BUILDING DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
Minutes of July 17, 2012 Meeting

Ed Horne opened the Building-Development Commission (BDC) meeting at **3:07 p.m. on Tuesday, July 17, 2012**.

Present: Ed Horne, Harry Sherrill, John Taylor, Jon Wood, Rob Belisle, Hal Hester and Tim West

Absent: Jon Morris, Elliot Mann, Bernice Cutler, Zeke Acosta, Travis Haston and Kevin Silva

1. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The motion by Harry Sherrill seconded by Rob Belisle to approve the June 19th, 2012 meeting minutes passed unanimously.

2. BDC MEMBER ISSUES AND COMMENTS

No BDC Member issues or comments.

3. PUBLIC ATTENDEE ISSUES

No Public Attendee issues or comments.

4. CSS Report Strategy for Customer Group Discussion

Jim discussed the CSS survey and the BDC's request to assemble a small group of 5 – 10 customers to give us feedback and comments in helping us understand the survey and especially give us insight into issues where we are stuck. Management met on June 14th and came up with a rough strategy. We then met with Ed Gagnon on July 2nd; based on that meeting we have an idea of how we want to respond to your request. We think it will take multiple customers group meetings. In today's agenda the CEMs are going to talk about reconvening the CCTF on the auto-notification tool; this addresses a concern that was in the report. We are going to propose a couple of groups of customers to help us work on the problem. It will be a multi-headed initiative. The topics we have identified falls in 7 areas; 1- design of auto-notification and customers awareness of how it will work; 2- customer's expectations of timely inspections and how that compares to what the department and the BDC have agreed to on our IRT goals; 3- plan review and permitting umbrella and how well customers understand what we do versus what other agencies do; 4 – reach the right person; 5 – clarifying what customers meant by clear explanation of changes, we are not sure if they are referring to process or code requirement or what; 6 – suggestions on how to elevate customer's awareness of the value of our team based service delivery structure, value of the project managers, value of the code enforcement managers and the project-centric problem solving focus; 7 – getting private sector ideas on how to help customers self manage the process which has become more and more of an issue as we fully automate which we are 99.9% of the way there. For people that are not as familiar with it how do you coach them without relieving them the responsibilities of their outcomes inside the process? We think the private sector can help us a lot. We have a regiment of how we will approach all the meetings. That's all separate from issues that have to be taken into management meetings, things like inspectors use the notification button on auto notification, staff returning calls, the developer/owner dashboard is a priority inside our technical developmental strategy for this year; listen to my point of view and the importance of interactive review. These are all things in our management team discussions we'll go over those and they will show up in our work plans for this year. As far as the composition of it; we see 3 different groups. In item 8 of today's agenda the CEMs will make a recommendation of reconvening the CCTF specifically for one topic that addresses one of the issues in this and then there are 5 issues where we think we can get 4 professionals and 4 contractors (not those around the table) we want to reach out ideally to people who participated in the survey and make a focus group out of them. And then the tough one is the last item I talked about which has to do with ideas on how to help customers self manage in a fully electronic process. We want to see if we can find 4 local business leaders who may have wrestled with the same kind of problem in their work and what drove them to self service, how they coached customers and how do you move 85% of your customers without blowing off the other 15%. That's our strategy; if that makes sense to the BDC members here; we are responding to your request from the May meeting we will push that forward and will probably take us 2 – 6 weeks to get our legs under us and get going on the meetings. Is this getting after what you want when you talked about the survey in the May meeting? Since there are no comments I can assume that that plan works.

