

BUILDING DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Minutes of February 19, 2013 Meeting

Ed Horne opened the Building-Development Commission (BDC) meeting at 3:08 p.m. on Tuesday, February 19, 2013.

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

Absent: Zeke Acosta and Elliot Mann,

1. MINUTES APPROVED

The motion by Harry Sherrill, seconded by Kevin Silva, to approve the January 15, 2013 meeting minutes passed unanimously.

2. BDC MEMBER ISSUES AND COMMENTS

Ed Horne thanked Joe Weathers, Gary Mullis and Jeff Griffin for coming to our contractors meeting last month. They've done this on numerous occasions and I realize it is time away from your families; thanks again for being so proactive working with the contractors.

3. PUBLIC ISSUES AND COMMENTS

No public issues and/or comments.

4. INTRODUCTION OF NEW LUESA DIRECTOR

Jim Bartl introduced Ebenezer Gujjarlapudi, the new LUESA Director to BDC members and public attendees. Jim stated that Mr. Gujjarlapudi is a PE from Jacksonville, Florida. He has a master's degree in environmental engineering from Texas A&M. Mr. Gujjarlapudi was the former director of the Environmental and Compliance Department in the city of Jacksonville. BDC Members introduced themselves also sharing the association in which they represent.

5. CA WEB SEARCH ENGINE DEMO

Joe Weathers gave an overview of this initiative as well as sharing our progress to date. Joe went on to say that the overall goal is to make each discipline interpretation page as similar as possible, and included the following. We conducted a website visit style survey of site users on familiarity with interpretation pages and also staff feedback. We added a Code Interpretation link and code interpretation dashboard page to site. We added individual site search to each discipline page. We will create an interpretation archive link and database for existing building research as well as a consistency meeting Q&A archive link and database. Currently we are planning presentations in hopes to reach all industry partners.

HS: So are you saying if I have a mechanical question, I would need to know what code was in effect in November 2006 in order to understand the interpretation?

JW: Sometimes folks call us and say "when did GFI's become required in kitchens?" because my house was built in 20XX and I don't have any. We have to go back to that code cycle of that code year and find out when that hit the code so they can determine if they actually have to add those or not. We will have a note saying "2002 code used for these questions" so you can be aware that you are on the right track.

JB: Most architects and engineers think in terms of the year the project was done. Most people go in looking knowing that the project was done around 2006, example.

WH: We also discussed having an archive page and just having the current code on our current web pages.

Joe Weathers went on to say that when this is completely rolled out we will send out an email blast through notify me telling everyone it's there and ready. This is currently live. Once we get this complete; we plan to come back to you BDC members and different industry partners so that we can go to meetings like we did with Ed and roll it out to contractors or whomever wants to see the presentation, which is the last step to make everyone aware.

BC: Joe when you search Building Residential; does it search all the archived stuff or does it only search the current stuff.

JW: That's our debate; right now it only searches current because I don't have the archive stuff on my page yet; but right now it will search anything that's on any page I have control over which is 15+ pages.

JB: When it's built out the intent is that it will search the interpretations in your discipline and your archives too.

JW: We are trying to determine whether to make a separate site for archives and just search for archives or do we want to search everything with current and archives.

JB: How many pages are your archives roughly?

WH: 30 per year for each one

JB: This is where you folks can give us some input, besides the fact when this is finalized we are going to want to take this around to the industry meetings. We could use some direction from you folks on do you want to stay inside the interpretations or also go into the archives where you will hit a larger pool.

RB: Can't you just have a box when you type in your search (you have 2 or 3 boxes for present archives)?

BC: In my opinion you want to keep them separate, because if you are searching right now you don't want to get all the archive stuff mixed in.

JB: Separate search of interpretations from search archive.

JW: We will see if this is possible and will move from there.

GM: If you have a subject that came up in 2006 and it hasn't come up since then; it may be that the code interpretation hasn't changed or been effected by a code change, if you separate it you may not get all of your information. Assuming that we're not taking every interpretation each year and bringing it forward and putting it in with the current year.

BC: Based on Gene's comment you might want to look at whether it searches it all (your results) are current and archive results separate so that all your current stuff is in one. Even just the results come up defined so that you know what's current and you know what's archived so when you are looking at it you know if it's old or off an old code.

6. BOCC ACTION RELATED ITEMS

January 15 action on "homeowner as contractor" change

The homeowner as contractor change was pulled from the fee ordinance until such time as we can fix a credit card payment problem. It was approved by the BOCC. When that technology problem is fixed, sometime late summer early fall; we'll bring an RFBA back to you to put back into the ordinance. This is how the county attorney wanted to handle it. This was approved on the 15th.

