



*Mecklenburg County
December 16, 2014
@ 3:00 p.m.
Agenda*

Building-Development Commission

1. Minutes Approved
2. BDC Member Issues
3. Public Attendee Issues
4. 2014 BDC Member Attendance Authentication.....R. Wright
5. Gartner Presentation
6. Adjournment

The next **BDC Meeting** is scheduled for **3:00 p.m., January 20th, 2015.**

Please mark your calendars.

BUILDING DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Minutes of November 19, 2014 Meeting

Jonathan Bahr opened the Building-Development Commission (BDC) meeting at 3:04 p.m. on Tuesday, November 19, 2014.

Present: Jonathan Bahr, Travis Haston, Ed Horne, Chad Askew, Rob Belisle, Tom Brasse, Melanie Coyne, Hal Hester, John Taylor, Bernice Cutler and Ben Simpson

Absent: Zeke Acosta and Kevin Silva

1. MINUTES APPROVED

Travis Haston made the motion to approve the BDC Meeting Minutes from the October 21st meeting; seconded by Ed Horne. The motion passed unanimously.

2. BDC MEMBER ISSUES

Melanie Coyne questioned the custom plan drawing conversion previously discussed being different than what is on the agenda to be discussed today. Patrick Granson said this topic is being addressed later in today's meeting.

Ed Horne stated that given the BOCC approval of the nominee submitted to take the Master Electrical Contractors Association of NC, Inc. seat; this will be his last meeting. Mr. Horne graciously expressed his pleasure of serving on the Commission and feels the Department is ahead of the curve and does a very good job.

Tom Brasse asked about structural Special Inspections when required during the Plan Review process. Registered professionals are doing inspections then the County is performing the same inspection often resulting in a change having to be made when the inspection was approved by the PE in the field. Is there a way to tag on to the PEs field inspection? Gene Morton said an upcoming presentation on Special Inspections during one of the Task Force meetings on 12-4 will cover this. Patrick Granson commented that 1704 does seem to have duplications but the state requirement in the administration code has certain required inspections and Special Inspections are additional inspections. Bernice Cutler asked that Tom's question be covered in the upcoming meeting on 12-4-14. Gene Morton shared that BDC members identified specifically which topics they wanted to be invited to on the AE-GC Task Force. We'll be glad to cover your issue and any of you are invited to all task force meetings you want to attend. The next meeting is the 20th and we will go over this.

John Taylor referenced an email that was sent out yesterday from the public asking to bring up transparency and logging of issues. I think there are further questions that need to be clarified by this individual but it was basically about logging issues from people submitting for permitting or general inspections. Since they are logged in, this should be public knowledge so that anyone can look at discrepancies or conversations that have taken place.

Travis Haston shared he was familiar with the email and asked Melanie if this person had reached out to her since she was our Public Representative; which he had not. Travis went on to say that we need to clarify what is actually being said in the email. Various members agreed they didn't fully understand what it was the individual was trying to convey. John Taylor said he would respond to this individual. Gene Morton asked if this was sent to just the BDC members; Travis said it was sent to Mr. Bartl as well.

3. PUBLIC ATTENDEE ISSUES

No public attendee issues.

4. CUSTOMER SERVICE CENTER DETAIL DESIGN UPDATE

LUESA Director, Ebenezer Gujjarlapudi addressed the Building Development Commission and briefed members on the Customer Service Center to date saying that a portion of the plan had changed in the last two months. Based on reports from two consultants hired by County Manager, Dena Diorio specifically looking at a master plan to better serve the citizens of Mecklenburg County. The master plan consultant made a presentation to the board in their last meeting. Dena has now embarked on a path that has been approved and is moving forward to sell the Hal Marshall Center. We are now working with the master plan consultants to determine opportunities for LUESA's growth. This is going to happen quickly; 18-24 month timeline. I have halted funding on the reconstruction of the Hal Marshall Center as I do not want to spend money unnecessarily until I had a better idea of what the plan looks like to include clarification on when we will leave HMC. Ebenezer shared pictures taken of the Customer Service Center in Nashville. He went on to describe that customers, for example; that want to add a deck, can walk in and visit each required counter ultimately walking out with a permit same day. The County is moving forward with hiring the Customer Service Manager and Specialist then once we get a sense of the direction we are going we will hire the remaining 4 customer service liaison positions. All of this information has been provided to Gartner. We will review what recommendations are going to be made by mid-next month. We want to make sure we don't spend money unnecessarily at the expense of the County which is why I put a hold on it until we get a clear picture from the County Manager and the BOCC as to where we are going. We've also met with the City asking them to think about what they will do if Gartner says this is the model you have to go with. My initial reaction was it looks more like government and yet this may be what we need. We want to be able to answer customer's questions the first time they come into the building and give them the help they need. Having the opportunity to move into a new place gives us an opportunity to design it like we want it.