4.1 CSS Related Confirmation of Performance Goal

Related to the performance goals, it showed up in the survey after the last survey of 2010 so this is a sub-point to the first topic. We discussed with you all our performance goals. Two of those are how quickly we return phone calls and emails. Last time we did this was when we created the criteria for returning emails and everyone agreed to return emails w/in 24 hours. The criteria that we have used for returning phone calls with our staff have been every 2-3 hours or 3-4 times per day. That's the criteria we tell them to use/aspire to as much as they can. There are days you can do it better than others. Last time you specifically asked us to put a descriptor on the telephones that is what we do. 2 years ago I changed my message to say I return calls every 2-4 hours 3-4 times per day so someone that calls in should know that I should be getting back to them. One thing we want to confirm with you because it is going to come up in these focus group meetings is we think that works when we agreed to it 2 years ago with you; does that still work for you?
HS: What could you do differently?
JB: It's obvious from some of our customers that their expectations of a return phone call is shorter than every 2-3 hours / 3-4 times per day and some of them have an expectation for returning emails quicker than 24 hours.
EH: From a private perspective that sounds reasonable to me, sometimes you just cannot return the call w/in 2 hours.
HS: If your voicemail says that you expect a return w/in 24 hours, you have already given me notice of the turnaround time to expect. The worst thing is to not set any expectation just saying I'll get back to you when I can as opposed to an expectation.
JB: That's the point you made to us two years ago and so we have revised our department policy on our voicemail descriptors, adding the expectation.
RB: Does most of your staff manage the phone when they are available or do they queue up and every 2-3 hours they check their voicemail and make phone calls?
JB: I would guess they queue it up.
HS: You have to; if you are reviewing a set of plans and you answer the phone every time I call you, you'd never get it done.

5. Update on the COG's Work on Electric Vehicles

Sean Flaherty a Sustainable Program Analyst with Centralina's Counsel of Governments, updated the BDC on the EV progress through a comprehensive Power Point. Sean was hired to administer NC's Plug-In Electric Vehicle's Readiness Initiative which is also called "plugging in from mountains to sea" (M2S). He explained that plug-in electrical vehicles have zero emissions from their tailpipe having no impact on environmental air quality especially if the electricity that's fueling those vehicles comes from a renewable source. Sean went on to discuss Clean Cities which is a Department of Energy program. For further information on Mr. Flaherty's presentation, please contact rebecca.simcox@mecklenburgcountync.gov for a copy of the Power Point presentation. Sean also shared with the group that for those wanting to get involved; now is the time as they could use the help. Information on the web site www.ncpevtaskforce.org all the information gathered is kept on a virtual library called base camp and give folks that attend the planning meeting are given access to base camp so that you can pull all types of reports for more information.
EH: Have any utilities come forth offering a type of separate metering where they would get preferred rates?
SF: The average person may commute 30 miles per day, considering this commute your electric bill, if you had a charging unit at home, would be about $25 per month, so it's pretty insignificant. Duke Energy is actually offering free installations and free charging units that they will install for you if you want to charge at home, which is a great incentive. Joe Weathers has been very instrumental in helping us outline and figure out the required expedited permitting process. We are using your Trade Internet Permit (TIP) process as a model for the state. We are requesting a flag to your TIP system which indicates permit for a "charging unit".
JB: Reminded BDC members that Nissan recognized TIP as a national "Best Practice" program. Today, TIP handles approximately 20,000 permits per year with no given intervention.

6. CRWG Detail Subcommittee Recommendation

Jim Bartl discussed the detailed subcommittee recommendation presented to BDC members, laid out in a memo distributed in the meeting, please see attachment. The Subcommittee held 4 meetings and now offers a tentative agreement on three of the details:

Upfit/Renovation Permit Fee Calculator

The Subcommittee based their work on an analysis prepared by Patrick Granson of 7 projects, comparing the current fee structure, to the permit fees resulting from the proposed Upfit/Renovation permit fee calculator, agreeing on the following.

- To combine existing renovation calculator with upfit, to make an upfit/renovation calculator.
- Elevate the calculator ceiling from $50k to $100k constructions cost; anything above uses the BVD and regular Fee ordinance calculation.
- Below $100k construction cost, permit fees will be based on:
    - Base permit fee of $83.80 per trade discipline involved
    - Plus an added square foot charge per trade; Bldg @ $.12/sq. ft., M-E-P each @ $.08/sq. ft.
- It merits noting the attached study predicts this will improve the cost recovery rate on these projects from approximately 35% to >50%.
- While some projects will be hit harder than others (as indicated by the right hand column on the handout), we know we can't get to 100% recovery, and the subcommittee believes this is a good middle ground and sound next step to advocate to the BDC.
- The subcommittee recommends putting this in place for 2-3 years and returning to evaluate the impact of these proposed changes.

Inspection Count Limits on Mega Projects

The subcommittee recommended deferring any action on mega project inspection count limits for 18-24 months, allowing the collection of further data.

"Owner as Contractor" Inspection Count Limits and Permit Fees

The subcommittee advocates dropping the idea of inspection count limits on "owner as contractor" projects and instead, focusing on residential homeowner as contractor projects implementing something that is roughly equivalent to the way New Hanover County, Wilmington has their permit fee structured. This was studied by the CRWG at large back in the fall and the detail group revisited it.

