

# BUILDING DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

## Minutes of January 15, 2013 Meeting

Jon Morris opened the Building-Development Commission (BDC) meeting at 3:07 p.m. on Tuesday, January 15, 2012.

**Present:** Ed Horne, John Taylor, Hal Hester, Jon Morris, Elliot Mann, Harry Sherrill, Zeke Acosta, Jon Wood, Rob Belisle, Kevin Silva and Tim West

**Absent:** Bernice Cutler and Travis Haston

### 1. MINUTES APPROVED

*The motion by Zeke Acosta, seconded by Rob Belisle, to approve the November 20, 2012 meeting minutes passed unanimously.*

### 2. BDC MEMBER ISSUES AND COMMENTS

**Bernice Cutler** is there a way to calculate all fees to include other fees (Fire, etc.).

**PG:** I think we are talking about Mega projects and Mixed Use projects. These fees are a little different due to the complexity with it being table top buildings. What I hear you saying is there ways that we can inform our customer to better instruct them on how to look at the fee structure and where they can go to find the fees.

**BC:** And including the fees that aren't necessarily governed by the department but are collected.

**JB:** The best place to review this is in the preliminary code review; which is also an excellent place to discuss how you are actually going to deliver the project as opposed to saying I'm going to take out the whole permit at once.

**PG:** It's the same old process. Start with the design, then the preliminary, then go through the gate, we submit the job and there is a handoff. The handoff is between the Designer of Record and the team and the contractors' team and there are expectations we are seeing which is the gap. They have this idea what the price is and then when they see the price (and it says estimate in bold letters) and they think that is the total fee and it is not. I'd like to get back to you on this if I can.

**BC:** I'll provide specific examples.

**JT:** I will provide specific examples also. The Mega projects are where it's very difficult for us to be able to estimate it. We are missing it by 30 – 40% and when you are talking about \$130k permit and missing it by 40% it is quite significant.

**JT:** In the statistics reports; and tracking turn around on inspections; and I was recently asked by a developer (they were experiencing this on a project I am not working on) and was asking if I had experienced this; but for an OnSchedule inspection; they were experiencing on their project where they went through a normal inspection process that they weren't getting inspections done in a timely manner and they were being told because other projects were using the OnSchedule inspection; the inspector told them that the other inspection took precedence over theirs and they couldn't give an accurate timeframe as to when it would occur. Does another company's work if they are using an OnSchedule for an inspection; will that trump a normal inspection for another job?

**JB:** It is conceivable that an IBA could compete with a regular inspection which is one of the reasons that we wanted to add the four (4) positions that you supported and the BOCC approved on December 4<sup>th</sup>. That was one of our concerns. Does an IBA cause someone's inspection to fall back a day every time? No I do not think that is the case. There is a difference between the Inspection Response Time report and the Inspection Efficiency report; we discussed this with you in November and we started giving you an added report that compares the two. This is part of what they may be seeing. We also went onto the web site and put a notice that there is a variance between two reports and neither one is accurate and stated the range of the variance. So when someone looks at the IRT; hopefully they will see that notice and will know there is a variation that we are working on. We also say in that notice that we are going to bring a new report on line by April 1<sup>st</sup>.

**GM:** As a general rule just because a company uses an IBA doesn't mean they have inspection time booked and we won't come and do inspections for another company. Normally when we have an inspector get tied up on IBA we'll fill in the gap that is created with some of the adjacent inspector; spreading the load as best we can. Sometimes when that doesn't work so well is when you have two

large projects and you have the same inspector and its continuity critical that he be the one to do both inspections and there may be some cases where if he is tied up on an IBA it may cause a delay for the other job.

**TH:** Are there certain inspectors that are fully allocated to perform just IBA?

**JB:** Not currently and you'll recall when we created the inspection by appointment program back in 2006 there were 4 inspectors that were allocated to it and the use of it was not what we anticipated and those inspectors which were also doing floating work; and after about a year of that (2008) we decided to mainstream them and that worked fine during the recession; one of the reasons we brought you the proposal as explained in November was that as the markets heated up and people have used it more it does begin to compete with regular inspections and that was a concern when the program was designed by the construction community and the department. This is one of the reasons we are adding the positions and hopefully it will make that problem go away. The demand on IBA has gone up and concern that Gene and the Code Enforcement Managers have is that we've seen situations where that may have been difficult for us to take care of all customers, so we made the proposal to you because we think one of the original concerns back in 2007 was going to become a reality and that is why we added the 4 positions and are trying to fill them as quickly as we can.