CA: What are the options we are looking at; an existing facility the County has offices in or a standalone building like HMC outside of uptown?

EG: Dena's philosophy is to bring government to the people. Most of the customers that use the health services are north of uptown and have to sometimes use 4 different busses to get to us then 4 busses to get back. All options are on the table.

BS: I commend you on reaching out to the City about this growth. You mentioned cohabitation potential and from a consulting standpoint it is very important for the City and County to work together. You are to be commended for reaching out and I hope discussions remain positive.

EG: Nan Peterson has been a great advocate from the City side. Initial discussions included what makes sense, which groups should be alongside the County.

BS: If you want to improve the perception from private and public sectors; that is the single most important thing you can do.

TB: The only time I've ever used the bike share program is to go between here and the City, I think that would be huge.

EG: I didn't want you to think that because we have not begun construction on the HMC that we are sitting on our hands. That is not the case. I don't want to spend any money we don't have to. Because of the space needs of Code Enforcement we've moved GIS out of the building so that Patrick and Gene can begin to grow and accommodate the Customer Service Center.

JB: When do you expect to have Customer Service in the lobby?

EB: The manager will be in place in the next couple of weeks. Looking to have that person help design it from the ground up. My guess, early January.

CA: In reference to Gartner, I've been in correspondence with an organization outside of the county and they have documents with summary information of preliminary finds from Gartner that we haven't seen

as a commission and was wondering if we can get that information and was surprised we don't already have it.

EG: I am unsure where that information came from.

Nan P: That is erroneous.

CA: I've seen it. It was attached to an email.

EB: I don't know where that came from, all we have seen is a draft that was forwarded to Dena, which I have done and have been waiting for her and Gartner to finalize the report for distribution. Not sure where that came from.

Nan P: In December, Gartner will present their findings to the City.

EG: We are targeting mid-December to present their review. If I had had an opportunity to have seen their final report, I can assure you; you would have been the first to receive it. I have not seen the information in which you refer.

RB: Is there a draft going around that nobody knows about?

CA: I don't know what it is as I haven't spent time researching and have had a lot on my plate. I received an email that had some form of a draft that was being discussed which lead me to believe that it had been shared and we hadn't been privy to and it sounds like someone shared some things they shouldn't have.

EG: We only received a preliminary draft that was for review and had to be forwarded to the County Manager's office and have not seen anything since. If I had a finalized document; I'd be happy to share with all of you.

CA: I wasn't suggesting you guys aren't sharing something we expected you to share.

EG: Anytime you have any of these questions come up, please feel free to email or call me. I am available to you each day until 9:30 p.m.

MILESTONES: SPACE

- Temporary space secured at Counter 1 (currently Revenue Collections) starting in March
- Funds secured to modify space as needed, pending outcome of Gartner report.
- County Manager has announced plans to sell Hal Marshall Center in the foreseeable future as part of the County Facilities Master Plan. Depending on timing of that, physical changes to the CSC space may be kept minimal.

MILESTONES: STAFFING

- Two hires currently under way – training coordinator and Senior Customer Liaison/CSC Manager
- One round of training coordinator interviews complete

MILESTONES: TECH

- Funds secured for Phase I technology purchases, pending outcome of Gartner report
- Funds secured for consultant to define next steps and workflows, pending outcome of Gartner report

NEXT STEPS

- Incorporate findings from Gartner report
- Train manager and training coordinator; they will then spearhead work on developing CSC Answer Book, processes and workflows
- Purchase technology/hire tech & workflows consultant
- CSC to be operational (Phase I staffing) by the end of March

