

BUILDING DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Minutes of August 20, 2013 Meeting

Elliot Mann opened the Building-Development Commission (BDC) meeting at 3:10 p.m. on Tuesday, August 20, 2013.

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

Absent: Jonathan Bahr and Jon Wood

1. MINUTES APPROVED

The motion by Rob Belisle, seconded by Zeke Acosta, to approve the July 16, 2013 meeting minutes passed unanimously.

2. BDC MEMBER ISSUES AND COMMENTS

Zeke Acosta shared that when given the instruction to call the core process, choose option 3. This option has nothing to do with canceling the permit. It only gives you instructions to go online, fill out the form and mail it back. If we have to go through those steps to get off the permit your email needs to change to match the process. The email that goes out should be corrected and state how to do it.

Harry Sherrill stated that web site forms / links have crossed / broken. Harry will email Patrick with a list of items needing correction.

Elliot Mann asked for confirmation that Inspection by Appointment was running further behind and discussed how to fix it when we get behind with one trade in a premium inspection.

3. PUBLIC ISSUES AND COMMENTS

No public issues and/or comments.

4. DEVELOPER DASH MOCKUP PRESENTATION

Patrick Granson shared that this project first began in 2012 by the BDC when we discussed how to enhance web site production for commercial developers. We identified information sets most important to a developer or commercial property owner, and designed a web page (a dashboard) providing only that information in a clear and understandable manner. With representatives from NAIOP and the Chamber, the Department identified important design features.

Geri Walton shared the proposal for the Owners and Developers dashboard as well as provided a web site demonstration.

5. CA INTERPRETATION SEARCH ENGINE DEMO

Jim Bartl provided a brief background on this project stating this initiative came out of a management team meeting last fall, requesting a web search of current BEMP interpretations. The CA's worked on it and presented to the BDC on February 19, 2013 showing the current interpretation search tool. BDC members requested the ability to search current and archives (historical reference comparison). Extending search to archives has been a real challenge, running into several hurdles. The key features we have tried to incorporate search engine subdividing buttons to allow you to search current code interpretations individually in Building, Electrical, Mechanical-Fuel Gas and Plumbing Codes.

Joe Weathers gave a brief demo and shared some specifics on the technical roadblocks that we have encountered. First of all during this project, the County migrated to SharePoint 2010, and we discovered that we couldn't create any new per trade searches, the same way we did before in SharePoint 2007. The process for inserting the search code is different now, and so far we haven't found a sure fix. This has been assigned to the County IST folks and they are working on a fix, but to date we don't have a timetable from them. One of the challenges is the detail level of the search, for example, say we want to search either current interpretations or archives; customer gets to pick. Right now, it's mixing them together, which can confuse customers between the current requirements, vs. something they just wanted to see for historical reference.

After some discussion the BDC said it was worth finding out how much it would cost to get an outside vendor to create this archive search.

6. MULTI-TRADE INSPECTION BUNDLING

Gene Morton gave some background saying this topic was brought to you in the July meeting, requesting BDC representative volunteers to work with us. The issue goes back to the Cost Recovery Work Group meetings, and is one which staff suggested as a possible way to curb costs. It was included as item 13 in the final report to the BDC, and subsequently was written into the LUESA Fee Ordinance, amending item 48.2, in the change approved by the BOCC on June 5, 2012. The problem has been that while the Code Enforcement Managers (CEM's) feel this is an idea worth merit, it has proven to be extremely difficult to implement. It works well for HVAC change outs but is far less effective on other trades, or on the residential projects at large. Part of this is the complexity (which we didn't anticipate, not having flow charted all the loose ends) and part of it is the lack of coordinating leadership on many small projects.

The department would like to temporarily suspend it, taking a closer look, flowcharting and identifying other potential issues we haven't discovered. The complexity is too much for the small amount of work. We will report back to you should we decide to permanently suspend or modify/re-introduce with the understanding that any Building Development Ordinance or Fee Ordinance. We will work with Marvin to once we determine which way we are taking the program.

We met with BDC reps today, August 20 reviewing the problem at length. The general agreement was this:

- *Although the bundling idea seems to have merit, the problems indicated that more work was needed before it could be successful.*
- *The program should be temporarily suspended, while the Department executes the following work;*
 - *Flow chart the current (original) idea to identify all the moving parts*
 - *Redesign the MT Inspection Bundling process to address all the flow chart issues.*
 - *Decide if the revisions fix the problem and merit putting in place, or if*
 - c.1) it is still too complex a process for customers and*
 - c.2) still too much administrative time involved compared to the 1% of inspection volume benefiting*

There were no objections from BDC Members at large to go ahead with this strategy.