- Focus on residential "owner as contractor" projects, since commercial projects of this type represent only 2% of the total "owner as contractor field".
- Applies only to residential owner as contactor permits with a construction value <$30,000. Above that total, refers to the base LUESA Fee Ordinance.
- Below $30,000 construction cost, fee structure is; a) $60, base permit fee/trade, b) if required, plan review charge of $45/per trade involved, c) Each inspection charged at $45 per trip (whether single discipline or multiple)
- Inspector will perform the normal inspection procedure for the trade(s) identified, with a defect markup not to exceed 30 minutes.

This is the recommendation from the Subcommittee including the BDC representatives that you had on it.

JT: The only thing I will add is to try and review the fees on a more regular basis so we don't get in the position where we are increasing at a fairly significant rate and I think this was addressed in emails to do this on a more regular basis; every 2-3 years whether it changes or not; we can keep it more on track.

JB: The department agrees with that; in fact in the next topic (BVD posting on the web) what we think we need to do is to create (we have very few standing committees, several years ago we threw all those out; we typically have task forces that reconvene or that needs to solve a problem and then they go away. Sometimes we bring them back as we will discuss later but in this case we talked that it makes sense to have a contractor group made

up of small and large contractors residential/commercial, which doesn't necessarily have to be BDC members but the contractor group that are ready to come in periodically; would probably be 1-2 years as suggested to look at some of these to be sure we are where we want to be. We are going to talk about BVD modifications which is something that we would typically do once a year and frankly we need more guidance when we look at those to identify how close we to the market, but we agree completely.

After no further comments Jim went on to say that we will prepare an RFBA because 2 of these things require an RFBA change, in the fee ordinance and the one may go into the building development ordinance too. We will bring that back to you if not in the August meeting then in the September meeting.
HS: I look at this as anything above $100k and then from $100k down to $30k and then below $30k. Below $100k you are looking at a square footage cost, and below $30k you are looking at a per trip cost
JB: Two separate things; one if the upfit renovation cost calculator; that is a separate thing originally focused on the upfits and after the detail subcommittee studied it they decided to combine upfits and renovations together and that would focus on projects that have a construction cost of >$100k and above would use the normal fee ordinance. Then when it comes to residential owner as contractor project (not all residential projects) if it's >$30k then these rules will kick in. What we are trying to do here is to create some awareness on the part of the owner that is acting as their own contractor that we don't have an unlimited amount of time or inspection resources for them what it's trying to do is pay by the pound structure for them so that if they need more inspections because of what happens to them then there are going to pay for more inspections.
HS: Having a limit of 30 minutes per trip?
JB: The idea here is to define limits so our inspector doesn't get out there and wind up being a consultant to the owner and 1.5 hours later trying to explain what is going on and why it was turned down. Typically these would be either a building, electrical, mechanical or plumbing disciplines or they would be combined.
HS: I don't see how you make any money at $45 per trip.
JB: We argued about this for a long time. One of the subcommittees of the original focus groups discussed the rate to charge homeowners on a per trip basis. There is a conception here that this is a ½ hour trip. It is the first place for us to start to see if this works as a way to manage owners as contractors on residential projects and their use of inspector's time; better than nothing, which is what we have now.
HS: Go at it one time and cover your cost. What percentage is 30k or less? How many jobs per year at this rate?
JG: It was right at 1,100 permits issued last year in this category.
GM: Very few over 30k.

7. Proposed Changes to BVD Posting on Web

We are going to make some changes on our BVD posting on the web and want to make you aware of those before we make those changes. We have been working on this since back in the winter. We started discussing it with the CRWG at large and decided to leave the topic for the detail subcommittees so we worked in that group as a sub set of meetings to go over this problem. We were looking at the building valuation data chart (last one plugged in) focused on things needing to be adjusted specifically falling in four areas:

- <u>Metal Building Construction (has to be in the A and B option program)</u>
  - 50% Modifier for Storage and Factory Buildings (50% of the value)
  - 20% Modifier for other Occupancy's (80% of the value)
  - Note: It cannot be below the # hours of review and # of field inspections for basic service
- <u>Open parking Garages (2 or more stories above grade)(Free standing)</u>
  - 60% modifier to the BVD (40%of the value)
- <u>Enclosed Parking decks (Free standing)</u>
  - 40 % modifier to the BVD (60% of the value)
- <u>Shell Building Construction (Free standing)</u>
  - 40% modifier to the BVC (60% of the value)