5. BDC PAPERLESS STRATEGY REVIEW

Shannon Clubb provided background on the paperless strategy stating that at the beginning of FY14, the BDC switched to a paperless reporting process. BDC members currently receive monthly / quarterly reports and other support materials via Dropbox in advance of each meeting. Code Enforcement's data gathering process is highly automated and detailed. Because of the way our data gathering software was reporting numbers staff still had to do a significant amount of manual data extraction, analysis, arithmetical functions and reformatting. Monthly reports averaged 6 hours staff time as Quarterly

Reports were averaging roughly 9.5 hours staff time. What formerly took hours now takes minutes or even just a few clicks per report. Most of the extraction, arithmetic and formatting is automated with a few manual tasks each. At this point Shannon shared examples of the new reporting through a PowerPoint presentation. She went on to report that we've recovered about 5 hours of monthly staff time so far on monthly reports and about 8,5 hours of staff time on quarterly reports. Shannon identified the process will go live in January after final refinements and BDC member requested changes if applicable.

BC: I like having the previous month in all reports. We can see when something goes awry or if an issue is coming up.

RB: Instead of running one quarter can you run two quarters?

SC: This software cannot accomplish this in its current form. We have run the previous quarter so we can copy and paste.

RB: So you can't run two quarters to just change the date? Is there an arbitrary cut-off date?

JW: There is a query you input the dates you want yet you can't run two quarters. But, I can run current quarter and within three minutes run the second report. At this date we don't have the ability to run both in the same report.

BS: One of the things we monitor is our trends and I do think it is important to see this.

JW: What I hear you saying is that you want the current and previous reports and we'll make that happen for you.

6. DEPARTMENT STATISTICS AND INITIATIVES REPORT

OCTOBER STATISTICS

Permit Revenue:

- October permit (only) rev - \$2,009,668, compares to September permit - \$2,115,759Fy15 budget projected monthly permit rev; \$20,593,309/12 = \$1,716,109
- So October permit revenue is \$293.56k above monthly projection
- YTD permit rev = \$7,920,147, is above projection (\$6,864,436) by \$1,055,711 or 15.38%.

Construction Value of Permits Issued

- October total - \$565,150,504, compares to September total - \$566,938,965
- YTD at 10/31/14 of \$2,032,573,217; 35.74% above Fy14constr value permit'd at 10/31//13 of \$1.306M

Permits Issued:

	Sept	Oct	3 Month Trend
Residential	4490	4784	5379/4171/4490/4784
Commercial	2855	2835	3219/2758/2855/2835
Other (Fire/Zone)	434	546	511/492/434/546
Total	7779	8165	9109/7421/7779/8165

- Changes (Sept-Oct); Residential up 6.5%; commercial same; total up 4.9%

Inspection Activity: Inspections Performed

Insp. Req.	Sept	Oct	Insp. Perf.	Sept	Oct	% Change
Bldg.	6828	7828	Bldg.	6714	7680	+14.4%
Elec.	8148	8267	Elec.	8100	8318	+2.7%
Mech.	4268	4482	Mech.	4179	4474	+7.05%
Plbg.	3400	3837	Plbg.	3357	3781	+12.6%
Total	22,644	24,414	Total	22,350	24,253	+8.5%

- Changes (August-Sept); all trades up, Bldg and plbg>10%, mech up 7%, elec up <3%
- Inspections performed were 99.34% of inspections requested

Inspection Activity: Inspections Response Time (new IRT report)

Insp. Resp. Time	OnTime %		Total % After 24 Hrs. Late		Total % After 48 Hrs. Late		AverageResp. in Days	
	Sept	Oct	Sept	Oct	Sept	Oct	Sept	Oct
Bldg.	75.8	76.3	94.0	92.4	98.9	98.3	1.35	1.34
Elec.	49.0	58.3	83.6	91.7	97.8	99.0	1.69	1.51
Mech.	62.7	64.4	94.0	91.5	99.3	98.9	1.44	1.45
Plbg.	81.2	82.3	98.3	98.9	99.8	100	1.20	1.19
Total	64.4	68.9	90.9	93.0	98.7	98.9	1.47	1.39

- Per the BDC Performance Goal agreement (7/20/2010), the goal range is 85-90%, so the new IRT report indicates the August average is currently 16.1% below the goal range.
- Though below goal, across the board, the numbers are better this month.

