

BUILDING DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Minutes of December 17, 2013 Meeting

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

Present: Rob Belisle, Bernice Cutler, Jonathan Bahr, John Taylor, Elliot Mann, Ed Horne, Melanie Coyne, Travis Haston, Hal Hester, Kevin Silva, Zeke Acosta, Chad Askew and Jonathan Wood

Absent:

1. MINUTES APPROVED

The motion by Ed Horne, seconded by Jon Wood, to approve the November 19, 2013 meeting minutes passed unanimously.

2. BDC MEMBER ISSUES AND COMMENTS

Ed Horne requested that his comment in the November BDC meeting minutes be revised to state that the entire process from beginning to end could cost upwards of \$1,000.00. The minutes have been revised.

3. PUBLIC ISSUES AND COMMENTS

No public issues and/or comments.

4. BDC 2011 Attendance Authentication

2013 Authentication was reviewed by all and passed to the Chairman for signature by Rebecca Simcox.

5. Code Enforcement 2014 CSS Survey

Ed Gagnon discussed the upcoming survey. Since 2002 the County has retained Customer Service Solutions (CSS) on a bi-annual basis to perform a customer service survey on the Department's work. The next survey occurs in 2014. The LUESA-Code Enforcement management team worked with Ed Gagnon of CSS to develop a draft of the questions that will be used, copies of which were e-mailed to BDC members last week. Ed will be available in the January meeting to address any questions that members may have.

6. Report on Virtual Inspection Pilot

Andy Scoggins discussed the Virtual Inspection pilot purpose which addresses a BIM-IPD industry question of whether 3D modeling tools could be used for virtual inspections, to check for code compliance issues and details before the full scale model is constructed. The end goal included identifying both the benefit of using BIM for virtual inspections, as well as the limits. Note this does not propose replacing field inspections with virtual inspections. Instead, the pilot tested using virtual inspections to check construction in the model for code compliance, so that ideally the final product is built correctly & will pass inspection the first time. The projects involved are CMC Morrocroft Pavilion and CMC Behavioral Health in Davidson. The benefits include; color coding of systems in the model makes the inspection easier to follow; finding errors in the model prior to construction saves construction dollars; encourages open communication between designer, reviewer, and inspector; model can display materials and equipment specified with a mouse click; working clearances can be verified in three dimensions; should reduce the incidence of value engineering changes in the field; Inspector has a better understanding of the finished product before it is built; gives the inspector the ability to see how the building should look at completion; could make field inspection work easier and faster. The limits of virtual inspections are; increased plan review time and inspector involvement in the review; supporting technology equipment (monitors, etc.) is required at the job site to view the model; using the BIM software is not intuitive; model standardization could be an issue; incomplete model data could result in incomplete virtual inspections; without color coding of systems, the virtual inspection is difficult. With a preliminary model inspection, first inspection approvals should increase. Ideally, plan review and inspections collaborate, or are the same person. The data in the model dictates the overall effectiveness of the virtual inspection. The inspection is only as good as the data provided. If specifications and equipment are missing,

the virtual inspection will not be complete. Not all models will be created equal, the level of detail will be job specific. Hopefully this will be proportional to the complexity of the project, and value of the virtual inspection. We need to look at the model as dynamic, therefore we will be performing a series of virtual inspections as the model is 'constructed', not just one or two overall inspections. We may need to consider this process a "model review" instead of a "virtual inspection".

7. Report on NC Building Code Council meeting

Rob Kinniburg reported on the NC Building Code Council (BCC) meeting in Raleigh, NC on December 10. The BCC granted seven new code change petitions (Part B of the meeting). The BCC held a public hearing on fifteen code change petitions, including the 6 year code change cycle policy proposal under consideration by the BCC (Part C of the meeting). The BCC considered final action on eight code change petitions (Part D of the meeting). Five petitions were approved and moved on to the Rule Review Commission. Two petitions were denied and one petition was sent back to committee. New Existing Building Code; in approving item D-3, the 2015 NC Existing Building Code (NCEBC), the BCC set an effective date of March 1, 2015. They also approved a 3 year transition period during which both the new NCEBC and the NC Rehab Code would be available for use by customers. The NC Rehab Code would then be taken out of service on March 1, 2018. Commercial six-year code change cycle proposal; the BCC heard extensive testimony under item C-7 of the public hearing, with 30 people testifying. The vast majority of people testifying spoke against the change, and represented a wide range of interests, including institutions, hospitals, manufacturing, insurance reps, professional associations, Architects, code officials and local government. At the end of the day, the BCC voted on two motions to proceed with a change to the six-year commercial code change cycle. In both cases, the motion was voted down. The BCC chair requested the topic again be placed on the BCC's March agenda.

