BUILDING DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
Minutes of July 16, 2013 Meeting

Jonathan Bahr opened the Building-Development Commission (BDC) meeting at 3:07 p.m. on Tuesday, July 16, 2013.

Present: Jonathan Bahr, John Taylor, Harry Sherrill, Jon Wood, Rob Belisle, Travis Haston, Hal Hester Elliot Mann, Ed Horne, Zeke Acosta and Kevin Silva

Absent: Bernice Cutler

1. MINUTES APPROVED
The motion by Harry Sherrill, seconded by Jon Wood, to approve the June 18, 2013 meeting minutes passed unanimously.

2. BDC MEMBER ISSUES AND COMMENTS
No BDC Member issues or comments.

3. PUBLIC ISSUES AND COMMENTS
No public issues and/or comments.

4. CA INTERPRETATION SEARCH ENGINE DEMO POSTPONED
Joe Weathers updated the BDC Members on the CA Search Engine. Joe went on to say that early in the spring we migrated from SharePoint 2007 – SharePoint 2010. Just prior to the migration we upgraded our consistency pages to include individual searches per trade. We have been working on the same type of search for archive searches only but have had many technical difficulties. The 2010 version of SharePoint that we upgraded to is not compatible with the search engines that we were trying to work with. At this point we are unable to present the new archived sites with the search engine on it. We have our webmasters at the division and county levels working on this problem. We plan to have an update next month for you. If we can't get the SharePoint 2010 to work we are going outside for an off the shelf type software to get this going.

Jim Bartl went on to say this is taking longer than we thought and we did not expect these technology setbacks that were truly outside the scope of the department to solve, we have to lean on IST. It has been a challenge to get this done.

5. DIRECTORS RECOMMENDATION ON BDC-IRT STUDY SUBCOMMITTEE
Jim Bartl and Gene Morton recommended to the BDC the creation of a subcommittee to study the IRT report. The back ground, was first discussed in November of last year. The point made; the department for the last few years has had two (2) different reports on inspection response time being done in the first 24 hours. One is the IRT report that was designed by the Revere Group back in 2004 and it measures 24 hour percentage complete. Then there is a POSSE report that came along in 2009 developed by Computronix as a management tool for multi-trade inspection work and it also measures inspection response time for inspections complete in the first 24 hours. Historically there has always been some difference between the two reports (about 5% difference); low enough so that we didn't worry about it in the large field of numbers that we work with. Last summer as the economy started come back, we noticed some IRT numbers that we were getting out of the Revere report where we questioned the validity of the report. We then launched into a detailed study that we did from September to November and came up with three (3) that we brought to you in the November meeting. 1) there was a variance between the two reports 2) neither of the reports accurately reflected field conditions for different reasons 3) both reports differed from the performance criteria that we had agreed with you and that we conveyed on to customers. We studied six data sets that covered 30 months. In those six data sets there was a 13% average variance between the two reports. We presented these findings to you in November and committed to post the IRT and add a clarification for the 13% variance so that people using the numbers knew it. Then we were to create a special monthly report that shows the difference between the two reports so you can gauge where we are. We have contracted with Computronix to create a new report that is based on the criteria that we've always talked about with you. The 24 hour performance goal starts at 7:00 a.m. and ends at 6:59 a.m. the next day. That's how we

measure 24 hours complete. Originally they were to deliver that report early in the spring but have been delayed because of the POSSE upgrades. BTW the POSSE upgrades finally went into place on Monday morning. We are now fairly confident we will have this report for you in the August meeting. Back in the May meeting a lively discussion was held on the new data that was coming out of the new POSSE IRT Report. 1st, could it go back and could it recreate history and say what actually happened in the period going back 30 months. Sandra checked with Computronix and they can't recreate it. We will have a large field of information that we can bring you. 2nd, how will that react to the 85%-90% goal we have; does this still feel right and what does it say about staffing levels. It occurred to us when we get into discussions that whether the recreation of historical data is useable and how to mark sets in that data for what's normal business for us vs. things that are abnormal that impact us such as the DNC, training, and vacation blackout that we had then lifted. Patrick and Gene and I shouldn't be sitting in a room doing by ourselves or staff. Perhaps what makes sense is we put a sub-committee together and you members work with on this. We'll do all the number crunching but we think that analyzing the data and agreeing on what it means about where we are on staffing and what the 85-90% goal should be, etc. Just as we would do a budget subcommittee collective effort would bring to the BDC at large what it all means. This is significant enough issue to merit the same type effort if much smaller than typical budget development effort. We would like 4-5 BDC members to volunteer to be on this sub-committee.