Some things we need to do as we implement this such as create some examples on the web site besides the usual things; making staff and customers aware of the change, we are going to make this retro-active

to the beginning of the fiscal year that just ended because we identified this problem early on in the fiscal year but it took a long time to wrestle this problem to the mat. We'll go back and identify the impact of projects and come up with a strategy to deal with them. In the future, the department is going to create a standing group that will help us study this problem on an annual basis and it will be that same group that we would ask to help look at where we have set factors in the fee ordinance we cannot wait 5 years to deal with them but periodically go back in, look at it and be sure they are current to avoid the huge bumps

8. Should the CCTF Reconvene to Work on Auto-Notification

Jeff Griffin discussed some of the issues that have come up with this particular feature the background of what auto-notification is: a process where the inspector in the field can actually on their screen in front of the inspection request can hit a button and send an electronic message to the customer who signed up for the service, and the message reads something like; "at 11:35 today inspector 140 indicated they are in route to your inspection request at address…". That's the electronic text message you would receive on your end. This was a feature that the Code Compliance Task Force put together back in 2007; this was a component of all this work and in the minutes there is actually a link to the web site that actually gives you the full report of the initial work that was done. This program was piloted at first for a number of years by just the Building trades, the building inspectors did it; we didn't roll it out to Mechanical, Plumbing or Electrical it was just the Building Inspectors. In 2011 we rolled it out to all trades. All trades have been using it now for about a year. There is some good and bad in the feature both the customers and staff agree that there are some issues with the particular feature Auto-notification; we think there are some modifications that can be done to improve upon it and currently look at it as one of the biggest customer service issues that we have, because it is a way to communicate to the field for the customer that you are in route to their job site because everyone wants to know when the inspector is going to arrive. Some of the major concerns we've heard from customers have to do with when you set up this program and you do it behind your contractors login screen there is no way to test whether or not it was set up correctly. So you've got to assume that you are hopefully going to get that message. We want to create some test buttons and ways the customers can do this; multiple points of contact rather than sending it to one person; can I send it to multiple people. The biggest thing we are hearing is that there is not enough lead time. The way the program was set up as indicated in the message it says that the inspector is in route. We're sending it from our link to your link and when the inspector hits it; sometimes it's automatic sometimes it's not; sometimes you may receive it after the inspector has left the job site. We realize the average time being is 20 – 30 minutes out. There are some expectations that it would be better lead times given to the customer so they would know exactly when you will be there so that you can meet them on site if you need to meet the inspector and walk the job with. To us auto-notification is clear; it's a way we can keep our efficiency high by not adding staff. We are doing about 800 inspections per day across all trades. If an inspector is receiving about 20-25 calls per day 80% of that is related to when are you going to be on my job site and those calls are generally hard to get to. It's difficult to know from this inspection to the next how long it's going to take you to be on that job; could take an hour could take 10 minutes. We try to do something to give you that information. You can see they are taking a large volume of calls regarding arrival; they are spending about 1.5 just on phone calls they can't give solid information on. We are trying to put the tools together that will work both for our staff and the customer as far as proper lead times, they way to set it up, contact, and so on. See attached handout. We sat down with our staff and asked what are you hearing/seeing from customers what are the problem areas that you think we need to modify and those are the recommendations put forth in the handout. The next step would be for the CCTF to reconvene, study this and determine if we have missed anything or is there anything we need to add to this feature before we try to implement something on the electronic side.

JB: One of the things we discovered (great idea from the general contractors) how many people didn't understand how the subscription worked thinking it happened automatically and then we get into the question is the notification going to the right entity, which are details we will be raking through in this group. You folks don't have to pick the people. We'll go back into the meeting notes from last time this was worked on, contact those people see if they are interested in coming back and working with us on this again. Typically if they helped us design it the first time and they are still around would be interested in working on it again. We'll do the heavy

lifting, we just need to know if you concur that it makes sense to bring those people back together again to work on this.