**EH:** Thank the department for coming and talking to us at our last meeting. The other thing; a particular contractor had a beef with the fact that he was turned down because no wiring was in. They put telephone stubs in the space the owner elected to have wireless internet; so there is no reason to have that in there. His question was why is that not treated like a spare conduit out of a panel? He got turned down and subsequently had to get a low voltage permit and go back and put it in. So in an office if you put data stubs up do you have to put the wiring in at that time or can that be put in later?

**JW:** I need to investigate that, so if you will send me the particulars I will follow-up on it.

**TH:** I'd like to thank the department for going to the lunch and learn at Captain Steve's for makeup error on the new code (hoods pulling over 400 CFMs). The second thing is what is the rule on pulling a permit on a residential elevator? Permitted for an elevator and we got the electrical rough and he said he did not see a separate permit for the electrical work pertaining to the residential elevator. The installer wasn't aware of it in the residential world and the inspector said "it's always been a rule but I won't come back until I see that permit and he didn't say whether the electrical contractor needed to pull it or whether the elevator contractor needed to pull it.

**JB:** The BCC added in a section to the 2012 code specifically dealing with residential elevators when they occur.

**JG:** There are requirements in the residential code for elevators but what we've found is usually the person that is installing from the electrical standpoint is not the house electrician. It's a different contractor that is doing the connection of the elevator and its service/electric; it's not the guy that is actually wiring the house. So there is a separate electrical contractor and a separate electrical permitting required.

**TH:** It's the same electrical contractor but he didn't even know who needed to pull it and didn't ask the question (who was doing the wiring on it). He just said he wouldn't come back out and let us move forward.

**JG:** Usually what the house electrical contractor wiring it to a disconnect and that is where he stops and then the elevator installer is connecting to the disconnect.

**TH:** So the elevator company should pull their separate permit. We probably need to publicize this information cause when the elevator contractors don't know this; it's a problem and further more I've got to go back and go to the homeowner and say sorry; there was a mix up on the permitting when it was initially submitted; it's going to be an extra cost.

**GM:** Both the electrical contractors should have been listed on the initial permit and it wouldn't have been an issue.

**TH:** The electrical permit was listed as they were handling all the high voltage and the elevator contractor was handling all the low voltage.

**GM:** Did you have 2 electrical contractors with permits under your umbrella?

**GMorton:** When you talking about your building permits; you can list 2, 3, or 4 contractors if you have that many separate ones working.

**TH:** Understand but nobody knew that was a need and it wasn't deemed at permitting. There wasn't one word mentioned when it was issued. And it was in plan review. It's no problem pulling it from now on but we should get the information out to people that haven't ran into this situation yet. The electrical inspector even said this is a grey area; that nobody has been enforcing it; but he is...

**JB:** Contractors aren't aware of how this works and we need to find a way to explain this to them. That was changed in the building code in the last cycle and there is nothing grey about it anymore. We'll go to work on a description that addresses the process and we'll bounce it off you so that you get a chance to comment on it before we publish it. We appreciate you telling us.

**GMorton:** Generally speaking if you have 2 mechanical contractors we're probably not going to ask that question when you come in to get the building permit if you have more than one mechanical contractor working on your house. The assumption is every contractor working on a project should be under a permit if they are not working as a sub under themselves.

**BC:** Inspections and what we are hearing from the apartment contractors is they've had no shows or delays and when their inspector finally arrives what their project managers and superintendents are hearing is well if you don't want to have that problem schedule and IBA. So they are feeling like well do I have to pay for extra services just to get my inspections in a reasonable amount of time? The inspectors have been telling the superintendents that this is a way to solve it.

**JB:** And accurately that is why we created inspection by appointment was that if they had a killer schedule problem and they just had to have something and assure that they could get their inspection. At this time even an 85% - 90% chance just wasn't good enough for them and the 2<sup>nd</sup> thing IBA kind of works the way Express Review does; it improves your chances to pass the inspection because the inspector will be there and they can identify things, you've got time to fix it and then you can pass. Those are the 2 reasons why.

**BC:** There problem is when they get a no show for 2 days in a row and you finally get there on the 3<sup>rd</sup> day and I'm told I should be paying extra if I want to get an inspection within the schedule you said you'd come on.

**JB:** We give customers more information than anybody about our current status on performance on response time, posted every week and we put the notice up there that there is a variation that they should take into account. I think all the inspectors are trying to do is say that the information is out there and if that works for you great; and if it doesn't there is this program. Nobody is trying to push anyone into using IBA it's not the idea. The reason we brought you the betterment for 21 positions is because we were concerned about this very thing.