BS: How did you get caught up on the Electrical Inspections so well?

GM: Working a lot of overtime.

Gary M: We have part-time working on Electrical Inspections as well.

BS: My questions was based on openings you were having trouble getting filled. Are they filled yet?

GM: We have three new employees that began work with us today.

Inspection Pass Rates for October, 2014:

OVERALL MONTHLY AV'G @ 82.96% in October, compared to 81.01% in September

Bldg: September – 76.3%
October – 77.68%

Elec: September – 78.09%
October – 81.15%

Mech: September – 83.86%
October – 86.0%

Plbg: September – 90.08%
October – 90.72%

- Bldg up 1.38%, Elec up 3.06%, Mech up 2.14%, Plumbing up .64%
- Overall average up 1.95% from last month, and above 75-80% goal range

OnSchedule and CTAC Numbers for October, 2014

CTAC:

- 128 first reviews, compared to 118 in September.
 - Projects approval rate (pass/fail) – 72%
 - CTAC was 42% of OnSch (*) first review volume ($128/128+178 = 262$) = 41.8%
- *CTAC as a % of OnSch is based on the total of only scheduled and Express projects

On Schedule:

- 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
- December, 13: 157 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–96% all trades, 92.5% B/E/M/P only
- January, 14: 252 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–92.38% all trades, 94% B/E/M/P only
- February, 14: 199 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–85% all trades, 95.25% B/E/M/P only
- March, 14: 195 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–97.38% all trades, 95% B/E/M/P only
- April, 14: 242 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–94% all trades, 90.5% B/E/M/P only
- May, 14: 223 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–97.63% all trades, 96% B/E/M/P only
- June, 14: 241 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–94% all trades, 95% B/E/M/P only
- July, 14: 203 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–90.4% all trades, 96% B/E/M/P only
- August, 14: 248 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–85.75% all trades, 96% B/E/M/P only
- September, 14: 189 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–92% all trades, 94.75% B/E/M/P only
- October, 14: 239 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–95% all trades, 94% B/E/M/P only

Booking Lead Times:

- On Schedule Projects: **for reporting chart posted on line**, on November 3, 2014, showed
 - 1-2 hr projects; at 2-3 work days booking lead, except bldg.-6, M/P-14 and CMUD - 5 work days
 - 3-4 hr projects; at 2-4 work days lead, except bldg.-13, MP-14, CMUD-6 and CFD-6 work days
 - 5-8 hr projects; at 3 days, except bldg.-13, MP-14 and all Elec-CMUD-City Zoning-CFD all at 8work days
- CTAC plan review turnaround time; BEMP at 5 work days, and all others at 1 day.
- Express Rev'w booking lead time was; 5 work days for small projects, 5 work days for large projects

Status Report on Various Department Initiatives

Patrick Granson shared the BDC Quarterly Bulletin is in draft and is completed based on the bullet points noted in the October BDC meeting; sent to BDC chair on 10/31. Awaiting comments from BDC Chair Bahr and Department will post to website and e-mail the final version of the Bulletin to NotifyMe registrants.

RDS Custom Plan Drawing Conversion

Patrick Granson described that on Nov. 10, Code Enforcement staff met with BDC members to discuss options and strategies for moving from our existing paper custom plan receiving process to an electronic plan review process. Attendees: BDC members Melanie Coyne and Travis Haston, Staff members Shannon Clubb, Patrick Granson, and Tim Taylor. We reviewed the current paper process requires two sets of paper plans with associated paperwork accompanying the project. These plans are passed to different departments/agencies during the review and approval process. Currently, the department has one

