

BUILDING DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Minutes of September 17, 2013 Meeting

Jonathan Bahr opened the Building-Development Commission (BDC) meeting at 3:11 p.m. on Tuesday, September 17, 2013.

Present: Harry Sherrill, Rob Belisle, Travis Haston, Hal Hester, Zeke Acosta, Kevin Silva, Bernice Cutler, Jonathan Bahr and Jon Wood

Absent: John Taylor, Elliot Mann and Ed Horne

1. MINUTES APPROVED

The motion by Harry Sherrill, seconded by Travis Haston, to approve the August 20, 2013 meeting minutes passed unanimously.

2. BDC MEMBER ISSUES AND COMMENTS

Travis Haston asked, in residential permitting apps online do we have to fax in the plot plans for zoning? Some people don't have faxes. Can we upload the plot plan and email it instead?

Patrick Granson said we would look into creating a common email box to alleviate the problem with faxes.

3. PUBLIC ISSUES AND COMMENTS

No public issues and/or comments.

4. CA INTERPRETATION SEARCH ENGINE DEMO

Joe Weathers presented the CA interpretations archive search page, saying since the last meeting the Department brought in vendors and met with IT Support Services. We now have the archive page set up "behind the scenes". In February we created the current code interpretations page then created the trade search button before the department migrated to SharePoint 2010. Joe demonstrated a search using the word "floor" showing how you can search by code year. We now feel the capability of the archive search is an improvement over our current search that we are now remodeling our "current" search to work like the archive search. Both processes will search all trades. We still have a lot more to do behind the scenes before making this a live feature including the upload of all documents.

Zeke Acosta asked the difference between an interpretation and a Q & A. Joe shared that an interpretation is a grey area within the code that will affect many jobs and he plans to put these instructions on the web.

5. CSS REPORT WRAP UP STRATEGY

Patrick Granson described the customer satisfaction survey and took the BDC through the seven (7) steps we are currently working on: 1) design of auto-notification to include customer awareness of how it works, 2) customer's expectations for timely inspections comparing the Department goal and the IRT report, 3) items reviewed under the plan review and permitting umbrella include the update of the graphic process description, develop a success story case study web page, provide success story articles to the Chamber for their monthly newsletter, and report Group B conclusions to the BDC that will be rolled into the FY14 Outcomes and Challenges. 4) reach the right person includes a study for replacement of the ACD supporting technology, 5) clear explanation of changes using Notify Me, it works well but should be used as a power tool, 6) elevate customer awareness of the value of PM/CEM resources, and 7) helping customers self manage their projects w/out relieving them of the overall responsibility. **Harry Sherrill** shared that the department may want to include this cost in budget for the latter portion of FY14. There were no further questions.

6. FY13 YEAR-END NUMBERS REPORT

Amy Hollingsworth discussed the FY13 yearend numbers below:

FY 13 Year End Numbers

FY 13 Revenue:	Permit Revenue	\$18, 157,548.99
	Other Revenue	\$ 3,060,531.01
	Technology	\$ <u>427,504.91</u>
	Total Revenue	\$ 21,645,584.91

FY 13 Expenses:	Expenses	\$ 17,088,809.00
	Encumbrances	\$ <u>181,201.00</u>
	Total Expenses	\$ 17,270,010.00

FY 13 Special Fund	Code Enforcement+/-	\$ 4,000,000.00**
--------------------	---------------------	-------------------

** adjustments: previous years carry forwards \$216,795 and FY 14 carry forwards \$ 246,000, figure rounded for reporting

Total in Special Fund	Code Enforcement	\$ 8,500,000.00***
-----------------------	------------------	--------------------

*** adjustments: figure rounded based on differences between systems

Code Enforcement Data Sheet 2002-2013

Gene Morton discussed the Code Enforcement Data Sheet at a glance describing how we have changed over the years through the recession and how we are bouncing back. Harry Sherrill said he would like to be able to see our cost and how we break it out for the north and south sectors. Gene went on to say that our cash layout has increased from 2008 to 2014 but costs are growing as well. Harry Sherrill shared that as we get more into the electronic aspect that we have to get more IT people in house to make this happen. Gene went on to say it correlates to our increase in current workload. We expected the pass rate to begin to suffer a bit as we bring others back into the workforce. During the recession a lot of the people doing less quality work left the industry. The pass rate improved for that reason. As we get busier the pass rates begin to suffer. Harry Sherrill asked what other factors are of impact. Patrick Granson said some other factors are code changes, RIF, cycle reviews was at 12 now at 78 and when the fee increased the number of review counts went down; in relationship to cost.