EM: It is good that we will be able to go backwards to get a baseline so we can measure over time vs. having something to do and nothing to relate to. That will be positive. We can hit the rewind button over that and see where we are in staffing levels in comparison to where the data is coming from. It probably would be a good idea to have a small group. Doesn't need to be as large as the budget subcommittee to at least use as a sounding board and look at it as we compare the data going backwards and forwards. Maybe a few people that isn't on the budget subcommittee that can volunteer.

JB: Rob, Kevin, Travis, Ed, and Harry. We'll be in touch with you folks as soon as we get information sets that we think make a good use of your time.

EM: How long do you think that will be?

JB: They are going to produce a report and the 4 of us will be SBE, GM, PG and JNB look at the report to make sure it is picking up what we want for a monthly report then we'll ask them to go back and run for specific periods. Sandra do you think we'll be there in the next 30 days or do you think it will be 45 days out? Sometime in the next 4-6 weeks we'll be able to tee the ball up.

6. MULTI-TRADE INSPECTION BUNDLING

Gene Morton reviewed where Multi-Trade Inspections have a single inspector and they are responsible for doing multiple types of inspections. We were finding that often out on a particular remodel on Monday and may have to come back on Tuesday to do another rough or another type of inspection. The idea was it would make sense to bundle those together and hold the first request until the last of the requests came in to push those through. It would be ideal if we could do that on all inspections but that is a difficult thing to do so we decided to try first on final inspections which would have been the simplest of types to bundle together but even with those we have run into a lot of difficulties, a lot of confusion as much as we try to explain the bundling process where one may get high failure contractor, he gets held back, someone puts a request in, they don't always get the message that someone on the team is a high failure contractor having to wait a mandatory 2 days. There is a lot of confusion surrounding this and it generates a lot of calls to team managers and supervisors to try and explain. Seems there is more effort to make that work than it is suppose to save us in inspection trips to the same location. This topic came from the Cost Recovery Group was one way we might save some money and again it was brought by us and not one of the committee members. We think it is a good idea worth merit but has proven to be a little too difficult the way we are trying to do it right now. This was something that also included a Fee Ordinance change that you approved last year and that fee ordinance had to do with a contractor wanting to buy out on the bundling process. Say he wanted to go ahead and get his inspection out of the way; you could pay the fee and have his done ahead of the other two or three types of inspections. While we think this has merit it has proven to be extremely

difficult to implement. What we would like to is to set up another meeting asking for a few volunteers. We had some conversation with Travis who was willing to join us so we think we might need to expand that to include Zeke, Hal, and some of the others that might have interest in this because it does involve multiple trades. We'd like to review the original change that we were going to try and implement; look at the same problem now, which is 2-3 years later after the original idea and ask ourselves if we changed the original idea what would we change to and we want to agree on whatever that change might be. Well set up a meeting in the next few weeks; Travis has agreed to join us and we'll open it up to any others.

TH: Is this a one meeting deal?

GM: We hope so.

EM: Are you thinking this is only going to be for small projects initially?

GM: If we can't make it work on a small project, it won't expand unless we can come up with a process that makes it a lot simpler than we can think of now. We'll change to make it work better or make a decision to delay or postpone or end it.

EM: I remember discussions long ago on multi-trades trying to reduce trips.