online system, E-Plan NC Review, which handles custom plans undergoing the electronic review process. E-Plan's initial primary purpose was to help track builders with master plans submitting projects in both Mecklenburg County and City of Raleigh, using the same approved plans in both jurisdictions. The system has limitations in terms of qualified approval of plans, for example, there is no option for "Approved as Noted (AAN)" or Interactive Review. As a consequence, because of our inability to make qualified plan approvals in E-Plan, the approval rate is only 10%, compared to 60% in the traditional, paper-based residential plan review. For this reason, we do not believe it to be an ideal option for taking all of our custom residential plans to electronic plan review. Not only would it necessitate a higher turndown rate for the reasons described above, it is also likely to affect our five-day turnaround benchmark for plan review. Instead, we propose the following strategy in Technology Enhancements; We will create a model similar to CTAC's electronic review process and introduce it as an interim option for residential electronic plan review until the Avolve process changes come online in early summer. This will give the customer the flexibility of online submittal and the department retains the use of important tools like AAN and Interactive Review. We think this also addresses some of the customer service enhancement opportunities we have gleaned from focus groups and the 2014 Customer Survey, in that it provides some relief for dealing with picking up and dropping off paper plans. We hope to begin testing this program, tentatively titled "RDS Electronic Plan Submittal," in late November or early December. While electronic submittal will be encouraged, we will still offer the option to convert customer's paper plan drawings to an electronic format, if the customer is willing to accept a delay in the process of three to five days. We will advise the towns and partner agencies that the paperless process is in transition.

How do we inform our customer of the transition? A "Notify Me" e-mail blast announcing the proposed date of implementation as January 5th, 2015. This will be sent out the first week of December to raise customer awareness. We will also have an information board in the lobby, will post notice on the online contractor dashboard, we'll develop a flyer to be attached to the current paper plans/permits. Will have a message to be posted on relevant pages on MeckPermit.com. The message to be sent to BDC members for sharing, especially Homebuilders Association. Social Media (will reach more than 18,000 people on Twitter, 2,000 on Facebook).

The transition period; on Monday, January 5th, we will provide the option within the contractor dashboard to start uploading residential plans and documents to the system. We will still process the paper plans coming into the system and will advise our customers of the new system as an added convenience for them. In early April, we will take the full transition to paperless. We will still accept paper drawings and documents and will then send them out to be converted to electronic files for an additional fee. Choosing to require the department to oversee the conversion of the files from paper to electronic will also mean a five-day delay in the process. Customers that are using the RDS electronic version will have direct access to the approved plans through their dashboard and can print out the plans anytime. In the field, the contractor and inspector may still choose to use paper drawings until the final installation of the plan room from Avolve is in place.

Patrick asked if there were any concerns or thoughts and if not we would ask for BDC approval to move this forward in development. Since there were no further questions, we will move forward.

Invite County Manager

The BDC Chair requested we contact the County Manager regarding attending the next (or a future) BDC meeting, with the BOCC Chair. Similarly, the Chair requested the County Manager attend a future AE-GC-Builder Task Force meeting. Both requests have been passed along to the CM's office, through the LUESA Director.

Consistency Team Meeting Agenda Publication

Gene discussed the CA's October Consistency Team quarterly report presentations of the BDC and the discussion of MF topics in Building Consistency meetings (see item 6.2.1.6, following), the BDC requested that all Consistency Team meeting agendas be broadcast 24-48 hours in advance to the following parties; a) BDC members, and b) the involved/affected industry association; this is now SOP and the CA's have begun

doing so in the November meeting announcements.

Building Consistency MF Topics

Gene Morton shared that last month we committed to the BDC to reschedule a 2nd discussion of the multi-family topics reviewed in the October 1 Building Consistency Meeting, with advance notice to BDC members, GCAA, AIA, PENC, and trade associations. Lon is still working on scheduling this, but we think we can make it a late November/early December event.

Legislative Change Proposal

Gene Morton said we initiated discussion with Marvin Bethune to propose language requiring the NC Dept. of Insurance to publish to all NC code enforcement authorities, all written instructions on code interpretations (whether formal interpretations or e-mail directive). Mr. Bethune has developed proposed language and sent a draft version on to Brian Francis. We will be scheduling a meeting with HBA and REBIC reps to solicit their support.

Electrical Plan Review Scope

Patrick Granson shared that the Department met with Keith Pehl, Sandy Blackwelder, Ed Horne and Lee Teeter on Oct 9. When Electrical PE's and contractors submit their thoughts on use of plan review resources on various project use and scale types, this will be incorporated in the appendix of Dept position paper on AE seals.