**ZA:** at our association meeting we had an attorney come in and talk about the new lien laws this year. Bill Spidel was supposed to check on it. According to the attorney anything over \$30k; the owner has to get a lien agent before you can even pull a permit but he wasn't aware of that so I need to know if the department is looking into that.

**JB:** Yes we are, we are working with Marvin and we've got until April 1<sup>st</sup> to get everything in place and we are working on it. It will take some technology changes where there are some things we are not certain of. Actually we are going to take a position with Marvin and he will tell us if it is ok. We aren't certain how the State is going to collect the names. In the legislation it says the State will hold the list of approved lien agents and we're not certain if we have to bounce up against that or what. They design these things for paper processes and if you've got an automated process then what but we know that it goes on April 1<sup>st</sup>. We think we can get the technology done by April 1<sup>st</sup> or that is the goal we set with IST that is doing the work for us. Very simply are going to collect the information

on the permit application we'll start on April 1<sup>st</sup> doing that and then when the permit comes out it will say it on the permit.

**ZA:** I guess the owner as contractor for \$30k or less; does it say \$30k or less or less than \$30k? Because \$30k is where you have to have the lien agent.

**PG:** I thought it was \$30k or more. If you are a homeowner acting as your own contractor it would be required. If it's less than \$30k I don't see any reason they would require it.

**GMorton:** For residential owner as contractor there is an exception.

**TH:** The new auto-notify system allowing more time has been a great hit in my industry. Everybody that signs up for it loves it. It's allowing more time for everyone to get where they need to be.

**ZA:** The other part is the H1. The homeowners have been glad that they are calling.

### **3. PUBLIC ATTENDEE ISSUES**

**Joe Padilla** reminded everyone about the REBIC forum tomorrow open to public down at UNC Center City building. 1:30 p.m. an author coming in from California; how household formations can change in our region and other regions around the country. Should be a great event, no cost but would like for people to register and we still have some space left.

### **4. BDC Budget Subcommittee Work**

Jim began discussing the upcoming BDC Budget Subcommittee work. He went on to say that last year volunteers included E. Mann, H. Sherrill, W. Towler, J. Taylor, J. Morris, T. Haston and Z. Acosta. We currently have three meetings of about 2-3 hours long and tentative dates are: Friday, February 8, 11-2pm, Wednesday, February 27, 11am-2pm and Friday, March 15th, 10-2pm. These meetings are in preparation to the BDC March 19<sup>th</sup> meeting that will be budget only. These are the tentative dates. The Manager's Office could move these around but I don't think it will change us that much and is what we have to get done to be ready for the next BDC. We now want to confirm volunteers for the FY14 Budget Subcommittee. Jon Morris, Zeke Acosta (not available for Feb. 8<sup>th</sup> meeting) Harry Sherrill, Rob Belisle (not available for Feb. 8<sup>th</sup> meeting) Trent Haston, Travis Haston and John Taylor. The agenda letter along with calendar invites will be sent to all of you that don't just set the dates but tells you what we will go over in all the meetings.

### **5. Final Action on RFBA's**

- Both RFBA's e-mailed to you on Friday, January 11
- These topics were reviewed with you in the December BDC meeting.
- "Homeowner as contractor" goes before BDC tonight.
- "MP Journeyman's Card" topic goes before BOCC on Feb 5

### **RFBA for delay in "Homeowner as Contractor" changes**

1. Last October, the BOCC approved this change, which applies to projects of \$30k construction cost or less, where the homeowner also serves as the contractor (HAC).
  - In brief, the Fee Ordinance change, moved these projects to a "pay by the pound" format, for permitting, plan review and inspections, and is specifically addressed by Section II, Part D, item 49.1.
  - Charging by the inspection event assumed customers could pay by e-check or credit card.
2. County Finance has suspended acceptance of e-checks until further notice. Credit card payment has run into similar problems and County Finance strongly recommends we wait until they have a new electronic payment vendor on board to fix these issues and resume the HAC strategy.
  - This may not be resolved until next October-November.
3. The County Attorney advised us, for now, to strike LUESA Fee Ordinance Part D, item 49.1.
  - When the tech issue is resolved, we will return to the BDC & BOCC with another RFBA to reinsert the text currently described in LUESA Fee Ordinance Part D, item 49.1.
4. The County Attorney reviewed and ok'd the language draft with the Department on Dec 27.