9. Quarterly Reports

Technical Advisory Board Quarterly Report

Lon McSwain shared that TAB held 1 meeting last quarter on May 16; key Points. Willis Horton reviewed the TAB quarterly report as presented to the BDC. Joe Weathers discussed the IgCC book purchase delay until FY 13. BCC update was presented by Willis Horton in Lon's absence. A fee incentive (GPR or other) discussion was introduced and led by Heidi Pruess. Discussion centered on the IgCC or other green code, should it be mandatory or voluntary. TAB leaned toward voluntary with incentive program to promote use. JNB went over former Green Permit Rebate, creation, successful use and end due to the recession. JNB recommended the committee consider; review and comment on the GPR process, and the merit of bringing back in some form. Take a formal position (regarding reconstituting GPR) and make recommendations to the BDC prior to submittal to the County Manager. This likely requires creating a subcommittee to work on incorporating new ideas, revising old GPR program, and outlining supporting changes to Fee Ordinance & Building-Development Ordinance. TAB's current focus is understanding changes in the last IgCC proposal and discussing advocacy of re-starting Green permit Rebates program (or similar), without dependence on Code Enforcement special fund.

Consistency Team Report

- Electrical: 31 Questions,(average attendance by contractors 2)
- Building: Commercial,(9 issues),(average attendance by contractors 3)
    - Residential, (24 issues), (average attendance by contractors 21)
- Plumbing: 51 Questions, (average attendance by contractors 3)
- Mechanical: 21 Questions. (average attendance by contractors 5)
- Fuel Gas: 6 Questions, (average attendance by contractors 5)

Code Compliance Report

Note comparative format; you can compare how topics and their standings change, quarter to quarter.
"Not ready"; Bldg – 8.44% (was 7.18%), Elec – 7.34% (was 6.63%), Mech – 4.99% (was 5.22%), plbg – 11.75% (was 8.57%); Note plumbing is way up.
Rough/finish % split varies, some up, some down

- Bldg.; rough @ 33.5% (up 1.5% from 31.98%), finish @ 22.78% (roughly same)
- Elec.; rough @ 22.14% (up 4% from 18.08%), finish @ 57.2% (dn 6% from 62.96%)
- Mech.; rough @ 23.76% (dn 2% from 25.74%), finish @ 65.96% (up 1.5% from 64.51%)
- Plbg; rough @ 26.76% (up .3% from 26.46%), finish @ 44.5% (dn .3% from 44.79%)

Commercial Plan Review Report

75% of projects pass on 1st review; 86% have passed after 2nd review

- pass rates on 1st review by trade:

Bldg.–87% (was 86%); Elec. – 86% (was 91%); Mech. – 87% (was 82%); Plbg. – 86% (was 81%);
Most common defects examples:

- Bldg: Appendix B, exit signs, interior finishes, exit rq'ts, exit remoteness
- Elec: Services/ Feeders, branch circuits, grounding & bonding, motors, ref'g eqpt
- Mech: T403.3, eqpt locations, exhaust systems, duct systems, fire/smoke damper req'ts
- Plbg: general installation, venting, drainage piping, water distr piping, wtr heater inst

1st rev'w use of approved as noted at 34% by all trades on the average (up from 29% last quarter)

- biggest users; CFD (81%) and MCFM (93%)

- critical path users; Bldg (25%, up from 14%), Elec. (9%, about same), Mech. (22% up from 17%), Plbg (26%, up from 23%)
- So BMP trades up (building up >10%), and Electrical down a little

10. Quarterly BDC Bulletin Exercise

Previous bulletin topics:

July, 2010	October, 2010	January, 2011	April, 2011
Expanding TIP AE Pass Rate update Web tools for contractors Current inspection service levels 2010 Reorg Field impact	Why Meck County is a project asset Nissan ID's Meck process as best practice AE Pass Rate success Progress on reorg plan Field service improvements	TAB purpose and customer participation Technology development and budget baseline Status of EV introduction Elec J-man program pilot Meckpermit.com changes	BIM-IPD code change public hearing CRWG startup Website redesign EPM development status Permit activity & IRT Impact of Senate Bill 22
July, 2011	**October, 2011**	**January, 2012**	**April, 2012**
Update on Senate Bill 22 2012 NC Building Code transition stipulated by BCC TU/LCU/CC/TCO/CO changes in process and fees NACO awards AE Pass Rate Incentives status Fy11 key data points	Carbon Monoxide alarm requirements Cost Recovery Work Group status 2012 NC Building Code transition Changes in temporary utility process	2012 NC State Building Code transition CRWG final report EPS-EPR startup Permit revenue trends Website redesign	NC Residential Code transition 2012 NC Building Code commercial project transition rules Code Enforcement Fy13 budget proposal
July, 2012			
FY12 year-end work load summary CRWG changes approved by the BOCC Challenges in the Residential Drawing Submittal program Changes in preliminary code review policy Department available for early project approval process schedule meetings			