Gene Morton shared that for homeowner access issues the homeowner has the option of checking 1 of 2 boxes. H-1 is the first box when homeowner will need to take off work to provide access for the inspection. H-2 box indicates the homeowner will not have to take off work but will need to be there to coordinate access.

7. CSS REPORT WRAP UP STRATEGY

Tabled for next month's BDC Meeting to be held on September 17th, 2013.

8. NC EXISTING BUILDING CODE PROPOSAL BEFORE BCC

Jim Bartl shared that the NC Building Code Council has a proposal before it that will replace the 2009 NC Rehab Code with the 2015 NC Existing Building Code. The proposal is modeled after the 2012 Int'l Existing Building Code, with many changes to make it roughly equivalent in performance to the 2009 NC Rehab Code. AIA-NC recently completed a comparison study. Based on 3 case study comparisons assembled by Meck on real NC Rehab Code projects, they found the codes are roughly similar, with the exception of the Energy code requirements, Seismic bracing of parapets, Drops Rehab Code 25% area increase exception for additions, Drops some Rehab Code accessibility disproportionately exclusions. There is some uncertainty if IEBC Chapter 14 is an exact match for NCBC Chapter 34. In terms of usability, the NCEBC is more favorable to the code official and ICC savvy professional. Rehab Code is more favorable to the novice professional or infrequent code user. Likely AIA-NC recommendation will be a 3 year overlap period where

you can use either code, returning at the end to evaluate differences and incorporate in the NCEBC. Idea is that you often don't know how a code will work out until it's used. Good recent examples of that is the BCC's work on wind bracing. The Rehab Code has a proven track record with over \$483,961,000 construction valuation permitted in Mecklenburg County alone, from July 2002 thru June 2013. This has been discussed with Bernice and Harry at length a couple of times in the last month. You have options. You can do nothing, you can endorse the IEBC proposal, or you can endorse AIA-NC position in concept. A formal statement in support of AIA where both codes are in play and useable w/ intent of the 3 yr outcome to be the NCBC will be the ICC base w/ NC adjustments as needed. Run both parallel with a 3 year transition period then merge the results.

Harry Sherrill made the motion to adopt a resolution that would endorse a parallel of these two (2) codes running side by side for three (3) years and at the end of the three (3) years, the committee would merge the two together. Bernice Cutler seconded the motion. Motion passed with no opposition.

9. DEPARTMENT STATISTICS AND INITIATIVES REPORT

Statistics Report

Permit Revenue

- July permit (only) revenue- \$1,735,610, compares to June revenue of \$1,575,334
- Fy14 budget projected monthly permit revenue; \$17,008,928/12 = \$1,417,411
- So July permit revenue is \$318,199 above monthly projection

Construction Value of Permits Issued

- July total - \$245,113,102, compared to June total of \$197,202,110
- Also compares to July, 2012 total of \$205,530,645

Permits Issued

	June	July	3 Month Trend
Residential	4877	5110	4852/5024/4877/5110
Commercial	2558	2534	2677/3267/2558/2534
Other (Fire/Zone)	417	540	673/569/419/540
Total	7852	8184	8202/8860/7852/8184

- Residential up 4.8%; commercial down 1%; total up 4.2%

Inspection Activity: Inspections Performed

Insp. Req.	June	July	Insp. Perf.	June	July	% Change
Bldg.	5624	6489	Bldg.	5532	6435	+16.3%
Elec.	6662	7375	Elec.	6533	7320	+12%
Mech.	3787	4007	Mech.	3726	3971	+6.5%
Plbg.	2803	3113	Plbg.	2757	3099	+12.4%
Total	18,876	20,984	Total	18,548	20,825	+12.3%

- Insp performed totals up 12.3%

- All BEMP inspections up, from 6% (M) to 16% (B)
- Insp performed were 99.24% of inspections requested

Inspection Activity: Inspections Response Time (IRT Report)

Insp. Resp. Time	OnTime %		Total % After 24 Hrs. Late		Total % After 48 Hrs. Late		AverageResp. in Days	
	June	July	June	July	June	July	June	July
Bldg.	95.9	94.59	97.1	96.0	99.4	98.8	1.08	1.12
Elec.	91.6	84.2	93.8	88.3	98.8	96.2	1.17	1.33
Mech.	93.9	78.9	94.9	84.7	98.7	92.7	1.14	1.49
Plbg.	94.1	87.9	94.6	90.8	98.7	97.0	1.13	1.26
Total	93.7	86.8	95.1	90.3	98.9	96.4	1.13	1.29

- Bldgdown a bit; Elec down 7%; Mech down 15%; Plbg down 6%
- Overall average within the 85-90% goal range.