February 5 action on mp journeyman's exam changes

On the 5th they approved the Mechanical/Plumbing Journeyman's exam changes. These are both changes in the Building Development Ordinance and the LUESA Fee Ordinance.

7. STATUS OF BETTERMENTS

Patrick Granson stated that currently we have 1 Controller position on line and productive. We have interviewed and selected a candidate for our second one and are waiting for HR to complete that process and give us a hiring date. We are now interviewing a Coordinator and hope to have that completed by February 25th. We have selected Scott VanZandt as our Senior Plans Examiner. He is currently in that position and we are moving some of his work now. We are going to be going through a transition and that also created a building plans examiner vacancy that we have posted, are gathering applications and setting up interviews. We had another vacancy of a Mechanical Plans Examiner we have recently posted and are going through that selection process as well. We have to fill our vacancies before we fill our betterments.

JM: Have you made progress interviewing for some of the other positions?

PG: The Plan Review position will close the end of this week and the Mechanical/Plumbing position will close the 25th. We'll go through the interview process for that and it will take 2-3 weeks then go through the selection hiring through HR.

Gene Morton stated we had several retirements at the end of the year we have to fill. 2 retired and 1 transferred. We had 13 betterment inspector positions and 2 inspection supervisor positions. We have hired 1 of those betterment positions that's in the field working. We have 3 candidates that have been offered positions and they are in the final stages of the HR process to establish start date. The interviews for remaining positions have concluded and we think we have selected good candidates all except for 1 position; we may go a bit longer in looking again to finalize that last position. Those will continue in the hiring process and sending it to HR and hopefully in the next 2-3 weeks we'll have some decisions made.

JM: Am I hearing we are making more progress in the field with inspectors than in the office and is there a reason for that?

PG: What we are doing is interviewing our candidates trying to fill our 2 vacancies before we fill our betterments. We will be looking at our pool the end of this week/beginning of next week.

GM: The last 2 inspection supervisor positions we have gone out for applicants internally. We had good applicants but wanted to have a larger pool before we make a selection so we put that back out and advertized throughout (inside/outside) the County. That will close the 25th of this month.

TH: What are all the different avenues you advertise in for these positions? Online, paper publications or word of mouth?

PG: We are going after a couple different skill sets; geared for field or geared for plans examiners. There is a different ratio there so we use the web base, we have our associations that we use, ICC and of course our internal process.

JM: I'm asking more what the applicant pool is like. More so than where you are in your process and to me it seems like Gene's applicant pool is bigger, you're having more success filling positions more quickly where as the plans examiners you aren't but maybe you aren't progressing.

PG: We're not there yet. We'll be seeing our window of opportunity next week.

JB: I think there is a difference between the 2 pools. I think there are still a lot of professionals A/Es on the sidelines and are convinced that business is going to come back to the way it was before and so they are waiting and it is ridiculous. They think that business will change back to the way it was and it's not. So there are a lot of people choosing to stay on the sidelines and not go after his positions which makes no sense and we've actually talked to some folks and they weren't interested.

HS: Are we in the right salary range?

PG: It is undetermined for me. I want to see our first pool, look at it and then go from there. We've reached out before and done this. You have to look at the candidate and ensure you have a good fit because there's a lot of skill sets that we offer w/in the department to maintain the volume the work ethic. We are careful when we look at the selection.

JB: If somebody wants to live in the past and compare what we offer for a plan reviewer to what they could make working in an architect's office back in the boom of the mid to late 2000s, well no we're not. But if they want to be in reality today it's competitive.

JM: It's a lot more technical than it used to be with certifications, etc. Thank you for continuing to keep us updated. It is a very interesting cross section of the employment situation out there in the construction industry.

JB: If you think in terms that from the pit of the recession to today or when the board approved the 21 positions on 12.4.12 that we've added a total of 35 code enforcement side positions. Those are approved positions a lot of those we are still trying to fill but 35 on top of a base at the pit of 130 is a lot better than a lot of offices are doing in terms of adding people back as a percent.

RB: What is the pay scale?

PG: Top is 86K and the mid is 63K. You've got people already here that's worked the hours and the years to include management and you've got to fit them in.