5. Will the BDC consider a motion in support of the RFBA?

### **Suspending Mechanical/Plumbing Journeyman's exam**

6. This change follows the successful Electrical Journeyman's Cards program change of 1/1/11.
7. Applies the same concept to MP Journeyman's Card; basics on this are as follows;
  - o Suspends all Mechanical/Plumbing testing, except for Ventilation Contractors
  - o As soon as the BOCC approves it, the Department will suspend tests, in their place accepting licenses by the NC Board of Plumbing, Heating and Fire Sprinkler Contractors (PHFSC Board).
  - o PHFSC Board will grandfather in all current Mecklenburg License holders in Plumbing, Heating Group 1, 2 & 3, and Fuel Gas, provided they applied by December 31, 2012.
    - The Department has advised current license holders of the grandfather option through Consistency Meetings and an e mail blast.
    - The PHFSC Board also discussed reciprocity in their September newsletter.
8. This requires changes to the Fee Ordinance (dropping exam charge) and Building-Development Ordinance (BDO), section 109-definitions & Section 109 A, B, C & G on licensing (various changes)
  - The County Attorney reviewed and ok'd the language draft with the Department on Jan 8.
  - Will the BDC consider a motion in support of the RFBA?

### **6. ISO Audit Update**

In the handouts after the minutes is a letter from ISO that documents the final score from our audit for FY12. We received this letter on December 26, the Department received confirmation from ISO on our final ISO-BCEGS audit score. It confirms the Commercial score of 1 and the Residential score of 2. The residential score of 2 was our goal. On the commercial side the score far exceeds what we anticipated. We had hoped that we would get a 3, so getting back to a 1 on the commercial side is amazing. It recognizes a lot of hard work by both the management and the line staff to meet an ISO standard, a lot of it had to do with training and other things that they did. It also represents recognition by ISO that on the Plan Review side that we have installed the plan review matrix which is part of EPS and EPR which is an automated tool that creates a benchmark minimum level of things that we check that's consistent on different size projects and varies from project to project. It's intelligent and it knows what it wants our staff to check at a minimum. It was also a lot of hard work by Jeanne Quinn and Masika Edwards and Geri Walton. Thank all of you that helped get us the ISO scores especially on Commercial; that is just amazing that we managed to get that done.

**JM:** Can you do a press release on that and send it to the Mecklenburg Times, The Observer and the Business Journal? Hard work by Mecklenburg County keeps property insurance rates low. That is a tremendous job by you guys especially when you have had to cut back your staff. To exceed expectations overall when you are cutting staff by that level in your extremes in that kind of downturn is phenomenal.

**JB:** I can send it to PS&I. It is a component in a commercial property insurance calculation. It is one of the factors in the formula.

### **7. FY13 Mid-Year Numbers Report**

Jim reviewed the data sheet handout with mid-year numbers showing FY13 and on note 6 says all the numbers are for the 6 month period July 1, 2012 through December 31, 2012. Some of the numbers are percentages and you can compare them directly but on other things like permits; you just double them and you can do a comparative on permits and inspection counts when you are talking hard numbers.

- Revenue:
  - Permit Rev.: \$8,594,965, above YTD permit fee rev projection (\$7,446,482) by \$1,148,482 or 15.4%
  - Other Rev.: \$1,510,983, above YTD permit fee rev projection (\$1,244,957) by \$266,026 or 21.3%
  - Total Rev.: (\*); \$10,105,948, above YTD permit fee rev projection (\$8,691,439) by \$1,414,509 (16.2%)  
(\* ) excludes technology commercial surcharge funds
- Permits: comparison of Fy13 to Fy12 mid-year data
  - Residential permits total 20,813, up 13.8% from Fy12 (18,277)
    - o Includes SF new construction permits total 1,483, up 41% from Fy12 (1050)

- Commercial permits total 14,697, up 5.2% from Fy12 (13,966)
  - Total permits at 75,050 up 7.4% from Fy11 (69,886)
- Inspections: comparison of Fy13 to Fy12 mid-year data
  - Building – 29,027, up 12.7% from 25,750 on Dec. 31, 2011
  - Electrical – 37,769, up 16.2% from 32,501 on Dec. 31, 2011
  - Mechanical – 20,930, up 17.2% from 17,849 on Dec. 31, 2011
  - Plumbing – 15,195, up 15.95% from 13,104 on Dec. 31, 2011
  - Total-102,921, up 15.37% from 89,204, on Dec. 31, 2011
- Inspection Complete 1<sup>st</sup> 24 hours: 90.55% compared to 92% at 12/31/2011 (\*\*)  
(\*\*) refer to IRT-IER discussion in November BDC meeting.
- Inspection Pass Rate: 84.54%, compared to 85.03% at mid-year Fy12
- Plan Review: overall OnSchedule av'g 97.21% on time or early, compared to 95.08% at mid-yr Fy12
- B-E-M-P Plan Review FY12 Booking Lead Time av'g: *(with all discipline av'g in parenthesis italics)*
  - 1-2 hour projects; av'g 3.3 (3.55) work day booking lead time; compares to 3.04 at 12/31/11
  - 3-4 hr projects; av'g 7.83 (5.25) work day booking lead time; compares to 3.65 at 12/31/11
  - 5-8 hr projects; av'g 9.39 (7.57) work day booking lead time; compares to 5.43 at 12/31/11
  - CTAC plan review turnaround time averaged 2.74 work days; compares to 2.8 at 12/31/11
  - Express Review booking lead; av'g of 12.3 days on small and 12.6 days on large projects
    - Compares to Ex Rev Fy11 av'g of 6 days on small and 7.66 days on large projects
- Residential Permitting Complete in 1<sup>st</sup> 24 hours: 94% (3647 of 3865 permits)
  - Compares to Fy12 mid-year totals of 94% (3303 of 3518 permits)
- Documents Calls Answered Rate: 88% (on 16,484 total calls)
  - Compares to Fy12 mid-year totals of : 83% (14,393 of 17,347 total calls)