JB: Yes, and we've tried to go at that from a different direction. We've learned some things about when you program it; what happens and trying to create rules, it just seemed to Gene and I that we just step back, the CRWG now (3 yrs. ago) we were talking about this. What we have learned and what does that tell us compared to what could originally happen, what's realistic and how do we want to go forward. If we have to go inside the fee ordinance to change things accordingly; I don't have any problem. I think it is a mix of what really will work. If now we think this will work, what are the long term implications or the long term goal and as Gene said; if you can't make it work on small stuff; how can you make it work on the big ones. Ultimately if we decide to do something then we may have to go in to tweak the Fee Ordinance which I will do.

TH: Asked for a volunteer to take his spot on the IRT subcommittee so I can work on this, can't do both.

JB: On the IRT we had volunteers of Rob, Kevin, Ed and Harry; that's probably enough to carry the ball.

JT: I can participate on the IRT.

JB: We'll take Travis off and add John Taylor; which solves Travis' problem. We appreciate you all helping us on these problems.

7. QUARTERLY REPORTS

1. Technical Advisory Board Quarterly Report

Willis Horton reported that 5 TAB meetings were held this past quarter; 2 Residential and 3 New and Existing Commercial

TAB Subcommittee - New and Existing Construction Energy Saving Incentives

The TAB Subcommittee met three times in the quarter. Rob Phocus, the Energy and Sustainability Manager for the City of Charlotte presented the City's Internal Environmental Operation Plan for City owned buildings. Building commissioning were discussed reassuring buildings meet design requirements. Incentive programs were also discussed. Erin DeBerardinis, County Energy Manager, outlined work on tracking the energy use in County, to create a benchmark of energy use as the County installs upgrades. Department updated progress on meeting with selected utilities to gauge interest in rate incentives for building owners who selected parts of the IgCC (focus mostly on chapter 6 & 7). The subcommittee itself discussed incentive ideas on how to drop energy use 20% over a ten year period.

TAB Subcommittee - Residential Energy Saving Incentives

The subcommittee met two times in the quarter. Discussed incentives for different levels of energy efficiency; home owner education was identified as a key issue, as well as some way to track improvements to existing house, assuring a future buyer was aware of the improvements which could enhance the resale. The second meeting included contractor presentation of a matrix that would provide the homeowners with energy savings, some applying to remodeling, some to tract

builders, and some to custom builders. Also discussed stamp identifying energy saving items performed, and contractor "green builder" award programs.

2. Consistency Team Report

Willis Horton reported that in <u>Building</u> there were 6 consistency meetings this quarter 3 residential and 3 commercial, with counts of topics discussed as follows. Residential having 11 Q&A's, and 15 issues with an average of 16 contractors at each meeting. Commercial having 11 Q&A's, one product presentation, and 1 issue. 2 public members at the June meeting. <u>Electrical</u> held 3 meetings with 28 questions addressed. The contractor meeting had 4 contractor attendees. <u>Mechanical/Fuel Gas</u> having 10 mechanical Q&A and 1 fuel gas Q&A in 2 meetings. Also had a 2 hr. presentation in May Meeting on Ground Source Heat Pumps (ASHRAE). The contractor meeting had 5 contractor attendees. <u>Plumbing</u> having 8 Q&A topics addressed in 2 meetings. Also had a 2 hr. presentation in April Meeting on Residential Sprinkler installation. The contractor meeting had 4 contractor attendees.

3. Code Compliance Report

Joe Weathers reported that in the "Not ready" category; Building was at 5.68% (was 4.73%), <u>Electrical</u> was at 7.29% (was 6.47%), <u>Mechanical</u> was at – 4.47% (was 4.9%), Plumbing was at 9.18% (was 9.41%). Note that <u>Building</u> & Electrical are up <1%. In the "Rough/finish" category; <u>Building</u> rough @ 35.27% (down from 35.91%), finish @ 19.39% (down from 20.55%) <u>Electrical</u> rough @ 23.02% (up from 20.35%), finish @ 55.08% (down from 59.16%) <u>Mechanical</u> rough @ 31.52% (down from 36.77%), finish @ 57.27 (down from 60%) <u>Plumbing</u> rough @ 27.36% (down from 30.88%), finish @ 33.10% (up from 32.17%) Most common topics repeating %; bldg-80%, elec-87%, mech-80%, plbg – 73%