IRT Comparison to POSSE Insp Efficiency Report (IER)

1 st - 24 hr average	IRT July rate	IER July rate	% difference	insp resp in days	IRT July av'g	IER July av'g	difference in days
Bldg.	94.59	87.5%	-7.1%	Bldg.	...1.12	1.26	-0.14
Elec.	84.2	54.7%	-29.5%	Elec.	...1.33	1.68	-0.35
Mech.	78.9	45.5%	-33.4%	Mech.	...1.49	1.86	-0.37
Plbg	87.9	66.6%	-21.3%	Plbg.	...1.26	1.54	-0.28
MT.	na	88.4%	na	MT.	Na	na	Na
Total	86.8%	72.3%	-14.5%	Total	1.29	1.585	-0.295

- So there appears to be variance between IRT & IER as follows;
 - IER is 14.5% lower on percent complete in 1st 24 hours.
 - IER av'g days per inspection is .295 days (2hours, 20 minutes) longer.
- Computronix recently confirmed that they will complete dashboard installations by Sept 13, with the new IRT report being available thereafter; see item 9.2.1.4 for related BDC-IRT subcommittee.

Inspection Pass Rates for July, 2013:

OVERALL MONTHLY AV'G @ 81.77%, compared to 82.79%, in June

<u>Bldg:</u>	June – 75.49%	<u>Elec:</u>	June – 82.64%
	July – 73.32%		July – 82.14%
<u>Mech:</u>	June – 85.48%	<u>Plbg:</u>	June – 90.07%
	July – 86.62%		July – 90.71%

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

OnSchedule and CTAC numbers for July, 2013

CTAC:

- 117 first reviews, compared to 123 in June.
- Projects approval rate (pass/fail) – 68%
- CTAC was 42% of OnSch (*) first review volume ($117/117+162 = 279$) = 41.9%
*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
- July, 13: 197 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–90.375% all trades, 92% B/E/M/P only

Booking Lead Times

- On Schedule Projects: **for reporting chart posted on line**, on July 29, 2013, showed
 - 1-2 hr projects; at 2-3 work days booking lead, except MP at 8 & City Zon'g at 14 work days
 - 3-4 hr projects; at 2-4 work days lead, except Bldg-15, M/P-9 days & City Zon'g at 14 days
 - 5-8 hr projects; at 3-5 work days lead, but Bldg-16, M/P-9, CMUD-20 & City Zon'g-20 days
- CTAC plan review turnaround time; BEMP at 5 work days, and all others at 1 day.
- Express Review – booking lead time was; 12 work days for small projects, 22 work days for large

Status Report on Various Department Initiatives

July BDC Meeting Follow-up Topics

BDC Quarterly Bulletin

Draft completed and sent to BDC Chair for comment on July 31. The Department posted and e-mailed the final version of the Bulletin on August 6.

BDC-IRT Subcommittee

Broken Permit Application Links

Zeke requested sending an e-mail to all customers providing a link to CE-Tech Triage, for use if they run into broken permitting process links. Geri Walton completed this task on July 19.

Updates on Other Department Work

- **CA Web Interpretation Search Engine**
- **Owner-Developer Dash**
- **Chamber/NAIOP February 6 Meeting Follow-Up**
- **CSS Report Follow-Up**

The “Group B” meeting was held at the Charlotte Chamber on August 6, 2013 with seven (7) industry reps in attendance. Primarily related to design/construction; The Department is seeking additional perspective from BofA and others, and will report back to the BDC when we think that’s either complete or a dead end.

Manager/CA added comments

No Manager/CA added comments.

10. Adjournment

The August 20th, 2013 Building Development Commission meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

The next BDC meeting is scheduled for 3:00 p.m., Tuesday, September 17th, 2013.