

# BUILDING DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

## Minutes of May 21, 2013 Meeting

*BDC representative Jonathan Wood made a motion for Harry Sherrill to Chair the BDC meeting in the absence of Chairman, Jonathan Bahr; Vice Chairman, Elliot Mann and Secretary, Ed Horne. This motion was seconded by Travis Haston and passed unanimously.*

Harry Sherrill opened the Building-Development Commission (BDC) meeting at 3:05 p.m. on Tuesday, May 21, 2013.

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

**Absent:** Elliot Mann, Ed Horne, Jonathan Bahr and Zeke Acosta

### 1. MINUTES APPROVED

*The motion by Jonathan Wood, seconded by Travis Haston, to approve the April 16, 2013 meeting minutes passed unanimously.*

### 2. BDC MEMBER ISSUES AND COMMENTS

No BDC member issues and/or comments.

### 3. PUBLIC ISSUES AND COMMENTS

No public issues and/or comments.

### 4. REVISIONS TO BUSINESS RECYCLING LAW

**Laurette Hall** addressed revisions to the Business Recycling Law that was presented to the BDC back in 2001. As part of the adoption process it is noted that construction & demolition (C&D) waste is exempt from this ordinance. A copy of the ordinance is available at: <http://charmec.org/mecklenburg/county/SolidWaste/BusinessRecycling/Pages/Recycling%20Ordinance.aspx> Future extensions include immediate cardboard recycling and long term to include a full recycling stream on C&D waste. Laurette solicited interested industry members to participate in future SW Task Force meeting discussions on removing the exemptions and beginning to phase in recycling on C&D sites. Interested parties include: Rob Belisle, Jon Taylor, Travis Haston, Bernice Cutler and Kevin Silva. Taskforce meeting to be held May 29<sup>th</sup>, 2013 at 11:30 a.m. in the Ed Woods Auditorium with the Stakeholder meeting on June 13<sup>th</sup> 2013; more details will follow.

### 5. CHANGES TO APPENDIX B

**Patrick Granson** presented changes to the Appendix B in which he, Harry and Bernice have worked since February of this year. The background started with the January Commercial Plan Review Quarterly Report when Harry asked plan review staff to identify the larger categories of why Appendix B failures occur in this report. Melanie Sellers reviewed the Appendix B with staff and identified 23 most common errors by AE's. On March 26 we met with Bernice and Harry to review Melanie's staff notes on most common mistakes/issues related to Appendix B, boil down those issues into possible training topics and to identify resources (preferably private sector) for development and training. The most common Appendix B plan review defects identified are; a) Fire Prot Tables/UL Assemblies, b) Mixed Use or Occupancies, c) Non-Separated to Separated Uses, d) Occupancy Load and Exit Widths, e) Construction Type and f) Special Inspections. Moving forward we plan to advise all plan review staff of changes and the principles behind why we're doing this. The Project Managers will generate a draft memo explaining the changes to customers. We will test the new/added Appendix B links to meckpermit.com to assure they work. There will be a transition period for customer use of the new form, with a feedback component that we will tweak accordingly. Finally, will hold brown bag lunches with AE's to explain final doc and involve PS&I in pushing notification out to customers. As a final note our long term goal is to fully automate Appendix B as part of the EPM project description query.

**6. UPDATE ON BIM-IPD AE SEAL NEGOTIATIONS W/ NC ARCHITECTURAL AND PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER BOARDS**

Jim Bartl shared that the CHS and Department jointly developed a pilot program proposal on how Architect and Engineer seals will work inside projects using both Building Information Modeling (BIM) and Integrated Project Delivery (IPD); a team based equivalent delivery mechanism. On March 12<sup>th</sup> and April 4<sup>th</sup>, CHS and Department representatives met with representatives of the NC Board of Examiners for Engineers and Surveyors and the NC Board of Architecture to review same. The board representatives reacted positively to the proposal, expressing a desire to work on challenges posed by specific board rules, finding solutions that allow projects to maximize collaboration inside the BIM-IPD service delivery model. The pilot proposal was approved by the Architecture Board on 4.12.13 and by the PE Board on 5.8.13. The pilot will move forward, awaiting the CHS selection of a BIM-collaborative delivery project.