## **8. Quarterly Reports**

### **Technical Advisory Board Quarterly Report**

Lon McSwain gave the TAB Quarterly Report stating that TAB held 2 meeting last quarter on October 17 and November 28. A synopsis is included on page two of the report and in brief. In the 10/17/12 meeting, the two subcommittees (formed in the September meeting) met separately to begin work on their individual assignments. One subcommittee focuses on the standard to be used in the green build program. The other subcommittee is working on the type of incentives that could be offered and where the funding for the program would come from. In the 11/28/12 meeting it was determined that the way the tasks of each committee were divided was not working and we needed a new strategy. The result called for the formation of three subcommittees. One would work on new buildings, one would work with existing buildings and the third would work with residential construction. Each committee would deal with the green build program, the incentives and program funding for the type of construction it was assigned. The TAB is in the process of obtaining volunteers and setting up the subcommittees. The Green Build Team continues to work on two BIM/IPD pilot projects with Carolina Healthcare.

### **Consistency Team Report**

Willis Horton gave the Consistency Team Report stating that a copy of public info. blast on roofing mechanical permit contractor awareness is in the Code compliance 4 page report summary. For building, there were 3 meetings, 19 items covered in residential, 16 items covered in commercial and an average of 13 public attendees at each residential meeting. For electrical due to the Democratic National Convention and the new scheduling of MEP Consistency meetings, the November Consistency meeting was held in October and was the only Public Electrical Meeting for the fourth quarter. There were 8 consistency items covered at the meeting. For mechanical/fuel gas there were two Mechanical/ Fuel Gas Meetings, 13 Fuel Gas and 18 Mechanical items covered. For plumbing there were two Plumbing Meetings, 33 items were covered.

**Code Compliance Report**

Joe Weathers gave the Code Compliance Report stating that for the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter; “not ready”; building – 5.51% (was 10.37%), electrical – 6.57% (was 7.23%), mechanical – 5.64% (was 6.66%), plumbing – 10.92% (was 10.88%). Note building is down significantly. For rough/finish % split varies, some up, some down but building; rough @ 35.46% (down 6% from 41.35%), finish @ 22.03% (down 3.5% from 22.8%); electrical rough @ 20.02% (up 1.5% from 18.38%), finish @ 61.24% (up 1.3% from 59.94%); mechanical rough @ 27.49% (up 1.5% from 25.91%), finish @ 60% (dn 4.26% from 64.26%) and plumbing rough @ 28.63% (down .8% from 29.48%), finish @ 40.64% (dn 2.5% from 43.16%).

**Commercial Plan Review Report**

Melanie Sellers gave the Commercial Plan Review Report stating that 72% of projects pass on 1<sup>st</sup> review; 84% have passed after 2<sup>nd</sup> review (both up from last quarter). The pass rates on 1<sup>st</sup> review by trade were, building 83% (was 84%); electrical 86% (same); mechanical 84% (same); and plumbing 85% (was 81%). The most common defect examples in building are Appendix B, egress related (4), energy summary, UL assembly, interior finishes. In electrical wire services/ Feeders, branch circuits, general, grounding & bonding, ref’g equipment, power & lighting. In mechanical were exhaust, fresh air req’t, equipment location, duct systems, gas piping & equipment inst’l, smoke detection. In plumbing were venting, drainage piping, plbg syst inst’l, water distr piping, potable water protection, min facil. Approved as noted (AAN) was at 36% by all trades on average (up from 34% last quarter). The biggest users were CFD (89%) and MCFM (83%). The critical path users were in building (28%, down from 30%), electrical (13%, up from 12%), in mechanical (14%, down from 16%), and in plumbing (18%, down from 19%). So building, mechanical & plumbing were down (1-2%), and electrical was up (1%).