Consistency Data Report Follow-Up on Defect Codes

Gene Morton updated on a follow up to July 15 and Sept 16 meeting discussions with the BDC on the Consistency Data Report work executed by the Department at the request of upper County Management. A meeting was scheduled in the Hal Marshall Center for November 3, with BDC reps E. Horne, H. Hester, Z. Acosta, J. Taylor and T. Brasse. Topics covered, identified in JNB's Sept 8 memo to BDC members, and included development of common language among the individual trade defect lists. The defect lists were initially developed in 1998 on a trade-by-trade basis with industry representatives; consequently, the same topics may use different language in differing trades. An example of this is "not ready" vs. "task requested is incomplete". Another is "defect on previous list not corrected". Develop common criteria for the use of "too many defects to list". Eliminate obsolete terms; such as "call clerk", replacing with direct connection to inspection failure information on the web. Develop new tools for paper based sites; so that failure notes left on site are also auto entered into the project's POSSE record. Eliminate all code defect references to "other; further research required. Tom Brasse and Hal Hester attended the November 3rd meeting. The five topics identified in Jim Bartl's memo were discussed. A follow-up meeting has been scheduled for Wednesday November 19, at 2 pm in the Hoffman Conference room to discuss the two remaining topics.

Work by the AE-GC-Builder Task Force

- The Task Force has four meetings complete, 9/25 (18 industry attendees), 10/9 (14 industry attendees), 10/23 (8 industry attendees), and 11/5 (10 industry attendees).
 - S0 average industry attendance is about 12, which we think is very good.
- To date, the Task Force has **directly discussed the following major topics**;
 - #14; consistency, field to office
 - #2; best practice summary; for industry & dept
 - #10; audit project input requirements in POSSE & EPS
 - #17; contractors with high pass rate getting a reward
- To date, **Dept work groups have reported in on the following topics**
 - Report in on #11; CEO's staying within NCGS authority, especially on AE seals.
 - Report in on #19; criteria on AE sealed documents regarding when the Department will or will not accept them for code compliance verification.
 - Report in on #16; written criteria on code interop change notification , from either local or state
 - Report in on #15; customer awareness of full notification tool capacity in EPS/POSSE
 - Report in on #9; electronic sheet index status/schedule
- So we think the Task Force is making good progress

- Upcoming TF meetings will address the following topics

Mtg #5; Thursday, November 20
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>Topic #18</u>; inspection trip time allocation• Report in on #8; RTAP policy
Mtg #6; Thursday, December 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>Topic #2</u> ; Best practice summary (conclusions)• Report in on #12; SI procedure• Report in on #13; Preconstruction meetings
Mtg #7; Thursday, December 18
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• First look at final report• Report in on #4; staff and customer training on services• Report in on #6; explain customer liaison role
Mtg #8; Wednesday, January 7
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Wrap up and confirm final report

Public Info on MF Electric Service Interpretation

As discussed in the BDC follow up memo, additional customer notification steps include; second round blast sent out through Notify Me, PENC and AIA notified again, announced at the September Contractors meeting; announced to staff and contractors in September Consistency meeting and emailed to staff.

Legal training on AE Sealed Documents in the P&I Process

Training with Marvin Bethune is tentatively scheduled for December 3 at 8am in the Woods training Center at HMC and will focus on case studies of how code official work meshes with AE seal responsibilities and the limits of code official's authority and how the County defends them. All BDC members are welcome to attend

Hybrid Collaborative Delivery Team

The HCD Team will update the BDC on team projects and status in the December meeting.

Manager/CA Added Comments

There were no Manager or CA added comments.

7. ADJOURNMENT

The November 18th meeting of the Building Development Commission adjourned at 4:34 p.m. Next meeting of the Building Development Commission is scheduled for, Tuesday, December 16, 2014.


Building-Development Commission Attendance Record (12-Month Period)																
Member Name	Jan-14	Feb-14	Mar-14	Apr-14	May-14	Jun-14	Jul-14	Aug-14	Sep-14	Oct-14	Nov-14	Dec-14	Total Attended	Overall Meetings	Overall Attended	Overall Percentage Attended
Acosta, Ezequiel	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	2	16.67%
Askew, Chad	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	10	12	10	83.33%
Bahr, Jonathan	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	11	12	11	91.67%
Belisle, Rob	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	10	12	10	83.33%
Brasse, Tom								1	1	1	1	1	5	5	5	100.00%
Coyne, Melanie	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12	12	12	100.00%
Cutler, Bernice	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	9	12	9	75.00%
Haston, Travis	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	12	11	91.67%
Hester, Hal	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	12	11	91.67%
Horne, Ed	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12	12	12	100.00%
Mann, Elliot	0	0	0	1	1	1	1						4	7	4	57.14%
Silva, Kevin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0.00%
Simpson, Benjamin								1	1	0	1	1	4	5	4	80.00%
Taylor, John	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	10	12	10	83.33%
Wood, Jon	1	1	0	1	1	1	1						6	7	6	85.71%