**7. DEPARTMENT STATISTICS AND INITIATIVES REPORT**

- April permit (only) revenue- \$1,642,508, compares to March revenue of \$1,550,206
- Fy13 budget projected monthly permit revenue; \$14,892,963(\*)/12 = \$1,241,080
- So April permit revenue is \$401,428 above monthly projection
- At 4/30/13, Fy13 YTD permit rev of \$14,606,248 is above the YTD permit fee revenue projection (\$12,410,800) by \$2.195M or 17.69%.

**Construction Value of Permits Issued:**

- April total - \$249,713,478, compared to March total of \$247,035,491
- YTD at April 30, 2013 of \$2,524,721,427; above constr value permit'd YTD at 4/30/12 of \$2,272,964,379 by \$251.757M or 11.08%.

**Permits Issued:**

	<b>March</b>	<b>April</b>	<b>3 Month Trend</b>
<b>Residential</b>	3521	4852	3225/2877/3521/4852
<b>Commercial</b>	2746	2677	2086/2542/2746/2677
<b>Other (Fire/Zone)</b>	500	673	422/504/500/673
<b>Total</b>	6767	8202	5733/5923/6767/8202

- Residential up 37.8%; commercial down 2.5%; total up 21.2%
- Note regarding SF detached permits;
  - In April we issued 339 permits, up from 283 in March, and compares to 131 in April 2012.
  - At 4/30/2013, Fy13 SF detached permits YTD totaled 2656, compared to 1807 at same time in Fy12 (up 47%), which seems to support the budget discussions in item March and item 8.2.1.

### Inspection Activity: Inspections Performed

Insp. Req.	March	April	Insp. Perf.	March	April	% Change
<b>Bldg.</b>	4991	6089	<b>Bldg.</b>	4874	6056	+24.25%
<b>Elec.</b>	5530	6627	<b>Elec.</b>	5466	6651	+21.7%
<b>Mech.</b>	3033	3620	<b>Mech.</b>	2995	3640	+21.54%
<b>Plbg.</b>	2688	3280	<b>Plbg.</b>	2667	3231	+21.15%
<b>Total</b>	16,042	19,616	<b>Total</b>	16,002	19,578	+22.34%

- Insp performed totals up 22.34%
- All inspections up, ranging from M-E-P at 21%+ to Bldg at 24%+
- Insp performed were 99.8%

### 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	
	March	April	March	April	March	April	March	April
Bldg.	85.8	75.9	91.0	83.8	96.1	90.2	1.29	1.57
Elec.	90.8	89.6	92.4	91.5	98.5	97.1	1.19	1.22
Mech.	95.5	94.9	95.9	95.6	99.4	98.2	1.10	1.12
Plbg.	94.8	90.0	95.5	91.8	99.2	97.4	1.11	1.22
<b>Total</b>	<b>90.9</b>	<b>86.6</b>	<b>93.2</b>	<b>90.0</b>	<b>98.1</b>	<b>95.3</b>	<b>1.19</b>	<b>1.31</b>

- Overall number down 1%+; Mech up 2%+; B-E-P down 1% to 4%
- All trades except building within or above 85-90% goal range; overall average within goal range.

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

1 <sup>st</sup> - 24 hr average	IRT Apr rate	IER Apr rate	% difference	insp resp in days	IRT Apr av'g	IER Apr av'g	difference in days
<b>Bldg.</b>	75.9%	54.1%	-21.8%	<b>Bldg.</b>	1.57	1.98	-.41
<b>Elec.</b>	89.6%	61.9%	-27.7%	<b>Elec.</b>	1.22	1.53	-.31
<b>Mech.</b>	94.9%	69.4%	-25.5%	<b>Mech.</b>	1.12	1.34	-.22
<b>Plbg.</b>	90.0%	67.1%	-22.9%	<b>Plbg.</b>	1.22	1.49	-.27
<b>MT.</b>	na	87.7%	na	<b>MT.</b>	Na	na	Na
<b>Total</b>	<b>86.6%</b>	<b>67.8%</b>	<b>-18.8%</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>1.31</b>	<b>1.58</b>	<b>-.27</b>

- So there appears to be variance between IRT & IER as follows;
  - IER is 18.8% lower on percent complete in 1<sup>st</sup> 24 hours.