**9. Quarterly BDC Bulletin Exercise**

**Previous bulletin topics:**

<p><b>January, 2011</b>                  TAB purpose and customer participation                   Technology development and budget baseline                   Status of EV introduction                   Elec J-man program pilot                   Meckpermit.com changes</p>	<p><b>April, 2011</b>                  BIM-IPD code change public hearing                   CRWG startup                   Website redesign                  EPM development status                   Permit activity &amp; IRT                   Impact of Senate Bill 22</p>	<p><b>July, 2011</b>                  Update on Senate Bill 22                   2012 NC Bldg Code transition dates from BCC                   TU/LCU/CC/TCO/CO changes in process &amp; fees                   NACO awards                   AE Pass Rate status                  FY11 Key data points</p>	<p><b>October, 2011</b>                  Carbon Monoxide alarm requirements                   Cost Recovery Work Group status                   2012 NC Building Code transition                   Changes in temporary utility process</p>
<p><b>January, 2012</b>                  2012 NC State Building Code transition                   CRWG final report                   EPS-EPR startup                   Permit revenue trends                   Website redesign</p>	<p><b>April, 2012</b>                   NC Res'd Code transition                   2012 NC Building Code commercial project transition rules                   Code Enforcement Fy13 budget proposal</p>	<p><b>July, 2012</b>                  Fy2012 yearend work load summary                   Cost Recovery Work Group changes approved by BOCC                   RDS program challenges                   Prelim Review policy change                   Dept available for early project meetings on process.</p>	<p><b>October, 2012</b>                  Democratic National Convention success                   RDS Master Plan change                   Cost Recovery Work Group changes approved by BOCC                   CSS Customer survey focus group follow up work</p>
<p><b>January, 2013</b>                   Dept. gains highest ISO</p>	<p><b>April, 2013</b></p>	<p><b>July, 2013</b></p>	<p><b>October, 2013</b></p>

commercial grade of "1"  BOCC approves 21 added positions  Racking permit process discussion  Revisions to inspections auto-notification			
--	--	--	--

## 10. Department Statistics and Initiatives Report Statistics Report

### Permit Revenue

- December permit (only) revenue- \$1,461,628, compares to November revenue of \$1,437,356.
  - $Fy13 \text{ budget projected monthly permit revenue; } \$14,892,963(*)/12 = \$1,241,080$ 
    - ❖ **These are new numbers, see note (\*) below**
  - So December permit revenue is \$220,548 above monthly projection
- At 12/31/12, YTD permit rev of \$8,594,965 is above the YTD permit fee revenue projection (\$7,446,482) by \$1,148,482 or 15.4%
- Note (\*); the December 4, 2012 BOCC approval of both RFBA's adjusted our expense and revenue picture as follows.
  - Original revenue level of \$13,752,732 bumped up \$227,996 by OMB in Fy13 setup
  - The 14 position betterment adds \$912,235; so new Fy13 permit revenue total of \$14,892,963
    - $\$13,752,732 + \$227,996 + \$912,235 = \$14,892,963$
  - The 4 position ISO related betterment adds \$263,265 to the Other Revenue projection.

### Construction Value of Permits Issued:

- December total - \$352,079,742, compared to November total of \$253,379,393
- YTD at Dec.31 of \$1,502,743,013; this is 16.5% above constr value permit'd YTD at 12/31/11 of \$1,289,660,454.

### Permits Issued:

	November	December	3 Month Trend
<b>Residential</b>	3482	2646	2994/3862/3482/2646
<b>Commercial</b>	2355	1979	2181/2734/2355/1979
<b>Other (Fire/Zone)</b>	490	293	469/490/313/293
<b>Total</b>	6150	4918	5644/7086/6150/4918

- Residential down 24%; commercial down 16%; total down 20%
  - The above permit counts are typical of December #'s (98% of December 2011, etc).
- Note; at Dec. 31 SF detached permits YTD totaled 1483, compared to 1050 at same time in Fy12 (up 41%)

### Inspection Activity: Inspections Performed

Insp. Req.	Nov	Dec	Insp. Perf.	Nov	Dec	% Change
<b>Bldg.</b>	4904	4353	<b>Bldg.</b>	4824	4411	-8.56%
<b>Elec.</b>	5939	5237	<b>Elec.</b>	5887	5296	-10%