1 = Present
0 = Absent

The above information is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.
Jonathan Bahr, 2014 Chairman - Building-Development Commission


Building Permit Revenue Fiscal YTD

INCREASE/DECREASE
 November 2014 Permit Revenue = \$1,314,146
 FY15 Year-To-Date Permit Revenue = \$9,234,293
 8% *above* Projected YTD Permit Revenue



Construction Valuation


INCREASE/DECREASE
November 2014 Total = \$295,546,037
 FY15 YTD Total = \$2,328,118,254
 FY14 YTD Total = \$1,643,200,201
 FY15 up 29.42% from this time FY14



Permits Issued


INCREASE/DECREASE
 Residential dn - 23.33%
 Commercial dn - 27.36%
 Overall dn - 25.77%

FISCAL YEAR TO DATE PERMIT TOTALS
 Residential November FY15 = 22,703 FY14 = 20,746
 Commercial November FY15 = 13,893 FY14 = 12,681
 Total FY15 = 38,966 FY14 = 35,886



Inspections Performed

INCREASE/DECREASE
November 2014 Inspections Performed dn 23.6%




Inspection Activity: inspections response time (new IRT report)


Insp. Resp. Time	OnTime %		Total % After 24 Hrs. Late		Total % After 48 Hrs. Late		Average Resp. in Days	
	Oct	Nov	Oct	Nov	Oct	Nov	Oct	Nov
Bldg.	76.3	80.2	92.4	96.2	98.3	99.13	1.34	1.24
Elec.	58.3	61.3	91.7	94.1	99.0	99.2	1.51	1.45
Mech.	64.4	60.3	91.5	92.2	98.9	98.8	1.45	1.48
Plbg.	82.3	77.5	98.9	98.1	100	99.9	1.19	1.23
Total	68.9	69.6	93.0	95.0	98.9	99.2	1.39	1.35

Inspection Pass Rates


November 2014 Pass Rates	
Building	76.87%
Electrical	78.97%
Mechanical	86.04%
Plumbing	90.34%
OVERALL:	82.00%




November CTAC First Reviews




CTAC Approval Rate




CTAC % of On-Sch. & Express




November OnSchedule 1st Reviews



OnTime/Early All Trades




OnTime/Early BEMP



December 1, 2014


Plan Review Lead Times for OnSchedule Review

12/1/14	Building	Electrical	Mech / Plumbing	County Fire	County Zoning	Backflow - CMUD	Health	City Zoning	City Fire
---------	----------	------------	-----------------	-------------	---------------	-----------------	--------	-------------	-----------




Working Days	2	5	2	2	2	2	2	6	2
--------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

12/1/14	Building	Electrical	Mech / Plumbing	County Fire	County Zoning	Backflow - CMUD	Health	City Zoning	City Fire
---------	----------	------------	-----------------	-------------	---------------	-----------------	--------	-------------	-----------



Working Days	5	5	2	4	2	4	2	11	3
--------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	---

12/1/14	Building	Electrical	Mech / Plumbing	County Fire	County Zoning	Backflow - CMUD	Health	City Zoning	City Fire
---------	----------	------------	-----------------	-------------	---------------	-----------------	--------	-------------	-----------



Working Days	10	8	8	4	3	4	3	11	6
--------------	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	---

Green: Booking Lead Times within 2 weeks (10 - 14 work days = The Goal)
 Yellow: Booking Lead Times within 3-4 weeks (15 - 20 work days)
 Red: Booking Lead Times exceeds 4 weeks (21 work days or greater)

All booking lead times indicated are a snapshot in time on the date specified.
 The actual booking lead time may vary on the day you submit the OnSchedule Application.