- IER av'g days per inspection is .27 days (2 hour, 10 minutes) longer.
- Note; as discussed in previous meetings, delays in Meck IT system work have pushed Computronix programming completion date on the new IRT report back to July 2013.

### Inspection Pass Rates for April, 2013:

OVERALL MONTHLY AV'G @ 83.3%, compared to 84.04%, in March

<b>Bldg:</b>	March – 77.08%	<b>Elec:</b>	March – 83.66%
	April – 77.03%		April – 81.98%

<b>Mech:</b>	March – 86.48%	<b>Plbg:</b>	March – 91.31%
	April – 86.52%		April – 90.51%

- Bldg and Mech about the same; Elect down 1.5%+; Plbg down 1%-
- Overall average down <1%, and still well above 75-80% goal range

### OnSchedule and CTAC numbers for April, 2013

#### CTAC:

- 91 first reviews, compared to 95 in March.
- Projects approval rate (pass/fail) – 60%
- CTAC was 40% of OnSch (\*) first review volume  $(91/91+134 = 225) = 40.44\%$   
\*CTAC as a % of OnSch is based on the total of only scheduled and Express projects

#### On Schedule:

- 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
- February, 13: 142 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–81.125% all trades, 94.25% B/E/M/P only
- March, 13: 137 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–87.5% all trades, 91.5% B/E/M/P only
- April, 13: 149 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–94.375% all trades, 94.5% B/E/M/P only

#### Booking Lead Times

- On Schedule Projects: **for reporting chart posted on line**, on April 29, 2013, showed
  - 1-2 hr projects; at 2-3 work days booking lead, except City Zoning at 15 days
  - 3-4 hr projects; at 2-4 work days lead, except Env Hlth at 8 days and City Zoning at 15 days
  - 5-8 hr projects; at 3 work days lead, except Bldg -8 days, CMUD-16, Env Hlth -8 days & City Zon'g-15 days.
- CTAC plan review turnaround time; BEMP at 3 work days, and all others at 1 day.
- Express Review – booking lead time was; 8 work days for small projects, 8 work days for large

## Status Report on Various Department Initiatives

### April Meeting Follow-up

#### BDC Quarterly Bulletin

- Draft completed and sent to BDC Chair for comment on April 23. Department posted and e-mailed the final version of the Bulletin on May 20.

#### Data Warehouse Issue

- Zeke Acosta asked if there is any way to web access a list of all mechanical permits on a daily basis.
- G Walton verified this information is available via the web, however users are required to register online in order to access the report. User's should also note that because Mecklenburg County issues permits 24/7 – the data is compiled at the end of each business day

## Updates on Other Department Work

### FY14 Budget Customer Information Strategy

- BOCC will vote on the overall budget on June 18.
- On June 19 we will issue a customer memo by e-mail blast covering the following;
  - The message;
    - Budget for 165 FTE's increases 9.5% to \$19,456,538 (including 564k from 12/4/12 betterment)
    - Department & BDC propose a 10 position betterment focusing on residential work
    - With betterment total proposed budget for 175 FTE's is \$20,301,212.
  - Justification;
    - Data trends noted 7/1 thru 2/28/2013 indicate commercial continues a slow steady climb out of 2008-2010 valley of recession
    - Permits up 8.34%, Inspections requested up 15.44%, Permit fee revenue up 11.7%, Construction value permitted up 8.1%, Residential Review up 35%, Small commercial project reviews (in CTAC) up 19.5%, Large commercial projects with more project applications plan review hour demand up 35%.
    - HBA industry projections of single family (SF) residential new construction starts growing 22% in 2013 and 30% in 2014.
    - NARI projections that residential remodeling will grow by 10% through 1/1/2015.
    - Residential review was decimated in 2009-2010 staff cuts.
    - Every SF house generates (on average) minimum 17-18 inspections.
- Begin public info effort. Topics as outlined above.
  - Will also pursue opportunities to present at design/construction trade association meetings, as we did at the April 9<sup>th</sup> CHPCCA meeting.

### CA Web Interpretation Search Engine

- We continue building this and we **will be ready to make a major presentation** on it to the BDC in July.
- As a reminder the following are key features of the upcoming **CA web interpretation search engine**, requested in feedback discussions with both industry users as well as staff.
  - Search engine subdividing buttons to; a) search current code interpretations, b) search archives.
  - Search individually on Building, Electrical, Mechanical-Fuel Gas and Plumbing Codes
  - Creates Interpretation Archive links and database for existing building research.
  - Creates consistency meeting Q&A archive link and database.
  - On Meckpermit.com, adds Code Interpretation link and dashboard page to site.

