

**NIST-GCR-98-741**

---

**ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT FOR  
STREAMLINING THE NATION'S BUILDING  
REGULATORY PROCESS PROJECT**

---

**Robert Wible and Mari Cote**

**National Conference of States on Building  
Codes and Standards, Inc.  
505 Huntmar Park Drive, Suite 210  
Herndon, VA 20170**



**United States Department of Commerce  
Technology Administration  
National Institute of Standards and Technology**

**ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT FOR  
STREAMLINING THE NATION'S BUILDING  
REGULATORY PROCESS PROJECT**

---

**Prepared for**

**U.S. Department of Commerce  
Building and Fire Research Laboratory  
National Institute of Standards and Technology  
Gaithersburg, MD 20899**

**By**

**Robert Wible and Mari Cote  
National Conference of States on Building  
Codes and Standards, Inc  
505 Huntmar Park Drive, Suite 210  
Herndon, VA 20170**

**December 1997**



### Notice

This report was prepared for the Building and Fire Research Laboratory of the National Institute of Standards and Technology under grant number 60NANB7D0001. The statement and conclusions contained in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Institute of Standards and Technology or the Building and Fire Research Laboratory.

**ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT**

**FOR**

**STREAMLINING THE NATION'S BUILDING**

**REGULATORY PROCESS PROJECT**

For Grant Period: September 1996 to November 1997

*Prepared for*

*National Institute of Standards and Technology  
Gaithersburg, MD*

*Prepared by*

*National Conference of States on Building  
Codes and Standards, Inc.  
505 Huntmar Park Drive, Suite 210  
Herndon, Virginia 20170*

November 1997

# **STREAMLINING THE NATION'S BUILDING REGULATORY PROCESS**

## **1997 ANNUAL REPORT**

### **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

ABSTRACT.....	ii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	iii
1) INTRODUCTION.....	1
2) ORIGINS AND GOALS OF THE PROJECT .....	2
3) PROJECT STRATEGY AND STRUCTURE .....	3
4) DEVELOPMENT OF MODEL REVIEW PROCESSES.....	4
5) FIRST YEAR ACCOMPLISHMENTS/MEETINGS.....	5
A) Monthly Meetings.....	5
B) Task Group Meetings.....	7
C) Regulatory Affairs Committee (RAC) Meetings.....	7
D) National Project Review Committee (NPRC) Meetings .....	8
6) MILESTONES .....	11
7) SUMMARY.....	11
8) SUMMARY OF NEXT STEPS .....	13
ATTACHMENTS	
A) Program/Model Status	
B) Programs Forwarded to Task Groups (By Regulatory Area)	
C) Executive Summaries	
D) RAC Model Evaluation	

## ABSTRACT

This report describes the progress made during the first year of the *Streamlining the Nation's Building Regulatory Process* Project, conceived and initiated by the National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards, Inc., (NCSBCS) with the assistance of fifty-five national partners and funding from federal agencies and in-kind services. Assisting NCSBCS in the conduct of this project is the Council of State and Community Development Agencies (COSCDA). This report includes executive summaries of more than forty case studies of improved regulatory processes and administrative tools submitted by various jurisdictions across the United States. The report also includes a summary of "next steps," in the project which are proposed project deliverables during the second year of this initiative.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY  
ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT FOR  
STREAMLINING THE NATION'S BUILDING REGULATORY PROCESS PROJECT**

This report describes the progress made during the first year of the *Streamlining the Nation's Building Regulatory Process* Project, conceived and initiated by the National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards, Inc., (NCSBCS) with the assistance of fifty-five national partners and funding from federal agencies and in-kind services. Assisting NCSBCS in the conduct of this project is the Council of State and Community Development Agencies (COSCDA).

The objective of the Streamlining Project is to bring better management practices to the regulation of the siting, design, and construction of all types of buildings throughout the United States thus reducing or eliminating regulatory conditions in many jurisdictions which create barriers to safe, affordable, and environmentally sound construction.

This project involves the identification, development, adoption and use by federal, state, regional, and local jurisdictions of model streamlined administrative rules, regulations, and procedures which eliminate areas of existing regulatory overlap, duplication, or other inefficiencies. The project also will identify model streamlined processes where no such processes currently exist.

During the first year of project covered in this report, NCSBCS:

- ◆ identified and assembled this initiative's fifty-four national partners;
- ◆ developed, tested, and finalized the process and procedures through which model processes are identified, reviewed and approved for national dissemination.

Executive summaries of models currently available for national release are available through the NCSBCS Website: [www.NCSBCS.org](http://www.NCSBCS.org)

This report includes executive summaries of more than forty case studies of improved regulatory processes and administrative tools submitted by various jurisdictions across the United States. The report also includes a summary of "next steps," in the project which are proposed project deliverables during the second year of this initiative.