7. DEPARTMENT STATISTICS AND INITIATIVES REPORT

Statistics Report

Permit Revenue

- August permit (only) revenue- \$1,960,638, compares to July revenue of \$1,735,610
- FY14 budget projected monthly permit revenue; $\$17,008,928/12 = \$1,417,411$
- So August permit revenue is \$543,219 above monthly projection
- At 8/31/13, YTD permit rev of \$3,696,248 is above permit fee rev projection by \$861.4k, or 30.4%

Construction Value of Permits Issued

- August total - \$359,568,055, compares to July, 13 total - \$245,113,102, & August, 12 total -\$267.87M
- YTD at 8/31/13 of \$604,681,157; 27.7% above constr value permit'd YTD at 8/31/12, of \$473.4M

Permits Issued:

	July	August	3 Month Trend
Residential	5110	4150	5024/4877/5110/4150
Commercial	2534	2744	3267/2558/2534/2744
Other (Fire/Zone)	540	477	569/419/540/477
Total	8184	7371	8860/7852/8184/7371

- Residential down 18.8%; commercial up 8.3%; total down 10%

Inspection Activity: Inspections Performed

Insp. Req.	July	August	Insp. Perf.	July	August	% Change
Bldg.	6489	6681	Bldg.	6435	6611	+2.7%
Elec.	7375	7351	Elec.	7320	7380	+0.8%
Mech.	4007	3963	Mech.	3971	3985	+0.4%
Plbg.	3113	3179	Plbg.	3099	3123	+0.8%
Total	20,984	21,174	Total	20,825	21,099	+1.3%

- Insp performed totals up 1.3%
- All BEMP inspections up, from <1% (EMP) to <3% (B)
- Insp performed were 99.64% 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	
	July	Aug	July	Aug	July	Aug	July	Aug
Bldg.	94.59	96.7	96.0	97.7	98.8	99.3	1.12	1.07
Elec.	84.2	83.2	88.3	89.2	96.2	95.7	1.33	1.33
Mech.	78.9	83.1	84.7	89.4	92.7	95.7	1.49	1.34
Plbg.	87.9	94.3	90.8	95.8	97.0	99.2	1.26	1.11
Total	86.8	89.0	90.3	92.9	96.4	97.4	1.29	1.22

- Bldg, Mech & Plbg up 2-6%; Elec down 1%
- Overall average within the 85-90% goal range.

IRT Comparison to POSSE Insp Efficiency Report (IER)

1 st - 24 hr average	IRT Aug rate	IER Aug rate	% difference	insp resp in days	IRT Aug av'g	IER Aug av'g	difference in days
Bldg.	96.7	87.9%	-8.8%	Bldg.1.07	1.20	-.13
Elec.	83.2	43.8%	-39.4%	Elec.1.33	1.78	-.45

Mech.	83.1	39.4%	-43.7%	Mech.1.34	1.74	-.40
Plbg	94.3	79.1%	-15.2%	Plbg.1.11	1.29	-.18
MT.	na	88.3%	na	MT.	Na	na	Na
Total	89.0%	70.4%	-18.6%	Total	1.22	1.5	-.28

- So there appears to be variance between IRT & IER as follows;
 - IER is 18.6% lower on percent complete in 1st 24 hours.
 - IER av'g days per inspection is .28 days (2hours, 15 minutes) longer.
- Computronix completed dashboard installations on Sept 13 and it is currently in UAT. When UAT is complete, the new IRT report will be available. See item 7.2.2.1 for related BDC-IRT subcomm work.

Inspection Pass Rates for August, 2013

OVERALL MONTHLY AV'G @ 81.99%, compared to 81.77%, in July

<u>Bldg:</u>	July – 73.32%	<u>Elec:</u>	July – 82.14%
	August – 74.3%		August – 82.56%
<u>Mech:</u>	July – 86.62%	<u>Plbg:</u>	July – 90.71%
	August – 85.37%		August – 89.7%

- Bldg and Elec up <1%, Mech down 1.25%; Plbg down 1%
- Overall average up .22%, and still above 75-80% goal range

On Schedule and CTAC Numbers for August, 2013

CTAC:

- 162 first reviews, compared to 117 in July.
 - Projects approval rate (pass/fail) – 68%
 - CTAC was 46% of OnSch (*) first review volume (162/162+185 = 347) = 46.68%
- *CTAC as a % of OnSch is based on the total of only scheduled and Express projects

On Schedule:

- 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

- August, 13: 210 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early—89.4% all trades, 93.5 B/E/M/P only