8. UPDATE ON MEETING WITH CHAMBER & NAIOP

Jim Bartl discussed the meeting held at the Chamber on February 6th that included Jon Morris, Natalie English, Theresa Salmen from NAIOP and went over the owner developer dashboard; how we can elevate customers awareness of the work that PMs and CEMs do on projects as well as the review umbrella which is what we're responsible for vs. what other agencies are responsible for and we also talked about the issue in how we bridge customer technology gap as we get closer and closer to a totally paperless process. We're at about 98% now. We are going to have a situation we think where some customers have a technology gap and we want to be careful and not leave them behind. We agreed in that meeting Theresa Salmen with NAIOP is going to take the lead on getting us volunteers for the Developer Dashboard. We need people to help us design the Developer Dashboard. It's a project where we have the funding, we put it in this year's budget and we're ready to go. We just need a customer focus group to work with and conversely Natalie is going to work on getting us representatives to participate in the technology gap for novices which are a much softer and more subjective topic. The biggest thing that came out of the meeting is Jon; proposed that we have another Chamber/NAIOP Town Hall Meeting with the Department and expanding that as far as the Chamber and NAIOP want to involve other authorities. The idea behind that would be to field customer comments but would give us an opportunity to do 2 things. To talk about the success that the project

managers have had on certain projects and the code enforcement managers have had on certain projects. They've really hit the ball out of the park on AABF North and on Siemens down south to be able to talk about that and get customers to understand that those assets are there if they want to take advantage of them. And then the second thing would be to talk about the graphic of the process plan review umbrella up in front of people so they can see the stop signs and know when something isn't ours and when it belongs to the agency and they have to work with those agencies to get the holds released; there's nothing we can do about it. We're anxious to get that town hall meeting set up. We didn't talk about time lines but I assume that after you are free of being chair and you have a lot more time on your hands you'll work with them to get it going. Theresa is a great resource.

JM: The first one was sort of a complaint session was the impression I got out of it. We've had 2 of these town hall meetings. The second one was more about discussing the problem and some solutions. I think this one should and could be a very solution oriented; maybe getting some of the customers up there at Siemens and ABB to talk about how they worked within the structure and have it very solution oriented. Yes there is going to be some issues/problems talk about perceived issues could be as we get busier in the next 3 -5 years.

JB: That's a good approach. You're not going to have problems that were more challenging than those on Siemens and ABB but they were really proactive in working with our staff and the other agencies involved. That's one of the reasons everyone kept the problems out of the way of the project being delivered on schedule.

JM: I think people are scared to come down here but when you engage the CEMs you've got 1 person you can call and you have resources here that you can work with that are solution based resources not retaliation issues.

JB: We need to have an orientation meeting with the new chair. You had some articles in the weekly chamber newsletter which we'll work on that and linked her to the quarterly bulletin that Jon gave me the comments on and we pushed out the door and we are working on web links. It was a good meeting and having Theresa in there made a big difference.

9. DEPARTMENT STATISTICS AND INITIATIVES REPORT

STATISTICS REPORT

Permit Revenue

- January permit (only) revenue- \$1,636,152, compares to December revenue of \$1,461,628.
 - Fy13 budget projected monthly permit revenue; $\$14,892,963(*)/12 = \$1,241,080$
 - **new numbers reflecting the increase from the 12/4/12 betterment, see below (*)**
 - So December permit revenue is \$395,072 above monthly projection
- At 1/31/13, YTD permit rev of \$10,128,197 is above the YTD permit fee revenue projection (\$8,687,562) by \$1,543,554 or 16.6%
 - 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

- January total - \$264,327,849, compared to December total of \$270,282,563
- YTD at January 31 of \$1,685,273,683; close to constr value permit'd YTD at 1/31/12 of \$1,631,085,643.
- Note; the comparative December construction valuation represents a correction of data in the system
 - Last month, we listed the December construction val as \$352,079,742
 - This month the December constr val is corrected to show \$270,282,563, dropping \$81,797,179.
 - This is primarily owed to a staff entry error listing a \$10M job as \$100M (added extra 0).