11. Preliminary End of Year Numbers Report *(See handout)*

- Revenue: Fy12 EOY permit rev total $16,251,710**,** above projection ($12,127,032) by $4,124,678 or 34%
- Permits: comparison of Fy12 to Fy11 end of year data
    - Residential permits total 40,086, down slightly from Fy11 (40,097)
        - Includes SF new construction permits total 2,315, up 21% from Fy11 (1914)
    - Commercial permits total 29,753, up 20% from Fy11 (24,807)
    - Total permits at 75,050 up 7.4% from Fy11 (69,886)
- Inspections: comparison of Fy11 to Fy11 end of year data
    - building – 51,833, up 7.8% from 48,079 on June 30, 2011

    - electrical – 64,089, up 8.8% from 58,907 on June 30, 2011
    - mechanical – 35,288, up 8.34% from 32,571on June 30, 2011
    - plumbing – 26,451, up 19.9% from 22,064 on June 30, 2011
    - total-177,661, up 9.92% from 161,621on June 30, 2011
- Inspection complete 1st 24 hours: 92.3% compared to 93.31% in Fy11
- Inspection pass rate: 85.36% compared to 86.9% in Fy11
- Plan review: overall OnSchedule averaged 92.3% on time or early, compared to 87.3% in Fy11.
- B-E-M-P Plan Review Fy12 booking lead time av'g; *(with all discipline average in parenthesis italics)*
    - 1-2 hour projects; averaged 3.61 work day booking lead time; compares to 1.94 in Fy11
    - 3-4 hour projects; averaged 4.8 *(4.95)* work day booking lead time; compares to 3.43 in Fy11
    - 5-8 hour projects; averaged 6.02 *(7.82)* work day booking lead time; compares to 5.86 in Fy11
    - CTAC plan review turnaround time averaged 3.05 work days; compares to 3.36 in Fy11
    - Express Review booking lead; av'g of 6.5days on small and 9days on large projects
        - Compares to Ex Rev Fy11 av'g of 9.4 days on small and 9.26 days on large projects
- Residential permitting complete in 1st 24 hours: 94% (7358/7838 SF permits processed)
    - Compares to Fy11 totals of 92% (5454/5916 SF permits processed)
- Documents calls answered rate: 85% (on 30,013 calls) vs. 85% (33,392 total calls) in Fy11

12. Department Statistics and Initiatives Report

Permit Revenue

- June permit (only) revenue- $1,528,107, compares to May revenue of $1,913,729.
- Fy12 budget projected monthly permit revenue; $12,127,032/12 = $1,000,083 x 12 = $12,127,032
- At 6/30/12, YTD permit rev of $16,251,710 is above permit fee rev projection by $4,124,678 (+34%)

Construction Value of Permits Issued

- May total - $198,264,678, with YTD amount $2,787,944,288; vs. Fy11Total at 6/30/11 – $1.70884M
- So YTD figure approximately 1.0791B or 63% above construction value permit'd YTD at Fy11 EOY

Permits Issued:

	May	June	3 Month Trend
Residential	4231	4340	4010/3529/4231/4340
Commercial	3279	2565	2576/2646/3279/2565
Other (Fire/Zone)	423	471	561504/423/471
Total	7933	7376	7147/6679/7933/7376

- Residential up 2.58%; commercial down 22%; total down 7%
- SF detached new construction permits YTD at 2315 vs. 1914 at 6/30/11, so up 21%-

Inspection Activity: Inspections Performed

Insp. Req.	May	June	Insp. Perf.	May	June	% Change
Bldg.	4596	4780	**Bldg.**	4534	4707	+3.8%
Elec.	5990	6286	**Elec.**	5919	6253	+5.6%
Mech.	3252	3253	**Mech.**	3179	3270	+2.8%
Plbg.	2432	2523	**Plbg.**	2413	2504	+3.8%

Total	16,270	16,842	**Total**	16,045	16,734	+4.3%

- Insp performed; all trades up ranging 3%- to 5.5%; overall av'g up 4.3%
- Inspections performed were 99.64% of inspections requested