8. Department statistics and initiatives report

8.1. Statistics report

8.1.1. Permit Revenue

- November permit (only) revenue- \$1,850,839, compares to October revenue of \$1,822,539.
- Fy14 budget projected monthly permit revenue; \$17,008,928/12 = \$1,417,411
- So November permit revenue is \$433,428 above monthly projection
 - For reference, this is also \$328.6k above the new monthly projection, bumped by the December 3 betterment, to be reported to you in the January BDC & midyear #'s.
- At 11/30/13, YTD permit rev of \$8,979,743 is above permit fee rev projection (5 x \$1.4174M = \$7,087,055) by \$1,892,688, or 26.7%

8.1.2. Construction Value of Permits Issued

- November total - \$337,039,703, compares to Oct total - \$388,135,293, & Oct, 12 total -\$253.38M
- YTD at 11/30/13 of \$1,643,200,201; 42.8% above Fy13 constr value permit'd at 11/30/12 of \$1.15B

8.1.3. Permits Issued:

	October	November	3 Month Trend
Residential	4108	3658	4150/3720/4108/3658
Commercial	2709	2401	2744/2293/2709/2401
Other (Fire/Zone)	538	480	477/424/538/480
Total	7355	6539	7371/6437/7355/6539

- Residential down 10.1%__ ; commercial down 11.4%__ ; total down 11.1%__
- Note; after 5 months, SF new construction permits total 1233; almost same as 1250 at 11/30/12

- Also note November, 2013 Res'd, Com'l and total permit counts all are slightly above Nov, 2012.
 - Nov 2012; Res'd permits @ 3419, Com'l permits @ 2355, total permits @ 6150

8.1.4. Inspection Activity: inspections performed

Insp. Req.	October	Nov	Insp. Perf.	October	Nov	% Change
Bldg.	6738	5409	Bldg.	6688	5359	-19.9%
Elec.	7297	6213	Elec.	7311	6299	-13.85%
Mech.	4088	3431	Mech.	3998	3421	-14.44%
Plbg.	3353	2587	Plbg.	3332	2512	-24.39%
Total	21,476	17,640	Total	21,329	17,591	-17.53%

- All inspection counts down; ranging from E @ 14%- to P at 24% plus; total down 17.53%
 - Note; November has 10% less work days than October
 - Also note; Nov 2013 inspections were 4% above Nov, 2012 (2013@17,591 vs 2012@ 16,920)
- Inspections performed were 99.7% of inspections requested

8.1.4.1 Inspection Activity: inspections response time (IRT Report)

Insp. Resp. Time	OnTime %		Total % After 24 Hrs. Late		Total % After 48 Hrs. Late		AverageResp. in Days	
	Oct	Nov	Oct	Nov	Oct	Nov	Oct	Nov
Bldg.	93.2	88.4	95.4	91.4	98.1	96.9	1.14	1.25
Elec.	91.8	87.1	93.8	90.0	98.2	97.4	1.17	1.26
Mech.	89.1	77.2	91.8	83.2	96.9	91.2	1.23	1.54
Plbg.	95.9	89.1	96.3	92.3	99.6	98.1	1.09	1.21
Total	92.4	86.0	94.3	89.2	98.1	95.9	1.16	1.32

- Overall average above the 85-90% goal range.

8.1.4.2 IRT comparison to POSSE Insp Efficiency Report (IER)

1 st - 24 hr average	IRT Nov rate	IER Nov rate	% difference	insp resp in days	IRT Nov av'g	IER Nov av'g	difference in days
Bldg.	88.4	74.0%	-14.4	Bldg.	...1.25	1.5	-0.25
Elec.	87.1	52.0%	-35.1	Elec.	...1.26	1.64	-0.38
Mech.	77.2	34.5%	-42.7	Mech.	...1.54	1.98	-0.44
Plbg.	xx.x	69.3%	-19.8	Plbg.	...1.21	1.49	-0.28
MT.	na	65.9%	na	MT.	Na	na	Na
Total	86.0%	59.14%	-26.86	Total	1.32	1.61	-0.23

- So there appears to be variance between IRT & IER as follows;
 - IER is slightly less than 27% lower on percent complete in 1st 24 hrs.
 - IER av'g days per inspection is .23 days longer.
- Progress on the IRT new report, and the schedule for work by the BDC-IRT subcommittee is discussed in item 8.2.2.3.