# **STREAMLINING THE NATION'S BUILDING REGULATORY PROCESS 1997 ANNUAL REPORT**

## **1) INTRODUCTION**

NCSBCS has joined together NIST and fifty-five national public and private sector organizations and federal agencies in a five-year initiative to "Streamline the Nation's Building Regulatory Process."

The project's objective is to enhance economic development, public safety, and environmental quality by bringing better management practices to the regulation of siting, design, and construction of all types of buildings throughout the United States. Regulatory conditions in many jurisdictions today create barriers to safe, affordable, and environmentally sound construction. The consortium will fulfill the project's objectives by identifying, developing, and gaining the adoption and use by federal, state, regional, and local jurisdictions of model streamlined administrative procedures, processes, rules, and regulations that will eliminate existing areas of regulatory overlap and inefficiencies.

The National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards, Inc. (NCSBCS) represents the building code and public safety concerns of the nation's governors, and supports national initiatives to make government more efficient and effective. The Streamlining Project grew out of discussion between NCSBCS and officials of the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), the Department of Commerce's National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), and the National Partners in Homeownership Initiative. Initiated in September 1996, the Streamlining Project completed its organizational and process development phase in its first year.

During its first year, the non-partisan project received national attention from both Congress and the White House. President Clinton and Vice President Gore have referred to the project in several national forums and the initiative was described in the President's biannual Office of Science and Technology Report to Congress, "Science and Technology - Shaping the Twenty-first Century."



## **2) ORIGINS AND GOALS OF THE PROJECT**

For far too long public safety, economic development, and home ownership have been hindered by regulatory overlap, duplication, and unnecessary delays. Many delays come from processing construction regulations, ranging from zoning and land use permits to inspections and issuance of certificates of occupancy. Timing, safety, and cost problems are a natural result of the coexistence of over 40,000 independent political jurisdictions adopting and enforcing laws regulating construction.

In late 1995, NCSBCS approached several federal agencies, associations representing state and local governments, and various segments of the nation's construction industry to determine their interest in forming a partnership to identify and eliminate regulatory duplication. In September 1996, with encouragement and support from the National Governor's Association (NGA), Council of State Governments (CSG), U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National Association of Counties, the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), and several other federal agencies and private sector organizations, NCSBCS and its sister organization, the Council of State Community Development Agencies (COSCDA), launched a multi-year project to "streamline the nation's building regulatory system".

The project covers all types of construction (commercial, industrial, manufacturing, institutional, and residential) regulated at every level of government (federal, state, regional, and local). The initiative is currently comprised of over fifty-five organizations representing each level of government and various private and public sector interests.

In support of the mission, the goals are to achieve the following by the year 2000:

1. To provide a package of model reforms and implementation strategy, which, when adopted by federal, state, regional, or local governments, will reduce by as much as 60 percent the amount of regulatory processing time it takes to move construction projects from the initial step of issuance of certificate of occupancy.
2. To have at least one jurisdiction in each state adopt a streamlined model process.
3. To establish a mechanism to identify, address, and eliminate areas of regulatory overlap and duplication between federal, state, regional, and local levels of government in areas of public safety in buildings and environmental protection.
4. Where the package of reforms is adopted, governments would lower the cost of their regulations and increase the quality of their services in the regulation of the siting, design, and construction of buildings.

5. To achieve substantial elimination of regulatory barriers to market aggregation and the use of innovative construction technologies and products, thus enhancing the overall international competitiveness of the U.S. construction industry.
6. To support the fulfillment of the goals of the National Partners in Home ownership Initiative and the National Science and Technology Council's Construction Technology Goals.

### **3) PROJECT STRATEGY AND STRUCTURE**

The mission and its goals will be fulfilled by three working groups that NCSBCS and its partners have assembled. The groups are comprised of individuals and organizations representing governmental agencies and the construction industry. These groups are:

1. Twelve model review Task Groups (corresponding to the Regulatory Areas listed in Attachment B) and the COSCDA Housing Committee. Prior to sending the case studies to the Task Groups, NCSBCS screens all programs submitted by the various jurisdictions and organizations to ensure only potentially viable case studies are forwarded.
2. The NCSBCS Regulatory Affairs Committee (RAC) acts as a coordinating body for each of the case studies/models, once they are forwarded by the Task Groups and COSCDA. When the case studies are received, the RAC is charged with deciding whether to forward them as stand alone models, to combine them with other case studies to be forwarded as a single model, or to put them on hold for future consideration. The RAC is less technically oriented than the Task Groups, taking a broader perspective of the streamlining process.
3. A consensus-based National Project Review Committee (NPRC) that assists in gaining the adoption and implementation of the draft models developed by NCSBCS and COSCDA task groups and committees. The NPRC members closely reflect the makeup of the stakeholders targeted by the project. The intent is to facilitate efficiently the dissemination, adoption, and implementation of models selected through the streamlining project processes to as many organizations/agencies as possible throughout the country.