Inspection Activity: Inspections Response Time

Insp. Resp. Time	OnTime %		Total % After 24 Hrs. Late		Total % After 48 Hrs. Late		Average Resp. in Days	
	May	June	May	June	May	June	May	June
Bldg.	82.0	91.8	86.6	94.3	92.7	97.7	1.44	1.18
Elec.	88.4	88.9	91.4	91.9	96.4	98.2	1.25	1.21
Mech.	89.2	87.4	92.1	91.2	96.0	96.3	1.25	1.27
Plbg.	95.8	93.4	96.5	94.7	98.6	98.7	1.09	1.14
Total	88.0	90.1	91.0	92.9	95.7	97.8	1.28	1.2

- BEM down; Bldg up 9%+, Elec up ½%, Mech and Plbg up 1.5-2.5%
- Overall average position up 2% and still at or above 85-90% goal range

Inspection Pass Rates for June, 2012

OVERALL MONTHLY AV'G @ 85.97%, compared to 84.4% in May

Bldg: May – 78.05%
June – 80.77%

Elec: May – 83.24%
June – 83.98%

Mech: May – 88.19%
June – 89.9%

Plbg: May – 90.62%
June – 91.99%

- Bldg, Mech & Plbg all up 1.5% to 2.5%; Elec up .7%
- Overall average up 1.5% and well above 75-80% goal range

OnSchedule and CTAC Numbers for June, 2012

CTAC:

- 136 first reviews
- Projects approval rate (pass/fail) – 65%
- CTAC was 44% of OnSch (*) first review volume (136/136+194 = 398) = 41.2%
  *CTAC as a % of OnSch is based on the total of only scheduled and Express projects

OnSchedule:

- March, 11: 185 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 85.75% all trades, 84.5% B/E/M/P only
- April, 11: 147- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 78.37% all trades, 84.8% B/E/M/P only
- May, 11: 196- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 98.5% all trades, 85.5% B/E/M/P only
- June, 11: 251- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 95.5% all trades, 94.2% B/E/M/P only
- July, 11: 175- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 92.25% all trades, 93.75% B/E/M/P only
- August, 11: 238- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 95% all trades, 94.75% B/E/M/P only
- Sept, 11: 219 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 95.25% all trades, 96.5% B/E/M/P only

- October, 11:176-1st rev'w projects; on time/early–96.75% all trades, 96.25% B/E/M/P only
- November, 11:184 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–91.75% all trades, 93.25% B/E/M/P only
- December, 11:143 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–95% all trades, 96% B/E/M/P only
- 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
    - ❖ Note: OnSchedule 1st reviews are 3rd highest number in last 24 months

Booking Lead Times

- OnSchedule Projects: **for reporting chart posted on line**, on June 25, 2012, showed
    - 1-2 hr projects; at 2-5 work days book'g lead, but CMUD-8, Hlth-11, CLT Zon'g at 15 days.
    - 3-4 hr projects; at 3-7 work days lead time, but CMUD-8, Hlth-21 and CLT Zon'g at 23 days.
- 5-8 hr projects; at 3-7 work days lead time, but CMUD-16, Hlth-25 and CLT Zon'g at 23 days.
- CTAC plan review turnaround time; 2-3 days, except Bldg at 6 days
- Express Review – booking lead time was; 9 work days for small projects, 10 work days for large

June Meeting Follow Up

Roofing Contractor Awareness of Permit Requirements and Related Mechanical Work

- BDC member Acosta believes the inspection failure incidence is unusually high and perhaps worse when considering work not permitted.
- The Department will study options on getting reminders out to the roofing contractor industry on their obligations to a) take out permits, and b) address selected details with respect to re-roof jobs.
- Current thinking on a possible strategy includes these steps;
    - push out the mechanical interpretation from MP Code Administrator, detailing the issue and what's required for code compliance.
    - Send to HBA and NARI asking to get to their membership.
    - E-mail blast to our data base.
    - push out someone in their office will get that word out. As far as options to notify customer at permitting we have not had a chance to discuss with Tim but we could do a flyer or handout if that is the best way to get the word out.
    - To include Carolinas Roofing and Sheet Metal Contractors Association, Inc. (P.O. Box 7643 Charlotte, NC 28241-7643 Phone: (704) 556-1228)
    - Still considering options to notify customer thru the permit counter; maybe a flyer or handout

RDS Turnaround Time

- JNB provided status update to HBA member meeting on June 21; 61 HBA members attended.
- As of today status is;
    - Turnaround times as of 7/16/12; paper plans 8 days, e-plans 6 days, townhouse 28 days.
    - Gatekeeping status; new "Gatekeeping" PTE position inspector starts July 23.
    - PTE staffing; one position filled, tentatively plan to have 2 more start July 25.
    - Inspector OT/Saturday review team status; still working to develop; the N&S Inspection Team Managers will pole their staff this Wednesday to collect interested parties.
    - Status of e-plan reviews by other authorities; have one position provided from Raleigh; also using William Whaley from Waxhaw performing e-plan review.
    - 3rd party resource; still working on it. Will have something to announce next week.