### **BVD Calculator Work**

- Pat G continued discussing the BVD application with John Taylor, agreeing to the following strategy;
  - *Keep the calculator, but **add a screaming bold statement** about its limits, how it can be misused and how (no matter what the answer) customers should check it against a manual calculation based on these steps (links to the example page).*
- John requested that the Dept work on an encompassing calculation tool to deal with fees for the overall process. This is not a small challenge;
  - Especially on complex projects the array of agencies and their charges can vary significantly.
  - The delivery method used by the owner's team (individual permit components or phasing, premium services such as team review or IBA, etc) can vary charges significantly.
  - In the past we have strongly encouraged including this in preliminary review discussions, but it appears that doesn't always happen, or work effectively on the problem.
- The Dept will continue to study this issue for possible solutions, whether thru automation or other.

### **Developer Dash**

- The industry volunteer list includes; Chris Urquhart w/Intercon, Matt Lucarelli w/Beacon, Cliff Coble w/Bissell, Allen Holloway w/ Childress Klein, Tim Garrison & Tara Bryant with Balfour Beatty.
- Initial meeting was held on April 23, with industry focus members identify 12 design points to consider in designing the dash.
- Management will hold a meeting on May 30 to review the mockup responding to the design criteria
- If that meeting confirms we think we've covered the 12 points, thereafter we will schedule a return meeting with the industry focus group members to a) see if they agree, and b) convert that into dash software programming performance requirements.
- We will also present the mockup to the BDC for comment before we move it into production.

### **Commercial Plan Review Most Common Defects**

- Addressed under the topic title "Changes to Appendix B".

### **Auto-Notification**

- The Department continues publicizing the auto-notification change details to the construction community, including the following approaches.
  - Soliciting opportunities to present to REBIC/HBA/NARI members, trade associations, et al
  - Devoting Consistency meeting time to it, where contractor presence merits same.
  - **It merits noting that much of our customer base has signed up for this service and are using this feature**
- Regarding Department development of a youtube style video on both auto notification and our temporary utility program. To that end, we're now working with software, started to field film different items, targeting the following to start with:
  - Document upload
  - Auto notification
  - Temporary utilitiesWhen something is ready for demo on this at a future date, we'll bring it back to the BDC.
- We now consider this topic complete, subject to our continuing on presentation follow up".

### **Chamber/NAIOP Meeting Follow-up**

- Still have two things we're working on;
  - a) Former Chair Jon M & Natalie E solicited articles for the Chamber weekly newsletter.
  - b) Web links to process graphic and new section emphasizing PM-CEM value through case study success stories. Can build on recent favorable Meck Times article about MSC-Direct, et al.

## CSS Follow-up

### CSS Focus Group A work

- Review umbrella; continue looking for ways to promote the graphic process description chart (stop signs); maybe part of webpage proposal discussed in item 7.2.7.
- Reach the right person; Department is proceeding with strategy using County staff (outside of Code Enforcement) to evaluate the ACD- telephone tree from 3 perspectives;
  - ACD current 4 pronged operation, what would be ideal, what needs to change, etc.
  - **Now tabulating evaluation results** for review the Directors.
- Clear explanation of changes – part 2; management team continues to work on developing a 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. The team will reconvene on April 12 to discuss;
  - **Still working on** surveys of other authorities (LasV, Phoenix, Houston, Fairfax County, West palm Beach, Nashville-Davidson, et al) on how they answer the future project question which Joe asked “How do I \_\_\_\_\_”, regarding services available, project problems, etc.
  - Any options on “Rebranding NotifyMe”, fixing the button that doesn’t look like a button, adding to contractor account sign in page, etc.
- PM/CEM resource awareness; mgmt/staff team need to develop a webpage concept to propose to the Chamber. Maybe add to upcoming meeting with Chamber/NAIOP. (see item 7.2.7above)

### CSS Focus Group B Work

- In the February 6 Chamber/NAIOP, we agreed Natalie E would take the lead in getting a list of focus group participants to work on this topic.
  - Bridging the customer technology gap; how to deal with the growing gap between customers who are well schooled in our process, and those who are either new to it, or use it infrequently enough that understanding the “ins and outs” is not intuitive.
- Natalie requested KB peg a meeting date down the road.
  - Since we’re currently embroiled in getting past the FPSD & Fy14 budget process, and trying to push the owner-developer dash “criteria definition” project to a completion, and we’ll need time to get prepared on how to manage the meeting effectively, JNB suggested early July as a possible time frame.