<b>Mech.</b>	3732	3041	<b>Mech.</b>	3634	3226	-11.23%
<b>Plbg.</b>	2607	2266	<b>Plbg.</b>	2575	2314	-10.14%
<b>Total</b>	17,182	14,897	<b>Total</b>	16,920	15,247	-9.9%

- Insp performed totals down 10%; with all trades down between 8.5%-11.2%
- Insp performed were 102.35% of inspections requested

### Inspection Activity: Inspections Response Time (IRT Report)

Insp. Resp. Time	OnTime %		Total % After 24 Hrs. Late		Total % After 48 Hrs. Late		Average Resp. in Days	
	Nov	Dec	Nov	Dec	Nov	Dec	Nov	Dec
Bldg.	89.0	86.5	91.9	90.6	94.9	95.3	1.31	1.33
Elec.	90.7	87.4	92.0	90.1	96.2	95.6	1.26	1.32
Mech.	71.1	7.96	76.3	83.9	83.5	89.5	1.86	1.7
Plbg.	92.4	91.8	92.7	92.6	96.0	97.6	1.25	1.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>86.2</b>	<b>86.2</b>	<b>88.7</b>	<b>89.3</b>	<b>93.0</b>	<b>94.5</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.38</b>

- Overall same; Mech up 8%+; Bldg, Elec & Plbg down 1-3%

### IRT Comparison to POSSE Inspections Efficiency Report (IER)

1 <sup>st</sup> - 24 hr average	IRT Dec rate	IER Dec rate	% difference	insp resp in days	IRT Dec av'g	IER Dec av'g	difference in days
<b>Bldg.</b>	<b>86.5%</b>	<b>66.4%</b>	-19.9%	<b>Bldg.</b>	<b>1.33</b>	<b>1.59</b>	-0.26
<b>Elec.</b>	<b>87.4%</b>	<b>54.4%</b>	-33%	<b>Elec.</b>	<b>1.32</b>	<b>1.68</b>	-0.36
<b>Mech.</b>	<b>79.6%</b>	<b>39.5%</b>	-40.1%	<b>Mech.</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.85</b>	-0.15
<b>Plbg.</b>	<b>91.8%</b>	<b>74.9%</b>	-16.9%	<b>Plbg.</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.39</b>	-0.19
<b>MT.</b>	<b>na</b>	<b>92.6%</b>	na	<b>MT.</b>	<b>Na</b>	<b>na</b>	na
<b>Total</b>	<b>86.2%</b>	<b>67.8%</b>	-18.4%	<b>Total</b>	<b>1.38</b>	<b>1.62</b>	-0.24

- So there appears to be variance between IRT & IER as follows;
  - IER is 18.4% lower on percent complete in 1<sup>st</sup> 24 hours.
  - IER av'g days per inspection is .24 days (2 ½ hours) longer.

### Inspection Pass Rates for December, 2012:

OVERALL MONTHLY AV'G @ 84.2%, compared to 85.07%, in November

**Bldg:** November – 78.69%                      **Elec:** November – 85.34%  
December – 75.8%                                      December – 81%

**Mech:** November – 86.94%                      **Plbg:** November – 91.08%  
December – 82.7%                                      December – 91.3%

- Bldg, Elec & mech all down 2.8% to 4.3%; Plbg up .2%

- Overall average up .down .8%, but still well above 75-80% goal range

## OnSchedule and CTAC Numbers for December, 2012

### CTAC:

- 150 first reviews, compared to 133 in November.
  - Projects approval rate (pass/fail) – 77%
  - CTAC was 54% of OnSch (\*) first review volume ( $150/150+126 = 276$ ) = 54.34%
- \*CTAC as a % of OnSch is based on the total of only scheduled and Express projects

### OnSchedule:

- November, 11:184 -1st review projects; on time/early–91.75% all trades, 93.25% B/E/M/P only
- December, 11:143 -1st review projects; on time/early–95% all trades, 96% B/E/M/P only
- January, 2012:136 -1st review projects; on time/early–78% all trades, 87% B/E/M/P only
- February, 12:139 -1st review projects; on time/early–74.88% all trades, 73% B/E/M/P only
- March, 12: 127 -1st review projects; on time/early–86.25% all trades, 87% B/E/M/P only
- April, 12: 151 -1st review projects; on time/early–92.25% all trades, 95% B/E/M/P only
- May, 12: 195 -1st review projects; on time/early–94.5% all trades, 97% B/E/M/P only
- June, 12: 235 -1st review projects; on time/early–98.63% all trades, 98.25% B/E/M/P only
- July, 12: 166 -1st review projects; on time/early–94.88% all trades, 97.5% B/E/M/P only
- August, 12: 199 -1st review projects; on time/early–89.5% all trades, 96% B/E/M/P only
- September, 12: 118 -1st review projects; on time/early–96.38% all trades, 97.25% B/E/M/P only
- October, 12: 183 -1st review projects; on time/early–97% all trades, 98.75% B/E/M/P only
- November, 12: 141 -1st review projects; on time/early–92.4% all trades, 97% B/E/M/P only
- December, 12: 150 -1st review projects; on time/early–93.25% all trades, 96.75 B/E/M/P only