Permits Issued:

	December	January	3 Month Trend
Residential	2646	3225	3862/3482/2646/3225
Commercial	1979	2086	2734/2355/1979/2086
Other (Fire/Zone)	293	422	490/313/293/422
Total	4918	5733	7086/6150/4918/5733

- Residential up 22%; commercial up 5%; total up 16.5%

Inspection Activity: Inspections Performed

Insp. Req.	Dec	Jan	Insp. Perf.	Dec	Jan	% Change
Bldg.	4353	4526	Bldg.	4411	4394	-0.4%
Elec.	5237	5652	Elec.	5296	5559	+4.9%
Mech.	3041	3265	Mech.	3226	3173	-1.7%
Plbg.	2266	2490	Plbg.	2314	2460	+6.3%
Total	14,897	15,933	Total	15,247	15,586	+2.2%

- Insp performed totals up 2%+
- Elec & Plbg up 5-6%; Bldg & Mech down ½% to 1.5%
- Insp performed were 97.8% 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	
	Dec	Jan	Dec	Jan	Dec	Jan	Dec	Jan
Bldg.	86.5	90.8	90.6	93.3	95.3	97.4	1.33	1.21
Elec.	87.4	88.6	90.1	91.1	95.6	96.0	1.32	1.26
Mech.	79.6	93.2	83.9	94.5	89.5	98.0	1.7	1.15
Plbg.	91.8	95.3	92.6	95.9	97.6	99.4	1.2	1.10
Total	86.2	91.2	89.3	93.2	94.5	97.3	1.38	1.20

- Overall improvement; Mech up 14%+; Bldg & Plbg up 4% +/-, Elec up 1%-

IRT Comparison to POSSE Insp. Efficiency Report (IER)

1 st - 24 hr average	IRT Jan rate	IER Jan rate	% difference	insp resp in days	IRT Jan av'g	IER Jan av'g	difference in days
Bldg.	90.8%	74.3%	-19.9%	Bldg.	1.21	1.45	-.24
Elec.	88.6%	57.9%	-33%	Elec.	1.26	1.59	-.33
Mech.	93.2%	68.2%	-40.1%	Mech.	1.15	1.38	-.23

Plbg	95.3%	80.6%	-16.9%	Plbg.	1.10	1.26	-.16
MT.	na	88.4%	na	MT.	Na	na	na
Total	91.2%	73.4%	-18.4%	Total	1.38	1.43	-.05

- So there appears to be variance between IRT & IER as follows;
 - IER is 17.8% lower on percent complete in 1st 24 hours.
 - IER av'g days per inspection is .05 days (½ hour) longer.
- Note; Computronix advised programming completion on the new IRT report is delayed to May 1.

Inspection Pass Rates for January, 2013:

OVERALL MONTHLY AV'G @ 84.07%, compared to 84.2%, in December

Bldg: December – 75.8% **Elec:** December – 81%
 January – 77.69% January – 82.47%

Mech: December – 82.7% **Plbg:** December – 91.3%
 January – 86.47% January – 92.28%

- All trades up, ranging from 1% (Plbg) to 3.8% (Mech)
- Overall average down .13%, but still well above 75-80% goal range

OnSchedule and CTAC Numbers for January, 2013:

CTAC:

- 129 first reviews, compared to 150 in December.
- Projects approval rate (pass/fail) – 77%
- CTAC was 52% of OnSch (*) first review volume (129/129+119 = 248) = 52.02%
 *CTAC as a % of OnSch is based on the total of only scheduled and Express projects

OnSchedule:

- November, 11:184 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–91.75% all trades, 93.25% B/E/M/P only
- December, 11:143 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–95% all trades, 96% B/E/M/P only
- January, 2012:136 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–78% all trades, 87% B/E/M/P only
- February, 12:139 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–74.88% all trades, 73% B/E/M/P only
- March, 12: 127 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–86.25% all trades, 87% B/E/M/P only
- April, 12: 151 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–92.25% all trades, 95% B/E/M/P only
- May, 12: 195 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–94.5% all trades, 97% B/E/M/P only
- June, 12: 235 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–98.63% all trades, 98.25% B/E/M/P only
- July, 12: 166 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–94.88% all trades, 97.5% B/E/M/P only
- August, 12: 199 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–89.5% all trades, 96% B/E/M/P only
- September, 12: 118 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–96.38% all trades, 97.25% B/E/M/P only
- October, 12: 183 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–97% all trades, 98.75% B/E/M/P only
- November, 12: 141 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–92.4% all trades, 97% B/E/M/P only
- December, 12: 150 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–93.25% all trades, 96.75 B/E/M/P only
- January, 13: 140 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–89.12% all trades, 94.25 B/E/M/P only

Booking Lead Times

- OnSchedule Projects: **for reporting chart posted on line**, on January 28, 2013, showed
 - 1-2 hr projects; at 2-3 work days booking lead, all trades
 - 3-4 hr projects; at 2-3 work days booking lead, all trades

- 5-8 hr projects; at 3-5 work days lead, but CMUD at 10 days and City Zoning at 17 days.
- CTAC plan review turnaround time; 1 work day, except BEMP at 5 days
- Express Review – booking lead time was; 12 work days for small projects, 12 work days for large

Status Report on Various Department Initiatives

December Meeting Follow Up

BDC Quarterly Bulletin

The Quarterly Bulletin was drafted, sent to Jon on February 11th, Jon quickly turned it around to us and we posted the final on February 14th, 2013 on meckpermit.com as well as distributed by e-blast through notify me.