8.1.5. Inspection Pass Rates for November, 2013:

OVERALL MONTHLY AV'G @ 82.64%, compared to 81.75%, in October

Bldg:	October – 74.79%	Elec:	October – 81.22%
	November – 77.56%		November – 80.39%

Mech:	October – 84.03%	Plbg:	October – 90.61
	November – 85.63%		November – 91.29

- Bldg, Mech & Plbg up approx 1-2%; Elec down <1%
- Overall average up just less than 1%, and well above 75-80% goal range

8.1.6. On Schedule and CTAC numbers for November, 2013

CTAC:

- 131 first reviews, compared to 147 in October.
 - Projects approval rate (pass/fail) – 66%
 - CTAC was 46% of OnSch (*) first review volume (131/131+174 = 305) = 42.9%
- *CTAC as a % of OnSch is based on the total of only scheduled and Express projects

On Schedule:

- 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
- September, 13: 203 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–89.88% all trades, 92.5% B/E/M/P only
- October, 13: 218 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–88.75% all trades, 91.25% B/E/M/P only
- November, 13: 207 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–95.87% all trades, 94% B/E/M/P only

Booking Lead Times

- On Schedule Projects: **for reporting chart posted on line**, on December 2, 2013, showed
 - 1-2 hr projects; at 2-3 work days booking lead.,

- 3-4 hr projects; at 2-3 work days lead.
- 5-8 hr projects; at 3-4 work days lead, CMUD-10, Clt Zon'g-10 work 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

8.2. Status report on various Department initiatives

8.2.1. Follow up on BDC member comments in November meeting

8.2.1.1. Ninety minute load test requirement.....update by Joe Weathers

Note: actually this regards a required two hour load test

- Ed Horne requested study of this, since it requires an IBA and Supt on site, with costs running to \$1000.
- Dept was charged with studying options other than IBA, and also how to provide contractor with early notification of requirement, meeting with BDC rep Horne.
- On Dec 10, Gene Morton, the CEM's and Joe Weathers, held a telephone conference with Ed Horne on the subject of two hour load test requirements. After approximately 30 minutes of discussion, the following consensus "take-aways" resulted:
 - IBA/OTI inspection is the best way to coordinate and insure all necessary personnel are present at the time of the test. Typically we will allow three hours for the test.
 - Collection of IBA/OTI fee during the permitting process was studied, but appears to have a number of administrative/accounting roadblocks and doesn't appear to work well for the customer.
 - The Department would continue meetings with inspection trades involved to come up with a SOP. We will ask if City Fire will join in the process.
 - A stamp with a note is to be added in the plan review approval stage stating that an NEC article 700 or 701 system will require the Dept. to witness a two hour load test before a TCO/ CO may be issued.
 - A friendly reminder to all industry partners will be sent out through Notify Me.

8.2.1.2. Gap in connection between RDS-Master Plan approval and permit applications.....Tim T

- Elliot Mann requested study of residential permit submittals disconnected from RDS Master Plan approvals by early submittal (of the permit application while the Master Plan is still under review).
- Here's our current status;
 - Solution: created an action plan, using automation where possible, in order to address the problem of permitting one or multiple permit applications submitted on a new master plan review.
 - We implemented the changes on Wednesday< Nov 26 at 12pm. Staff (and the customer) will know at all times what is going on, where it is in the process, & the next step that needs to occur in permitting.
 - New master plan submittals will be identified with the permit applications with notes in the system (e-plan number and permit submittal number) once the master plan receives building approval the plan approval number will be linked to the permit application for easier tracking.
 - Permit submittals associated with approved master plans, the approved master plan number will be linked to the electronic permit application and deferred as 'Zoning for Jurisdiction Needed'.
 - Custom paper submittals will be connected with the permit application and plan review project number to enable tracking status of zoning approval and the building review approval.
- Any questions on this approach?