4. Commercial Plan Review Report

Chuck Walker reported that 65% of projects pass on 1st review; 81% have passed after 2nd review (with 1st reviews down slightly from last quarter when the pass rate was 70% and the 2nd review pass rate was 79%). The pass rates on 1st review by trade are as follows: Building–82% (same); Electrical – 80% (was 86%); Mechanical – 81% (was 86%); Plumbing – 80% (was 81%). The most common defect examples are; Building's: Appendix B, egress related (3), occupancy, UL assembly, exit signs, hardware, Electrical services/ feeders, branch circuits, general, grounding & bonding, emergency systems, AC-ref'g, Mechanical's fresh air req't, exhaust, equipment location, duct systems, gas equipment install, energy compliance; Plumbing's plumbing system install, drainage piping, venting system install, minimum facilities, water distr piping. The 1st use of "approved as noted" (AAN) at 35% by all trades on average (up from 32% last quarter). The biggest users were CFD (89%), MCFM (76%) and County Zoning (65%). The critical path users were Building (25%, up from 22%), Electrical (14%, up from 12%), Mechanical (13%, up from 11%), and Plumbing (21%, up from 14%).

8. QUARTERLY BDC BULLETIN EXERCISE
Previous bulletin topics:

July, 2011	October, 2011	January, 2012	April, 2012
Update on Senate Bill 22	Carbon Monoxide alarm requirements	2012 NC State Building Code transition	NC Res'd Code transition
2012 NC Bldg Code transition dates from BCC	Cost Recovery Work Group status	CRWG final report	2012 NC Building Code commercial project transition rules
TU/LCU/CC/TCO/CO			

changes in process & fees NACO awards AE Pass Rate status FY11 Key data points	2012 NC Building Code transition Changes in temporary utility process	EPS-EPR startup	Code Enforcement Fy13 budget proposal
July, 2012 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.	**October, 2012** Democratic National Convention success RDS Master Plan change Cost Recovery Work Group changes approved by BOCC CSS Customer survey focus group follow up work	**January, 2013** ISO commercial score of '1' BOCC approves 21 position betterment Racking permit process discussions Revisions to inspections auto notification	**April, 2013** Change of BDC leadership Lien agent legislative change Status of 12/4/2012 betterment Trends considered in Fy14 budget development CTAC-EPS installation takes dept to 98% paperless
July, 2013 FY14 Code Enforcement Budget Proposal Economic Data Trends & Betterment Proposal POSSE Upgrade Announcement FY14 Budget Technology Enhancements			

9. DEPARTMENT STATISTICS AND INITIATIVES REPORT
Statistics Report
Permit Revenue

- June permit (only) revenue- $1,575,334, compares to May revenue of $1,975,965
- FY13 budget projected monthly permit revenue; $14,892,963(*)/12 = $1,241,080
- So June permit revenue is $334,254 above monthly projection
- At 6/30/13, Fy13 EOY permit revenue of $18,157,549 is above the YTD permit fee revenue projection ($14,892,963) by $3,264,586 or 21.9%.

Construction Value of Permits Issued

- June total - $193,766,088, compared to May total of $436,389,431
- FY13 EOY total $3,154,876,946; above construction value permitted FY12 EOY of $2,787,944,288 by $366,932,658 or 13.16%.

Permits Issued

	May	June	3 Month Trend
Residential	5024	4877	3521/4852/5024/4877
Commercial	3267	2558	2746/2677/3267/2558
Other (Fire/Zone)	569	417	500/673/569/419

Total	8860	7852	6767/8202/8860/7852

- Residential down 3%; commercial down 21.7%; total down 11.4%
- Note regarding SF detached permits;
  - At FY13 EOY, detached permits totaled 3300 vs. 2315 at FY12 EOY, up 42.5%).