In its first phase, the project assembles existing case studies that streamline the building regulatory process. In doing so, areas are identified where existing models need to be modified or where new models could be developed to help governments increase the efficiency of their regulatory systems.

The resultant models are then reviewed by the National Project Review Committee, which develops strategies designed to get the resultant models adopted and implemented across the

nation. The National Project Review committee also offers recommendations as to what other models might be developed to achieve the objectives of the projects.

#### **4) DEVELOPMENT OF MODEL REVIEW PROCESSES**

Based upon feedback from the December 12, 1996 organizational meeting of the National Project Review Committee, the first trial run of the model development process took place during the Task Group, RAC, and NPRC meetings, held on April 23 and 24, 1997. These meetings were used to initiate a test run of the Streamlining Project model review process. This proved to be extremely useful not only in familiarizing the participants with the process, but also in exposing potential flaws with the proposed procedures. With this experience, the NCSBCS staff, with direction from the monthly steering committee meeting participants, are able to adjust the forms and procedures into a more effective format.

The next round of Task Group and RAC meetings took place approximately six months later. In preparation for these meetings, NCSBCS staff continued to solicit potential models from building construction agencies and organizations across the country and at all levels of government. Between April and August nearly seventy additional programs were submitted. Upon receipt, significant information identifying and describing each program was recorded into a database.

Once the potential model programs were received, NCSBCS staff reviewed each one in its entirety in a thorough screening process. Twenty-eight of the originally submitted programs were deemed appropriate enough to be forwarded to the Task Groups for further consideration as potential models (once a program is sent to the Task Group members, it is defined as a "Case Study"). The programs that were not forwarded to the Task Groups were, in most cases, held over because of insufficient information. Letters have been sent to each of these organizations clarifying what additional information will be required from them to present their program as an appropriate Case Study.

Accompanying each Case Study sent to the Task Group members were a Screening form and an Executive Summary. The Summaries, completed by the NCSBCS staff, are designed to give an overview of each program. All of the Case Studies were delivered to the Task Group members on July 30, 1997. Providing materials more than a month prior to their meeting allowed Task Group members ample time for review, enabling them to be well prepared to send what they deemed appropriate Case Studies to the RAC as potential Streamlining Models.

To ensure further effective Task Group meetings, NCSBCS organized meetings with the chairs of each Task Group. This helped to clarify group members' roles in the meetings as well as to help further specify the goals of each group and what they should and should not try to accomplish before and during the work sessions.

The actual Task Group meetings held on September 8th and 9th, 1997 resulted in twenty-one of the twenty-eight case studies reviewed being approved by the groups to be forwarded to the next level of the Regulatory Affairs Committee. During the meetings, the Task Groups (representing each of the building code Regulatory Areas) completed detailed Task Group Case Study Evaluation forms. These forms provided information and recommendations necessary for the RAC to evaluate effectively the Case Studies while reviewing them with a broader perspective than that used by the more technically oriented Task Groups.

The Case Study Evaluation forms, as well as all other information deemed pertinent to the RAC review, were organized by NCSBCS staff and distributed to all the RAC participants three weeks prior to the RAC meeting on October 8, 1997. During the meeting, the RAC determined that eleven of the submitted case studies were ready to be forwarded as Models to the National Project Review Committee. All of the organizations who submitted programs/case studies not forwarded by either the Task Groups or the RAC were informed of the decision and given the option to resubmit in the future, provided they include additional information to make their program more appropriate for the Streamlining project.

Finally, on November 6, 1997 the first National Project Review Committee meeting was held to develop strategies for the adoption and use of the eleven models forwarded by the RAC. During this meeting time was spent clarifying the role of the committee and its participants. Five of the eleven models were reviewed and draft implementation strategies were developed. In addition at this meeting, revisions were made in the proposed strategy development worksheets, which will be used throughout the remainder of this project.

## **5) FIRST YEAR ACCOMPLISHMENTS/MEETINGS**

### **A) MONTHLY MEETINGS**

On a monthly basis, NCSBCS organized and chaired two different meetings crucial to the progress of the Streamlining Project. The first set of meetings was attended by NCSBCS staff and the Chairperson and Assistant Chairperson of the Regulatory Affairs Committee (RAC). During these sessions, short term and long term project strategies were discussed and planned.