8.2.2. Updates on other Dept work

8.2.2.1. Launch of 2014 Service Delivery Enhancement strategy

- Hybrid Collaborative Delivery Team RFBA; the BOCC approved the RFBA on Dec 3.
 - The PM, Project Coordinator and 8 Code Officials (plan reviewer-inspectors) are posted
 - The BIM-Navigator position is still going through HR classification.
- Customer Service Center design project;
 - Lobby customer survey work started December 9. Will spend 1 week interviewing customers and 1 week observing customer-counter interaction.
 - Conference calls complete with British Columbia Ministry of Natural Resources and Bellevue, WA; still scheduling with Portland, OR and Jefferson County, Co

- Still working on Bank of America contact with their Digital Customer Care Center.
- Novice-Infrequent Customer Focus Group initial meeting scheduled for January 7.
 - Will review all data from customer survey and other authority conference calls.
 - Will propose possible Design fix
 - What design focus group and management agree on, goes back to BDC with any related org changes (any staff count change), and proposed performance measures.
- PM/CEM support pilot:
 - Draft list of assignments compiled by Directors and reviewed with PM/CEM's on Dec 11.
 - Pilot is ready to kickoff on Jan 2, or shortly thereafter..

8.2.2.2. Temporary utility (TU) approval electronic placard information

- John Taylor questioned whether these placards are clear in describing what TU approval covers.
- After discussing with RBI reps, the problem seems to be the lack of detailed information on the TU placard indicating the scope of the approval.
 - The process we use starts with an unsigned TU placard, posted at the site by the contractor to be signed by the inspector after the on-site inspection and approval.
 - The scope of the approval is recorded by the inspector in the inspection result notes. Nothing is added to the placard because the description can at times be lengthy and detailed listing multiple panels and locations.
- Ideas we've come up with include;
 - Adding some directions on the placard on how to find the details on our website.
 - Adding a QR code to the placard that would direct the smart-phone user automatically to the permit inspection records. Once there, the customer locates the inspection record matching the approval date added by the inspector on the TU placard.
- We are continuing to discuss this with John as we consider other options.

8.2.2.3. BDC-IRT subcommittee

- BDC volunteers include Rob Belisle, Kevin Silva, John Taylor, Ed Horne and Harry Sherrill
- UAT on the new POSSE IRT report is complete. The special report creating historic data going back to July, 2011 (the goal date discussed) is under final review and will be e-mailed to subcomm by Dec 31.
- Trying to schedule the initial Subcomm meeting for early the week of January 13 or late in the week of January 20, with the idea that the subcomm's work will include.
 - Review of the data to see if it's useful; if so, compare to old IRT-EIR data.
 - Consideration will be given to time dating when the work environment is "normal", or identifying abnormal impacts, in trying to evaluate meaningful trends, and staff sufficiency
 - Based on the data run, the subcomm will address three questions;
 - a) Does the new report meet the BDC's need? Is the data usable?
 - b) Is the current staffing level sufficient to achieve performance goals agreed to with the BDC?
 - c) Does the performance goal (85-90% of inspections complete in 1st 24 hours) still "feels right"?

8.2.2.4. Plot plans submittal for zoning review

- Request from BDC member Haston; residential permitting option other than faxing for submittal of plot plans in connection with zoning review.
 - Currently, building plan review uses pdf submission
 - But plot (site) plan reflecting the building house locations and set back are faxed to Charlotte Zoning Department located in LUESA.
- Staff is working on a tech enhancement allowing both permit application and plot plans to be uploaded online, while building plans continue to be submitted through E-Plan-NC.
 - It is now in programming and should be in production by December 31.

8.3. Other

8.4. Manager/CA added comments

- Managers: Jeff Griffin & Gary Mullis__, Wendell__; Tim__; Chuck W__, Mark Auten__, Melanie S
- Code Administrators; Joe W__, Lon McS__, Willis H__
- Leadership team; Directors Pat G__ and Gene M__; Technology by Sandra B-E__

9. Future BDC agendas

- January BDC meeting tentative topics
 - CA report on further work in the CA interp web search engine
 - BDC Fy15 Budget Subcommittee appointment
 - Quarterly Reports Consistency teams, Code Defect, Commercial Plan Review, TAB
 - BDC Quarterly Bulletin exercise
 - To be determined
- Other future BDC meeting topics
 - HMC space analysis outcome, recommendations, construction schedule and estimated cost.
 - CSS Report-Group B findings, goal, strategy and predicted impact on future budgets

7. Adjournment

The December 17th, 2013 Building Development Commission meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

The next BDC meeting is scheduled for 3:00 p.m. on Tuesday, January 21st 2014.