BDC Budget Subcommittee Startup

The Budget Subcommittee started their work on February 8th. Our next meeting is on the 27th, the last meeting is on 3-15 and would remind everyone that next month's meeting March 19th is exclusively budget. Typically what we do is we approve the meeting minutes, we defer all BDC Member and Public comments and jump right to the budget since it is usually a 90 minute presentation discussion. If you have trouble with attendance; let us know. We've got to have a quorum in that meeting. One thing that Sandra and Jim have discussed is whether or not it makes sense to do something different with the technology budget this year. A big part of what we are going to discuss is Winchester which is Computronix's next generation of Posse that takes it off the client server basis and takes it to a cloud. We wonder if a select group of BDC members are interested and would like to have a special tech demo session of Winchester separate from the discussion of this in the Budget Subcommittee. Winchester is something you could easily spend 45 – 60 minutes discussing. To put that discussion inside the Budget Subcommittee meeting #2 would be a killer. We wondered if there are interested BDC members that want to sit through a separate discussion and feed their comments into the subcommittee perhaps in meeting 3.

JM: Is the idea we want to allocate some more money for technology or will need more money to update that?

JB: What's going to happen; this is the initiative that Marvin has determined you can't divert commercial technology surcharge funds to pay for this project because this benefits all projects at large.

JM: So Commercial can't pay for things that might benefit residential which is a wider pool?

JB: Right, so what you're probably going to do is recommend to the manager's office which then will recommend to the board of county commissioners that X amount of money would be taken out of the reserve fund which is funded by everybody and set aside for this project. The other thing we have to do is to designate money for the electronic plan room. Marvin's already determined that's ok to use commercial surcharge money for that. All we have to do is have an RFBA where the board recognizes that instead of three projects for that money there are four.

JM: This is where I don't understand exactly what you are talking about with Winchester but to me that seems like a very non controversial issue as opposed to you thought Posse would last for 6-10 years; it's lasted longer and you need to add this overlay to update it it's going to cost money but money well less than what a new Posse system would cost.

JB: To put this in the context we discussed in the meeting on the 8th; when we designed Posse it cost us \$1.8MM. This will cost us far less than that. There's a difference in scale, \$350K as opposed to \$1MM. If we can get another 7-9 years more out of Posse doing this change then it's a bargain.

JM: I personally from my point of view (which is different from a lot of mechanical/electrical trades). I don't need any more on this. Harry, what's your thought?

HS: I think that's a good idea. The \$300K we would be spending.

JB: That's good to know. What we can do is deliver less than a one page summary of what it is as part of the package we give to you on the 28th. And you'll have it for reference if someone asks. If that works for all of you especially those of you that are on the budget subcommittee who are here then we know

what to do; it's how we'll handle February the 28th and if someone wants something different they can speak up and we can figure something out.

JM: It just seems like a very judicious use of funds to upgrade something that works well with a good upgrade as opposed to recreating something new.

JT: I think the one page summary makes sense more so than a meeting.

TH: So this is keeping the Posse system and upgrading it onto a cyber server?

JB: Yes. What we talked briefly about in the meeting is that we always anticipated that Posse would have a defined life to it. We installed Posse in 2003. Computronix does a good job of upgrading Posse so that its lifetime is far more extended than we thought and this next generation of revisions which will open the door to some other benefits to both customers and staff it'll extend the lifetime of the backbone of our system. This generates all permits, manages all the inspections, and does a lot of the records work for us; it's a work horse.

BDC ISO Public Info Request

On the ISO we asked PS&I to develop a media notice on this. They put one together, not sure where they are in pushing it out the door. I specifically made a point to follow up on Jon's comment about the Meck Times and they know about it and they will follow up with them.