### Booking Lead Times

- OnSchedule Projects: **for reporting chart posted on line**, on January 7, 2013, showed
  - 1-2 hr projects; at 2-3 work days booking lead, all trades
  - 3-4 hr projects; at 2-3 work days lead, but MP at 6 days.
  - 5-8 hr projects; at 3-5 work days lead, but Elec-9, M/P–8 and CMUD at 6 days.
    - All improved significantly from 12/3/2012
- CTAC plan review turnaround time; 1 work day, except BEMP at 7 days (was 10 days on 12/3)
- Express Review – booking lead time was; 6 work days for small projects, 6 work days for large

## Status Report on Various Department Initiatives

### December Meeting Follow Up

#### Report on progress filling new positions approved by BOCC on 12/4/12

- Directors noted request. We think this is most effectively done with a monthly verbal update, rather than institutionalizing a new report.

## Updates on Other Department Work

### CSS Report Follow-Up Work

#### Auto-Notification Reconvene of CCTF

- Work reported to the BDC in December continues, including;
  - a) Dept. continues to focus effort on getting the word on this change out to customers, key steps being;
    - Soliciting opportunities to present to REBIC/HBA/NARI members, trade associations, et al
    - Devoting Consistency meeting time to it, where contractor presence merits same.
  - b) When software availability supports, we will also work on a Department YouTube style video on both auto notification and our temporary utility program

**Focus Group A Work;** status as follows:

- Timely inspections; Pat G's 10/19 e-mail to focus group participants addressed this.
- Review umbrella; looking for ways to promote the graphic process description chart (stop signs)
- Reach the right person; held management meeting on January 3 to discuss this (along with 5 other items).
  - a) Scheduling BDC public rep (current and former) meeting focusing on how the telephone tree works for novice customers. Director meeting January 17 to plan session.
  - b) Meeting topics; ACD current 4 pronged operation, what would be ideal, what needs to change, etc.
- Clear explanation of changes – part 1; JNB's 12/3/12 directive to managers and CA's addressed this
  - a) Instructs to use prof assoc periodicals to convey process or code changes and code interpretations.
- Clear explanation of changes – part 2; need Dept. meeting to agree on strategy to emphasize the power of "NotifyMe" to customers, as well as developing a "continuing customer reminder" tool, to get key (CEM & team based service, EPS, Rehab Code, et al) issues in front of them periodically, on a repeating basis.
  - a) Meeting tentatively scheduled for February 1 to continue work on this.
- PM/CEM resource awareness; mgmt/staff team need to develop a webpage concept to propose to the Chamber. Maybe add to meetings referenced in item 10.3.2 below.

**Chamber-NAIOP Follow-Up Work**

**Focus Group B Work**

- JNB sent a reminder request for participants to the Chamber's Natalie English on November 26. Working on a follow up meeting on this and two other points.
  - Hope to get help on this from NAIOP as well as Developer Dash project
- Sent 2<sup>nd</sup> request for meeting to both on January 15, 2013

**Developer Dash**

- Included request for help on this in Nov 26 e-mail to Natalie English at the Chamber
- Also sent 11/29 e-mail to Theresa Salmen of NAIOP, requesting participants in this design focus group.
- Sent 2<sup>nd</sup> request for meeting to both on January 15, 2013

**Other**

- Department is participating in February 5 all day BIM-IPD Symposium at UNCC Center City Building, sponsored by AIA Charlotte and UNCC-SoA.
- We will lead a 1 hour workshop discussing, Code Enforcement Process Support of BIM-IPD.
- The workshop will highlight;
  - a) CHC-BIM Pilot Projects, testing alternate service delivery
  - b) Brief review of the BIM-IPD code change to the NC Administrative Code, which the Department spearheaded in 2010-2011.
  - c) The Department's 2010 Reorganization and how it meshes with BIM-IPD
  - d) Review of Team Plan Review, as service tool likely seeing greater use on BIM-IPD projects.

**Manager/CA added comments**

There were no Manager/CA added comments.

**10. Adjournment**

The January 15th, 2013 Building Development Commission meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

*The next BDC meeting is scheduled for 3:00 p.m., Tuesday, February 15th, 2013.*