Booking Lead Times

- On Schedule Projects: **for reporting chart posted on line**, on September 3, 2013, showed
 - 1-2 hr projects; at 2 work days booking lead, except B-5, MP-8, Hlth-6 & City Zon'g-10 days
 - 3-4 hr projects; at 2-4 work days lead, except B-8, MP-8, CMUD-14, Hlth-10 and City Zon'g at 14 work days
 - 5-8 hr projects; at 3work days lead, but B-8, E-7, MP-9, CMUD-14, Hlth-11, and City Zon'g at 12 work days
- CTAC plan review turnaround time; BEMP at 3 work days, and all others at 1 day.
- Express Review – booking lead time was; 7 work days for small projects, 11 work days for large

Status Report on Various Department Initiatives

August BDC Meeting Follow-up Topics

BDC Member Comment Issues

Patrick addressed **Zeke Acosta's** issue from the last BDC meeting. **Wendell Dixon** shared that we've sent notification out to our customer with how to unassign the subcontractor. He went on to say we've added more instructions to that documentation where the contractor can remove name from permit online or by placing a call to staff. Zeke said it was still incorrect. Wendell shared that we are currently awaiting technology approval.

Patrick thanked **Harry Sherrill** for the process review saying it was very helpful.

Owner-Developer Webpage

Patrick discussed the Owner-Developer web page that it went live August 26th. We currently are adding a new option for starting a new business and are obtaining a lot of information from the small business advisory board.

CA Interpretation web search engine project

This topic was covered earlier in the meeting by **Joe Weathers**.

CSS Report Wrap-up

This topic was covered earlier in the meeting by **Patrick Granson**.

MT Inspection Bundling Meetings

The BDC approved a temporary disconnect of this process. We are currently working on how best to manage the handoff of the old requests already in queue. This information was email blasted to all customers on September 17th.

Updates on Other Department Work

BDC-IRT Subcommittee

Gene Morton discussed the department work on IRT sharing that we are waiting on Computronix for completion of new report. When they complete this report we will be ready to begin the task force that will recreate historical data from July 2011 and comparing it to the old IRT. Gene also noted that consideration will be given to "normal" work flow environment. Once the changes are complete by Computronix the subcommittee will discuss if this meets our needs, is current staffing levels sufficient and does the current inspection goal still feel right. The subcommittee members are Rob, Kevin, John, Ed and Harry.

Chamber/NAIOP February 6 Meeting Follow-up

The Department continues to work on two (2) articles for the Chamber newsletter as well as the web links to the process stop sign graphic with a new section for project manager and code enforcement managers showing the value they give to customers in their project work. This work will be rolled out in the CSS Report Wrap-Up Strategy.

BDC Paperless Meeting Strategy

Rebecca working with Sandra Broome-Edwards has created a drop box for the monthly BDC electronic file. In our upcoming quarterly meeting TAB, Consistency and Commercial Plan Review reports will have a summary slide ready to roll out in the October BDC meeting.

Other

NC Building Code Council Meeting Outcome

Lon McSwain shared that the NC Building Code Council (BCC) met in Raleigh on September 10 adding 14 new code change petitions. The following votes or discussions occurred, relevant to the BDC and Department's work.

- The BCC granted fourteen new code change petitions (Part B of the meeting).
- The BCC held a public hearing on four code change petitions (Part C of the meeting).
- The BCC considered final action on 15 code change petitions (Part D of the meeting), approving 8, with others addressed as follows;
 - Postponed 4 petitions to the December 10 meeting
 - Disapproved 2 petitions
 - One petition was withdrawn
- Other issues discussed;
 - The BCC received lengthy public comment on the idea of changing the family of NC commercial code to a 6 year code change cycle. At the end of the meeting, BCC members considered a formal motion to make this change, debating the issue at length. In the end, the BCC agreed to include this topic in the December 10 public hearing, to receive more stakeholder input on the proposal.

Manager/CA Added Comments

Wendell Dixon shared that we have processed updates to the Meck-SI web site and uploaded eight (8) corrected documents.

Joe Weathers shared that we are getting calls regarding the 2014 NEC as we await the BCC; stay tuned.

Lon McSwain invited members to come to the September BCC meeting in support of opinion.

Future BDC Topics

Gene Morton shared some BDC future topics such as Hal Marshall space analysis to include construction schedule and estimated cost; Hybrid Collaborative Delivery Team, report on BIM virtual inspections pilot and how the next CSS report findings will impact the future budget.

Patrick Granson thanked Harry Sherrill for his hard work and dedication to the BDC during his tenure as the BDC's AIA representative. Chad Askew will replace Harry Sherrill as the new AIA representative.

8. ADJOURNMENT

The BDC Meeting adjourned at 4:20.

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