Builder Concerns on Temporary Electrical Process

- CEM's asked to hold meetings with builder volunteers to discuss options to a) fully automate (full remote access) the TP application process and b) review the appropriateness of current fees charged.
- Meetings setup for July 24 at 9am and August 7th at 2pm.

- Have commitments from 2 large builders (waiting to hear from 2 others) and should have 4-6 total in meetings to review automated features and cost to see if any modifications to current program are possible.
- This process will also confirm would not change the impact on the City or towns regarding hold status.
- Basic idea is to see if we can streamline the existing process for customers as well as consider an alternate fee structure for residential in certain situations.

MEP Consistency Team Meeting Schedule
- Electrical and Mechanical/Plumbing Code Administrators will revise their Consistency Team meeting strategies to; a) focus quarterly on industry submitted issues, and b) with the other two monthly meetings focusing on staff consistency issues and training.
- CA's have identified the following months for industry focused meetings;
    - Electrical; March, June, September, and November
    - Mech/Plbg; March, June, September, and November

Meck Appendix B Variance from State Version
- H Sherrill requested adding a notice to Meck's Appendix B posting, noting it varies from state version.
- Changes were put in place on the web, the 2nd week of July

Other
Follow up on CSS Report

CRWG Detail Subcommittee Assignment Completion

EV Program Update and Status of Car Qualified List of Eng./Contr.
- JNB & Joe Weathers working on the NCPEV Task Force – Policy, Codes & Standards Committee, organized by the Centralina Council of Governments.
- Joe and Tim T Continue working with BDC Elec Rep and CAAEC to promote the program certifying Electrical Engineers and contractors as proficient in EV supply multiple commercial installations.
    - As we speak, Joe is auditing a local class for Engineers and Contractors, which they take in order to qualify to be put on the list, along with Tim's "TIP Presentation"
- After surveying a representation of the dealerships in this area we've discovered that most have already employed a Contactor for after sale installation of EVSE

Transition to 2011 NC Electrical Code
The 2011 NC Electrical Code was approved by the NC Building Code Council (BCC) on April 21, 2011 (with an effective date at that time of September 1, 2011). However, in moving through the Administrative Procedures Act process, 10 letters of objection were filed with the Rule Review Commission against the new Electrical Code, which suspended enforcement of this Code until the NC General Assembly took action in their 2012 session.

The General Assembly recently adjourned without taking action on the 2011 NC Electrical Code. Consequently, on July 9 at 3:35pm, we received notice from the NC Dept of Insurance that the new NC Electrical Code was now effective. Whereas in the past the BCC provided a transition period for codes in a similar state of uncertainty in the General Assembly (see accessibility provisions in the 2009 NC Building Code, wherein the BCC provided a transition through the end of 2010), in this case the BCC provided no further direction.

Considering the foregoing, the Department has taken the following position.
a) All permits issued on or before 7/10/2012 will be allowed to be constructed per the 2008 NC Electrical Code.
b) Projects that were in commercial plan review, or had conducted and recorded a formal preliminary plan review on or before July 10, 2012 will be allowed to continue under the 2008 NC Electrical Code, provided they gain issuance of their permit on or before September 30, 2012. (Note, recorded means having submitted preliminary review meeting notes to the Department)
c) While there is typically a transition period, allowing time for notification and training before a change such as this becomes mandatory, the NC Dept of Insurance advised us that, because the BCC took no specific action in their

June, 2012 (or prior) meeting, all projects must comply with the 2011 NC Electrical Code. So permits issued after 7/10/2012 (other than noted in 'b' above) are required to comply with the new NC Electrical Code.

Manager/CA added comments

There were no additional Manager/CA comments

13. Adjournment

The July 17th, 2012 Building-Development Commission meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Note: The next BDC Meeting is scheduled for 3:00 p.m., Tuesday, August 21st, 2012.