BVD Calculator Study

Patrick Granson shared in the January meeting John Taylor raised a question regarding how the BVD auto calculator works on web and whether it defaults to the most extreme condition. One of the things that I remember you were using it for is trying to justify and work in permits which included the renovations or the upfit square footage calculations or the BVD table. That calculator does not work in that function. It really just works in the spreadsheet; the manual calculations. There is a large difference between the manual calculation and the automated tool. The base automated calculator does not use the square foot notes, upfit/renovation factors, or the BVD table built in its calculation. So what we did was come up with some solutions and you can tell us which way you want to go. One is to keep the calculator, and add a note at the bottom saying this is a limited calculator and only addresses the arithmetic that's listed in 601 in the fee ordinance and it does not address the upfits/renovations square foot for additions for projects less than \$100K and the BVD table adjustments if you have those. The other one is to take it down and try to beef it up a bit; bring those tools upfront to see if we can plug those in and make those work and that would need some technology help from Sandra's group. The other option is to take it completely off line permanently until we get a tool that can navigate all the fees. One of the things you are talking about is working with food service fees and all the fees that will come up later once Posse is enhanced. We are looking at a fee schedule to build in phase where data can be plugged in and we'd cover all the fees from all the different agencies plus our fees and will give you a type of worksheet to work from. Those are our options and we are looking for some guidance which way you would like us to go.

JB: This is a lot of information but this is what Patrick and I have been working on. I don't know if you want to think about it and talk after the February 28th budget meeting.

JT: How would Mega Projects be factored in? If you took it down would it be able to figure out the Mega Project cost or is that still a sit down meeting?

JB: What we would do is send people to the page that walks people through how to manually use the tool and do a manual calculation. That's probably what we would do. All the instructions are right there it's just not an auto-calculator if you have to do it by hand.

PG: I think some of the factors that John's talking about is when you look at the Mega projects there's a 25% reduction when you go Mega (25% reduction on the permit fee). When you select Mega you have to realize there is a plan review charge and a reduction factor that goes in place when you qualify. Jim's correct, it's complicated and would take some time to do but once you check that Mega box then in the ordinance you get a 25% reduction in your permit fee. That would be hard to build in if someone doesn't understand what Mega is and they try to calculate and they don't know their Mega hour charge.

JB: When we talked about posting of the lead time chart (it was put together for a really good reason) and we put it out there but people would read and use it but would use it different than intended. It's just a snapshot; just a statement in time. We changed the way that we used it; put a sheet in front of them explaining what this is really about and what it is not. This is similar. We developed this very simple tool, at a very low cost that

has severe limits as your project gets more and more complicated. If your project is that complicated you need to do a manual calculation and the instructions are there for a manual calculation although we would have no problem in sitting down and reviewing the construction sensing if they need to be beefed up to cover a wider range of things. If we decide that what we need is an automated tool that's more robust than that is going to be a tech project unto itself. So the question is how do you deal? Do you design something really simple that has limited range? If people want to use it for a wider breadth; you can't do it w/out designing a replacement for it.

PG: The reason why we developed the tool was it was focused on the residential contractors, homeowners and they wanted us to do our manual fee calculations because they didn't understand. The more you escalate in the complexity of your project the more this tool doesn't work.

JB: There a lot of people that use it without any problem so what we were thinking was that maybe what you do is leave that there but you put a screaming bold statement that grabs the person by the lapels and shakes them to say your project is really like this and you should be going a different route; or something to that effect. Or we could take it down and force people to use the manual calculator.

BC: Do you think it is realistic to include all the other fees at least in a connective way, maybe not in the calculator but a connective way because that's the problem that I see from the people doing residential and multi-family is it's all the other fees and they need a place where they can get their arms around all the fees.

PG: If we had to do a tool like that it would be costly.

BC: I don't know that it needs to be automated but it would be nice if at that calculator place it said at least go here, here and here to get that fee even if it was connected.

PG: We provided the links and went ahead and made that modification for the customer but I think when you are talking about commercial residential its two different animals. One's \$62 per sf and whatever you build over here you can go from \$186 to \$22 per sf and it's based on your size and renovation area and the equipment you have and if you have a deduction and are you over \$1MM; a novice coming in is very tough. If we go into a Mega project like that we'd be walking them through the fee structure. A person w/ less than \$1MM would have to be plugged in. Usually the first impression of our department is through the CTAC area or the OnSchedule side. The CTAC side is contractor ready so the contractor should be familiar with the fee schedule. To answer your question, having all the fees plugged in that would have to come from Posse and would be a big event for us having everything listed which is a long way down the road in my opinion.

JB: Do you want to think about this? It might be that we have a separate meeting to strategize over this. Patrick did enough research on it and I think he and I have our arms around the problem but aren't sure where to take it next. Let us know next Tuesday what you've got in the back of your mind even if it's just to set up another meeting then we know what to do.

