea is once we offer electronic medium (debugged, tested and out there) that works; that's what our budget basis is. For those not using it they have to cover the difference. This is the largest conversion we have ever tried to do. In the past we've made conversions; when we switched to Posse or we brought up other components it was like a two week rough period and this is going to be a hard one and part of this is getting customers to understand that you have to think long term with some of the problems that we've been wrestling with but when we are done; you and all of our customers are going to have one of the most sophisticated systems in the country.
PG: Just for the record; we do about 20 electronic plan reviews per week. When you begin putting all the pieces together, adding the new systems looking at the whole thing, it can seem overwhelming but I think the strategy we have is supportive for customer service. We are doing electronic plan review now; we've been doing it for five years just not at the level/magnitude of 240-400 per month.
JB: One of the big things in our favor is that we have a core of staff that is anxious to get their teeth into this. I think one of the big things you wrestle with is in a cultural change is the staff support and I don't think that staff support is going to be an issue on this; they see it, understand it and we've been talking to them for a long time about how important this is in the future and I think our staff is chomping at the bit to get into this and try and make it work; which is a big part of why this is going to work for us and I can appreciate that people may be skeptical of the schedule.

6. DECEMBER BDC MEETING STRATEGY
The December meeting will be held at the home of Jon Morris on December 20th to begin at 2:00 p.m. Rebecca will change the public notice to reflect the time change. The agenda will be light, Rebecca will talk about 2011 Attendance Authentication; Gail Young and Ed Gagnon will be there to talk about the CSS survey that comes up in the spring; we'll hand out the questions, explain them and you can take them away and come back to talk about what you like or don't like in January. I've also tentatively added a Tech discussion about what we have identified as a commercial owner/developer dashboard that's a possible need.

7. ELECTRONIC PERMITTING HOMEPAGE UPDATE
Melanie Sellers gave a brief overview of the scope of the project and the current work status stating that we are laying out the new look of the E-permitting homepage, based on comments made in the 9/15/11 customer meeting. We are also studying the meckpermit.com front page right side buttons to address redundancy. After the E-permitting homepage is locked in, we plan to re-visit the AE tool box front page, studying both different service groups as well as the process flow charts requested by the AE reps participating in this effort. The latter may turn into an issue of limited real estate, as we're trying to avoid customers having to drill down several pages to find the needed info, resulting in an AE page with many links. We will also revisit the contractor tool box front page, with an eye towards grouping service topics.

8. DEPARTMENT STATISTICS AND INITIATIVES REPORT
8.1. Statistics Report
8.1.1. Permit Revenue
- October permit (only) revenue- $1,171,784, down $117.2k from September
- FY12 budget projected monthly permit revenue; (1) (2) $12,00,001/12 = $1,000,083 x 4 = $4,000,334
- At 9/30, YTD permit revenue of $5,341,196 is above permit fee revenue projection by $1,340,862 or 32.7%

Note 1: prior to this month, we've been using $11,738,711 as the FY12 permit revenue projection. This reflected the number presented to the full BDC in March, 2011. However, the final expense number approved by the BOCC included adjustments to fringe benefits levels calculated by SOI, which were lower than we estimated. TO balance the budget matching the SOI expense changes, the budgeted Permit Revenue was lowered $56,960, to $11,681,751.

Note 2: indicates revision of original Fy12 permit revenue projection, accounting for $319,250 added from RFBA approved by BOCC 0n August 2; $11,681,751 + $319,250 = $12,001,001.

8.1.1.1. New Three Year Permit Revenue Chart
- Note revision from last month's BDC request.

8.1.2. Construction Value of Permits Issued
- October total - $173,434,120, with YTD total of $890,406,019
- FY11 Total at October 31 – $491,518,879
- So FY12 ahead of FY11 by $398.9M or 44.8%

8.1.3. Permits Issued:

	Sept	October	3 Month Trend
Residential	2928	3138	3222/3762/2928/3138
Commercial	2275	2419	2134/2668/2275/2419
Other (Fire/Zone)	408	374	365/420/408/374
Total	5611	5931	5721/6850/5611/5931

- Residential up 7%; commercial up 6.3%; total up 5.7%
- SF detached new construction permits YTD at 778 vs. 622 at 10/31/2010, so up 25%

8.1.4. Inspection Activity: Inspections Performed

Insp. Req.	Sept	October	Insp. Perf.	Sept	October	% Change
Bldg.	4488	4397	**Bldg.**	4345	4379	+0.8%
Elec.	5679	5351	**Elec.**	5673	5330	-6.05%
Mech.	3100	2940	**Mech.**	3087	2919	-5.4%
Plbg.	2252	2337	**Plbg.**	2227	2368	+6.33%
Total	15,519	15,025	**Total**	15,332	14,996	-2.2%

- Bldg up slightly; Plbg up 6%; Elec & Mech down 5-6%
- Total inspection requests down 3.2%, total inspections performed down 2.2%
- Inspections performed were 99.8% 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	
	Sept	Oct	Sept	Oct	Sept	Oct	Sept	Oct
Bldg.	95.0	93.2	95.8	94.5	98.8	98.4	1.11	1.16
Elec.	92.1	91.5	93.6	92.8	97.6	99.2	1.17	1.17
Mech.	93.9	91.0	95.3	92.4	98.1	98.7	1.13	1.18
Plbg.	98.9	94.4	99.1	94.6	99.8	99.7	1.02	1.12
Total	94.3	92.3	95.4	93.5	98.3	99.0	1.12	1.16

- All trades down somewhat; Bldg<1.8%, Elec<.6%, Mech<2.9%, Plbg<4.5%
- All trades are 1% or better above the top end of 85-90% goal range.