Inspection Activity: inspections performed

Insp. Req.	May	June	Insp. Perf.	May	June	% Change
Bldg.	6417	5624	**Bldg.**	6345	5532	-12.8%
Elec.	7261	6662	**Elec.**	7189	6533	-9.13%
Mech.	4050	3787	**Mech.**	4008	3726	-7%
Plbg.	3214	2803	**Plbg.**	3208	2757	-14%
Total	20,942	18,876	**Total**	20,750	18,548	+10.6%

- Inspections performed totals down 9.87%
- All BEMP inspections down, from 5% (M) to 14% (P)
- Inspections performed were 98.26% of inspections requested
- *Note: Rebecca corrected and redistributed to BDC members the Inspections Performed chart on 7.19*

Inspection Activity: Inspections Response Time (IRT Report)

Insp. Resp. Time	OnTime %		Total % After 24 Hrs. Late		Total % After 48 Hrs. Late		AverageResp. in Days	
	May	**June**	**May**	**June**	**May**	**June**	**May**	**June**
Bldg.	95.8	95.9	96.9	97.1	99.3	99.4	1.08	1.08
Elec.	93.8	91.6	95.3	93.8	98.0	98.8	1.14	1.17
Mech.	96.7	93.9	97.2	94.9	99.2	98.7	1.07	1.14
Plbg.	93.6	94.1	94.8	9468	97.3	98.7	1.16	1.13
Total	95.0	93.7	96.1	95.1	98.5	98.9	1.11	1.13

- Bldg & Plbg up a bit; Elec & Mech down 2-3%.
- All trades are within or above 85-90% goal range; overall average above goal range.

IRT comparison to POSSE Insp. Efficiency Report (IER)

1st- 24 hr average	IRT June rate	IER June rate	% difference	insp resp in days	IRT June av'g	IER June av'g	difference in days
Bldg.	95.9%	85.8%	-10.1%	**Bldg.**	1.08	1.24	-.16
Elec.	91.6%	69.0%	-22.6%	**Elec.**	1.17	1.41	-.24
Mech.	93.9%	72.2%	-21.7%	**Mech.**	1.14	1.34	-.20
Plbg	94.1%	82.7%	-11.4%	**Plbg.**	1.13	1.28	-.15
MT.	na	88.6%	na	**MT.**	Na	na	Na

Total	93.7%	80.2%	-13.5%	**Total**	1.13	1.318	-.1875

- So there appears to be variance between IRT & IER as follows;
  - IER is 13.5% lower on percent complete in 1st 24 hours.
  - IER av'g days per inspection is .1875 days (1 hour, 30 minutes) longer.
- Note; as discussed in previous meetings, delays in MeckIT system work have pushed Computronix programming completion date on the new IRT report back to August 2013.

Inspection Pass Rates for June, 2013:

OVERALL MONTHLY AV'G @ 82.79%, compared to 83.05%, in May

Bldg:	May – 74.68%	**Elec**:	May – 82.46%
	June – 75.49%		June – 82.64%

Mech:	May – 87.87%	**Plbg:**	May – 90.72%
	June – 85.48%		June – 90.07%

- Bldg and Elec up <1%; Plbg down <1%; Mech down 2.4%
- Overall average down <1/2%, and still well above 75-80% goal range

On Schedule and CTAC Numbers for June, 2013

CTAC:

- 123 first reviews, compared to 112 in May.
- Projects approval rate (pass/fail) – 63%
- CTAC was 42% of OnSch (*) first review volume (123/123+172 = 295) = 41.7%
  - *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
- May, 13: 216 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–96.375% all trades, 96.25% B/E/M/P only
- June, 13: 191 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–96.88% all trades, 97.5% B/E/M/P only

Note: Rebecca corrected and redistributed to BDC members the OnSchedule1st Review Numbers chart on 7.19

Booking Lead Times
- o On Schedule Projects: **for reporting chart posted on line**, on July 1, 2013, showed
  - o 1-2 hr projects; at 2-4 work days booking lead, except Elec-5, MP-14 and CMUD at 7 days
  - o 3-4 hr projects; at 2-5 work days lead, except M/P at 14 days and CMUD at 12 days
  - o 5-8 hr projects; at 3-5 work days lead, except Elec-18, M/P-22, CMUD-13, Healt-8 and City Zoning at 17 work days..
- o CTAC plan review turnaround time; BEMP at 2work days, and all others at 1 day.
- o Express Review – booking lead time was; 15 work days for small projects, 20 work days for large