JT: I've got a job that's going to be coming on and it's complicated to figure out the permit cost due to its complexity. I wanted to sit down w/ you for maybe 30 minutes, bring the architect in and talk about it. It may help answer some of my questions in looking at the internet site so we could do it at the same time. That way we can use that as a case study.

PG: I'd like to do that too. I'll call you tomorrow to set that up.

JB: Maybe from that you can determine if there is something separate that we need to discuss as a group.

Commercial Plan Review Most Common Defects

Jim shared that Harry has a topic he's been kicking around with Patrick and I. We've endeavored to drag Bernice into this and Rob as well. It came out of a discussion that we had last month on the Commercial Plan Review Quarterly Report about Appendix B failures, what they consist of and Melanie came up with staff's idea of the most common errors are and this was sent to Harry. That was done by a sense of it; it is not tracked data. We've set a meeting up with AIA-Charlotte, Kate Shelton Executive Director, to include Harry and Bernice for March 26th after the budget. We are going to review Melanie's notes about the most common things and hopefully boil it down to training topics and then talk about ways that training can be delivered preferably private sector sources that could provide the training. We certainly are happy to support that and help identify the topics and the people that might do it and support AIA taking the lead. Harry and I've had several conversations in the last month that we do training for our own staff and we try to support professional training but where the private sector can take over the training we try and stay out of the way and not compete with them. Effective training classes can

consume a lot of time and we have to watch where our resources are. We try and weigh how much can we give to it and at the same time we have to take care of all our other customer service commitments.

HS: I was thinking more in terms of seeing if we could do something that would benefit both our staff here and a higher level than just beginning code training so that it would be beneficial to both our staff here and to the AIA, not a beginning course for instruction on how to interpret the code. I think there are enough courses out there that anybody can fly in from Seattle and teach that course. I'm looking at things that I know that are unique to Mecklenburg County that seem to be repeating over and over again and it would benefit the profession at large in getting a better understanding as to why this is a problem and then being able to create examples that we've seen in the past that would not be project specific but would really address the subject in terms of the reason why we are seeing this problem. I'd benefit from that the most rather than look under Chapter 5 Section 603; well that's great but I'm wanting to get a better understanding of symptomatic problems that we're seeing here and how that relates to me as a professional trying to get my plans reviewed and approved.

JB: I think I understand where you are going with this and I think where we are taking this meeting on the 26th will get us there. I'm not thinking of something as an introduction to the code as the outcome of this. I'm thinking of something very specific that points to sections of the code where professionals have a hard time understanding what they are supposed to do in depth. Once we do that we can line up several training & resources or refer that to Kate or PENC and they can decide who they want to work with. Some of those resources will be local or from here or Raleigh or some of them may be national. We've done this with AIA and brought in some very good trainers on very target things. The class that Bob Davidson and Sal DeChristina put on that had 2 days on it; one was means of egress and the other was on fire protection. It was an excellent class. That class came from a focus group with Architects who sat down and talked to us about what they needed help on and identified these things inside Chapter 10 and Chapter 7 which is how we constructed that class. I was thinking of that same kind of approach, don't really care who teaches it but I think it can be very targeted and very effective.

HS: If we have to train our staff anyway why can't we address it so that it accomplishes two things simultaneously or is it not that level of depth that we need to go into?

JB: My sense is it's not as much a problem for our staff as it is for the design professionals; am I missing this?

PG: No, you both have valid points. What we are finding out is an example last week we were dealing with mechanical and electrical on a building issue. What that issue was an R2 hotel and it now requires emergency fans to run for their exhaust in their bathrooms; that's new to us. Definitely the engineer missed it, the mechanical, electrical and building guy missed the hour rating so we had to go back and revisit that. Willis and Joe worked with us to plow through it. This would be an example where you have to provide a fan where the building doesn't require a generator for that fan to run 15 minutes but it's got to have 1.5 hr. backup. This would be a difficult situation if you weren't aware of it; how do you get around that; did you know about it? So you'd walk through the battery backup, how you'd wire it, how mechanical is effected how the room is protected where the gear sits in the room make sure you have your clearances make sure you meet the specs can it be outside can it not be outside? That is one of the issues I think Harry is talking about. That is a detailed problem that is new that we are discovering in the design work they didn't count on and is big dollars.

HS: It would also train our staff in knowing exactly how we are to interpret.

PG: We would bridge both. The guys in the field would identify the switch gear and understand why it's there and why it looks out of place, why do I need this.