8.1.5. Inspection Pass Rates for October, 2011:

OVERALL MONTHLY AV'G @ 85.01%, compared to 85.08% in September

Bldg:	Sept. – 78.09%	**Elec**:	Sept. – 84.12%
	Oct. – 77.5%		Oct. – 84.05%
Mech:	Sept. – 87.77%	**Plbg:**	Sept. – 93.22%
	Oct. – 88.76%		Oct. – 92.48%

- Mech up 1%; Bldg & Plbg down <1%, Elec same
- Overall average about same as last month and well above goal range (75-80%)

8.1.5.1 CFD Inspection Pass Rate for October, 2011

- CFD overall inspection pass rate of 76.56% for October, up 1.5% from 75.09% in September

8.1.6. OnSchedule and CTAC Numbers for October, 2011

CTAC:
- 112 first reviews
- Projects approval rate (pass/fail) – 68%
- CTAC was 49% of OnSch (*) first review volume (112/112+118 = 230) = 48.7%
    - *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
- 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
- July, 11: 175- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 92.25% all trades, 93.75% B/E/M/P only
- August, 11: 238- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 95% all trades, 94.75% B/E/M/P only
- Sept, 11: 219 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 95.25% all trades, 96.5% B/E/M/P only
- October, 11:176 (**)-1st rev'w projects; on time/early–96.75% all trades, 96.25% B/E/M/P only
  ** note that there were 49 pool reviews this month, included in the 176 total

<u>Booking Lead Times</u>

- OnSchedule Projects: **for reporting chart posted on line**, on October 31st showed
  - 1-2 hour projects; at 2 work day booking lead time, across the board
  - 3-4 hour projects; at 2-3 work day lead time, across the board
  - 5-8 hour projects; at 3days lead time, except building at 5 work days
- CTAC plan review turnaround time; 3 work days lead time, except bldg at 4 days & CFD at 1 day
- Express Review – booking lead time was 6 work days for small projects and 7 days for large

8.2. Status Report on Various Department Initiatives

8.2.1. October Meeting Follow Up

8.2.1.1. HB648 Follow-Up

- On October 19, JNB requested County Attorney to solicit an NC AG's opinion, proposing a contractor's affidavit testifying to their work comp coverage will satisfy the requirements of NCGS 87-14(a)(2).
- MB still working on it.

8.2.1.2. New Revenue Chart Tweaks

- Revised chart picture format, read from top and right.
- Works for BDC.

8.2.1.3. BDC Quarterly Bulletin

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

8.2.2. Cost Recovery Work Group Update

- The CRWG met for the 4th time on Nov 8; 5 private sector and 3 BDC reps attended, in addition to staff.
- To date the CRWG has covered 14 of 20 topics, with 3 of those topics set for return discussion on Dec 6.
- One of the topics discussed and agreed to with the CRWG involves homeowner permits.
  - The CRWG and Dept think that the concept and rough numbers agreed to in that proposal should also be discussed with a public representative focus group, perhaps consisting of current BDC public reps K Silva and T West, augmented by former BDC public reps G Austin and W Towler.
  - If the BDC concurs, we will extend invitations accordingly.
- The CRWG is still on target to deliver a final report/recommendation to the BDC on January 17.

8.2.3. Other

<u>ISO update</u>:

- What the ISO audit is about ;
  - ISO measures the Department on 28 points in 3 large categories; administration of the codes, plan review, field inspection.
  - Largest impact topics are; code official training__, code official certifications__, plan review staffing level__, inspections staffing level__
  - Impacts flood insurance rates and commercial insurance rates
- Department's grading history (with 1 being best and 10 being worst)
  - Fy94; com'l 4, res'd 10
  - Fy97; com'l 3, res'd 10
  - Fy01; com'l 1, res'd 4
  - Fy07; com'l 1, res'd 4
- FY 2012 is an ISO audit year
  - So all of our workloads, staff levels, training records etc will impact our grad
  - Already started prep for the audit, reminding managers of the key measurements, etc

- o New data collection point persons; Geri W handing off to Jeanne Quinn & Masika Edwards.

8.3. Disapproved Inspections RFBA's in 1999 & 2002

- Refer to e-mail sent yesterday to by JNB
- Relates to error in posting of 2002 RFBA on item 14. Disapproved Inspections in LUESA Fee Ord
- Omitted section remains in effect, as the BOCC did not vote to remove it.
- Department proposes 3 steps to address the issue.
  - a) On November 16, we will send an e-mail to all customers explaining the above.
  - b) Stipulate that we will enforce 1999 language (extend disapproved inspections program to all non-GC led small projects), on all projects with permits issued on or after 1/2/2012 (gives customers 45 days notice.
  - c) Post the "Small Project lead Contractor Schedule", agreed to in 1999, on the web.
- Questions?

8.4. Manager/CA Added Comments

There were no Manager/CA added comments.

8. Future BDC Agendas

- December BDC meeting tentative topics
  - BDC 2010 attendance authentication
  - Tech discussion; possible need for com'l owner/developer dashboard
  - CSS survey reminder

- January BDC meeting tentative topics
  - BDC Quarterly Bulletin exercise
  - Quarterly Reports Consistency teams, Code Defect, Commercial Plan Review, TAB
  - Web page maintenance strategy
  - BDC feedback on CSS survey questions

9. Adjournment

The November 15th, 2011 Building Development Commission meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Note: The next BDC Meeting is scheduled for 2:00 p.m., Tuesday, December 20th, 2011.