## Other

### SB648

Passed House and now in coinsideration in the Senate. As described by DOI, the change is;

- *When a North Carolina Licensed Plumbing, Heating, Fuel Piping and/or Electrical contractor performs the installation or replacement of any natural gas, propane gas or electrical appliance on an existing structure, a county shall not require more than one permit for the complete installation or replacement. The cost of this one permit shall not exceed the cost of any one individual trade permit issued by that jurisdiction."*
- The impact on the Department is significant. This prevents us from charging for a 2<sup>nd</sup> trade permit on a changeout project that requires multiple discipline inspections.
- 2012 numbers on that are follows
  - In calendar year 2012 revenue was **\$418,708** for appliance replacement (change-outs) on residential and commercial jobs when electrical was a sub-trade to mechanical or plumbing.
  - Residential equipment change-outs included 11,089 electrical permits as a sub-trade. 9,606 of these were pulled through TIP which allows the electrical permit to be charged ½ price (\$31.425), and 1,483 were submitted to staff to issue at full price (\$62.85). Therefore residential equipment change-outs that included sub-trade electrical permits totaled **\$395,076** in revenue during calendar year 2012. We also had 376 commercial equipment change-outs that included an electrical permit as a sub-trade (times \$62.85) totaled **\$23,632**. Note this report includes

replacement (change-outs) of appliances only (complete installation of appliances on an existing structure were not counted).

- In summary, the proposed change will push small changeout permit revenue down, and consequently, in a fully fee funded jurisdiction such as ours, will put pressure on us to raise permit fees on the larger permits, including the SF detached new construction.
  - We spent quite a bit of time from 2010-2013 trying to “level the valleys” (as Jon Morris described it) of small projects that can’t pay their way, and this certainly runs counter to that.

#### **RFBA on Fire Protection Service District (FPSD)**

This is before the BOCC tonight. Just want to make the BDC aware of this part of our work. No action is required, since this falls under the Fire Commission.

- As part of our public info effort, on January 17, 2012, Mark Auten updated the BDC on our work to create 5 FPSD in the Meck County ETJ’s of Cornelius, Davidson, Huntersville, Mint Hill & Charlotte
  - *ETJ definition; stands for Extra-Territorial Jurisdiction, the geography in the unincorporated area of Mecklenburg County that by agreement each municipality can annex.*
- This was a new approach to funding ETJ fire service, correcting a long standing inequity.
  - Before FPSD’s, all Meck residents paid for ETJ fire service thru County payments to 15 VFD’s.
  - This work created 5 FPSD’s, with those ETJ residents paying for fire service thru a new FPSD tax.
  - In Fy13, this allowed the BOCC to re-allocate \$2.5M of the General Fund to other programs.
- Since all the FPSD’s were new, there was no historical data base on FPSD tax values available.
  - The County made new estimates of property values and related tax revenue for each FPSD.
  - We hoped the estimates would either be plus or within 10-15%, and solvable by minor rate change.
- FPSD tax collection results at May 1 are; Cornelius, Davidson and Huntersville have surpluses.
  - Mint Hill-FPSD and the Charlotte ETJ FPSD have deficits.
- An RFBA before the Board tonight proposes a two strategy fix.
- The County’s Fy14 budget proposal will include tax rate proposals for each FPSD in Fy14, raising the Charlotte ETJ rate slightly and keeping the others at their current rates“

#### **Department 17th Annual State of Department (SOD) Address**

- Will be held tomorrow, Wednesday, May 22 at 7am, in the Woods Auditorium at HMC.
- All BDC members are invited to attend.

#### **Manager/CA Added Comments**

No manager or CA comments.

#### **8. Adjournment**

The May 21st, 2013 Building Development Commission meeting adjourned at 4:59 p.m.

The next BDC meeting is scheduled for 3:00 p.m., Tuesday, June 18<sup>th</sup>, 2013.