HS: If there is something new that both sides can have a better understanding on. I see in the long term if we can get that to the design professionals you'll be less likely to see it come in again. It might take awhile to solely come into plan, but if you teach me how to do something it's a lot better than have me out there fishing on my own.

PG: Jim's point is that there is a lot of work.

HS: I see the benefit of it and if we can get some A/Es who are willing to participate in this we can make it happen.

JB: Let's get in the meeting with Kate on March 26th and go over the topics. One thing I wasn't able to find out is if there is someone besides Kate we should have in the meeting that's ahead of the technical training committee with AIA-Charlotte. If you talk to her ask her if there is someone besides her that needs to be in the meeting. Any time you work with them the pricing structure is going to be different than if you work with us.

HS: This is where I see some cross pollination, if you guys are willing to participate in so many hours in that you should get so many free seats available in the course.

JB: We've always been able to work out a deal with them in the past. When we determine the topics we can figure out the best way to do it. The CAs are backside over elbows trying to manage everything they have to do now like coordinating training for all the people that work here. It's certainly within their capacity to do meetings such as Ed talked about or topical overviews that aren't that detailed. This takes someone that is going to take a topic and develop a really good presentation that connects and that takes some time. Raleigh and Meck did this together and one of the reasons we gave it up it just took so much time. We couldn't afford to do it anymore. It did exactly what Harry said; it offered really high quality classes for A/Es at a below market price but still through the professional associations so everyone received the certification they need but we just couldn't do it anymore.

Residential Elevator Permitting

Jim talked to Travis electronically earlier today on Residential Elevators; he and Joe communicated; that's all sorted out and is the last thing on the January meeting follow-up that we needed to comment on.

Updates on Other Department Work

CSS Report Follow-up Work

Auto-Notification

The CEMs are still looking for opportunities to present demos on how the new auto notification tool works. If you have a trade association meeting opportunity let Rebecca know and she will get it set up between Gary, Jeff or both and they would be happy to do a presentation of the new tool for contractors to understand how that works for them.

CSS Focus Group A Work

- Review umbrella; continue looking for ways to promote the graphic process description chart (stop signs)
 - a) Discussed in February 6 Chamber-NAIOP meeting. See item 8.
- PM/CEM resource awareness; mgmt/staff team need to develop a webpage concept proposal to Chamber.
 - a) Discussed in February 6 Chamber-NAIOP meeting. See item 8.
- Reach the right person; Directors to meet January 17 to a plan session with BDC public rep (current and former) meeting focusing on how the telephone tree works for novice customers.
 - a) Meeting topics; ACD current 4 pronged operation, what would be ideal, what needs to change, etc.
- Clear explanation of changes – part 2; management to meet on February 1 to continue working 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.

Other

CTAC-EPS Announcement

On January 28th we sent an email blast notice out to customers that CTAC-EPS is open to all users. Rebecca sent a notify me blast that went to over 5k people. Bill Carroll pushed out a news release on 2/6. We sent a memo to both AIA and PENC requesting them to make their members aware. This takes us to a 98% paperless process. The last 2% is on homeowner projects that require an agency plan review; we are working on it, it's a very small part of our work but we'll come up with something in the next year that nails that one too; we are essentially a paperless process now.

BIM-IPD Symposium

The department participated in a BIM-IPD Symposium on February 5 all day BIM-IPD at UNCC Center City Building, sponsored by AIA Charlotte and UNCC-SoA. Jim led a workshop with 27 attendees on how our Code Enforcement process supports BIM-IPD projects highlighting our pilots we are doing with Carolina Health Care. 1 pilot is at Morrocroft and one up at Davidson Behavioral Health. I also overviewed in brief the NC Administrative Code change that we pushed through specifically for BIM-IPD projects back in 2002, 2010 and 2011 and talked about how the 2010 reorganization including things coming down the road on the commercial side that made us think about moving the field side to a team base and were convinced we would have been dead in the water on the DNC projects had we not done that and we also talked about team plan review. It was a good hour long presentation.

Manager/CA Added Comments

Lon McSwain shared that the Building Code Council meets the 12th in Raleigh.

10. FUTURE BDC AGENDAS

March BDC meeting tentative topics

- Entire meeting devoted to Fy14 budget
- other

April BDC meeting tentative topics

- Quarterly Reports Consistency teams, Code Defect, Commercial Plan Review, TAB
- BDC Quarterly Bulletin exercise
- Other

11. ADJOURNMENT

The February 19th, 2012 Building Development Commission meeting adjourned at 4:38 p.m.

The next BDC meeting is scheduled for 3:00 p.m., Tuesday, March 19th, 2013.