Status Report on Various Department Initiatives
June BDC Meeting Follow-up Topics
SB468 Follow-up Question
- In the last meeting, B Cutler posed a question regarding SB468 wording that could be interpreted to mean that if only one license is held by the applicant, the department would be required to issue one permit covering work that may require multiple licenses.
- After discussing with M Bethune and the state licensing board's attorney, we concluded that it was not the intent of the bill to allow work by persons not properly licensed, and was likely an error in the wording. The decision was made to continue checking for and requiring all appropriate licenses.
- We don't think that anyone holding any state license will challenge that decision. If challenged, the board attorney asked that we inform the applicant of the licensing board's intent to take action on anyone performing work without proper licenses. We were also asked to alert the state licensing boards of any such challenges.

Updates on Other Department Work
FY14 Budget Customer Information Strategy
- On June 18, the Department sent out an e-mail blast to all customers announcing the BOCC vote in favor of our Fy14 budget proposal, including;
  - o Department & BDC proposed a 10 position betterment, focusing on residential work.
  - o Creating a total Department staff level of 175 FTE's and a total budget of $20,301,212.
- At the BOCC's request, the Department also sent an announcement to all customers in Notify Me regarding the 2.5% increase on demolition permit fees.

CA Web Interpretation Search Engine
- Postponed to August meeting

Owner - Developer Dash
- Staff and management are scheduled to meet with industry reps on July 25 at 2pm (tentative date) to receive comment on work so far. We sent them a mockup version to view in advance.
- Meeting will request that customer reps indicate a preference on pursuing one of two directions;
  - a) A web page with links
  - b) An actual dashboard, using CompX programming (takes longer to bring online)
- Whatever we agree to with industry reps, we plan to present same to the BDC for comment in their August meeting, before the project moves into production.

Chamber/NAIOP February 6 Meeting Follow-up
- The management team continues to work on two topics from this meeting;
  - o Jon Morris & Natalie E solicited articles for the Chamber weekly newsletter
  - o We blinks to process "stop sign" graphic and a new section emphasizing PM-CEM value thru 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
- <u>Reach the right person</u>; includes evaluating the ACD- telephone tree from 3 perspectives;
  - ACD current 4 pronged operation__, what would be ideal__, what needs to change__, etc.
  - **Completed tabulating evaluation results** from 4 participants and Directors currently reviewing.
- <u>Clear explanation of changes – part 2</u>; this regards the strategy to emphasize the power of "Notify Me" 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.
  - **Completed the surveys of seven other authorities**, on how they answer the future project question which Joe asked "How do I_____....", regarding services available, project problems, etc
  - Reviewed by management team in July 15 meeting noting, other than social media, none of these go beyond our current strategy.
  - In August meeting (see below), we will offer some final thoughts on how we can strengthen this, as well as ask for specific help from BDC members on this topic.
- <u>August meeting topic wrap</u>; the Directors will present an overview of all the work we've done on this in the last year, suggesting we move the rest of the follow up work to our Fy14 outcome/challenge list.

CSS Focus Group B Work
- Follow up on February 6 Chamber/NAIOP, where we agreed Natalie E would take the lead in getting a list of focus group participants to work on this topic.
  - <u>Bridging the customer technology gap</u>; 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. (**JNB, Pat G & Gene to lead discussion**)
- Invitations have been sent out by Chamber and we are scheduled to meet with Chamber selected business reps on August 6, 9-10:30am. We will bring feedback from this meeting back to the BDC.

Manager/CA Added Comments
No Manager / CA added comments.

10. Adjournment
The July 16th, 2013 Building Development Commission meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

The next BDC meeting is scheduled for 3:00 p.m., Tuesday, August 20th, 2013.