The second set of monthly meetings was for the Streamlining Project's Steering Committee. This group is comprised of representatives from NCSBCS and seven other organizations from both the public and private sectors with an interest in the Streamlining Project. Included among these seven organizations are: the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST); the National Association of Counties; the National Association of Home Builders (NAHB); the U.S. Conference of Mayors; the Council of State Community Development Agencies (COSCDA); and the Building Owners and Managers Association, International (BOMA). Again, project

strategy and organization were the main topics of discussion, generating extremely valuable feedback and information given the different perspectives of the participants.

The Steering Committee held 5 meetings resulting in the following activities:

Meeting - April 7, 1997 - Orientation Meeting

- Identified additional stakeholders necessary to advance the end product.
- Rephrased the mission statement
- Established work direction for the task groups
- Confirmed the problem statement

Meeting - May 13, 1997

- Reinforced the need for staff to refine and strengthen the model process using the recommendations made by the April 24 meeting participants.
- Expanded the model submission form to include a jurisdictional profile.
- Specified the format for executive summaries for each case study.
- Established a fall schedule for the next round of meetings.
- Developed strategies for obtaining case studies and representation by key stakeholders.
- Clarified the wording of the project goals.

Meeting - June 17, 1997

- Reviewed and augmented the project work plan.
- Further enhanced program submission and other project forms.
- Outlined what might be included in a recognition and awards system for those submitting case studies.
- Delineated model implementation issues.

Teleconference Call - July 25, 1997

- Approved the project work plan.
- Identified specific stakeholders to invite to join Steering Committee or NPRC.
- Reviewed case study packets to be sent to task groups before September meetings.
- Approved generic article and news release to publicize project.

Teleconference Call - August 26, 1997

- Reviewed agendas for upcoming meetings of task groups, Regulatory Affairs Committee, and National Project Review Committee.
- Recommended name change of NPRC to reflect more accurately the role of the committee.
- Discussed the elements to be included in the implementation strategies for models.

## **B) TASK GROUP MEETINGS**

The role of the task groups is to conduct a detailed technical review, analysis, and modification of the models submitted, and later to develop models where none currently exist. There are twelve different Task Groups for twelve specific regulatory areas. Each Task Group and the Case Studies reviewed by each are shown in Attachment B. The following two Task Group meetings were held with the resulting activities:

Meeting - April 23, 1997

- Orientation of the project
- Creation of task group mission and problem statements
- Field tested the model review process by evaluating five case studies (Case studies reviewed: Industrialized Buildings Commission, Texas Accessibility Code, Alexandria City, Palm Beach County)
- Recommended revisions to the process.

Meeting - September 8 and 9, 1997

- Reviewed twenty-eight case studies (see Attachments A and B), resulting in twenty-one models being forwarded to Regulatory Affairs Committee.
- COSCDA Regulatory Barrier Subcommittee met via conference call on September 25, 1997, and forwarded 3 models to Regulatory Affairs Committee.

## **C) REGULATORY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE (RAC) MEETINGS**

The role of the RAC is to serve as a coordinating body for each of the models as they emerge from the task groups and COSCDA. The Committee receives the case studies developed by the subject-specific task groups and, where appropriate, coordinates and assembles the task groups' products into the final models. There have been three RAC meetings resulting in the following activities:

Meeting - September 14, 1996

- Introduction to the Streamlining project.
- Orientation of the committee's role in the project.
- Identification of potential Task Group members.
- Solicitation of case studies from the members.
- Preparation for the project organizational meeting.

Meeting - April 23, 1997

- Reviewed work of the task groups and model process.
- Recommended modifications to refine the model process.

- Suggested that the project be extended to cover a longer period of time.
- Encouraged all participants to submit case studies.

Meeting - October 6, 1997

- Assessed the 21 models forwarded to RAC by task groups.
- Developed strategy regarding the regulatory problems the project will solve.
- Coordinated, assembled and prepared 11 models to be forwarded to NPRC.
- Results of the detailed evaluation made on the 21 models are as follows:
- 

#### **D) NATIONAL PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE (NPRC)**

Three NPRC meetings have been held over the past year resulting in the following activities:

Meeting - December 12, 1996 - Organizational

- Orientation of the members to the project.
- Attendees endorsed the Streamlining project and NPRC participation.
- Generated a list of 16 regulatory programs they felt the project should address.
- Recommended NPRC be expanded to include a number of other national organizations and governmental agencies.

To accomplish the NPRC's endorsements and recommendations, those attending the December organizational meeting agreed to undertake the following:

1. To disseminate among their organizations/agencies that during the meeting there was a consensus recommending the streamlining project and the NPRC as a needed regulatory reform initiative.
2. There was a commitment made to the project's mission and the National Project Review Committee's initial work assignments by the organizations in attendance. There also was the understanding that the NPRC's structure, roles, timetable, and the project's overall goals would be discussed further in the spring with the committee's expanded membership.
3. It was agreed that the membership on the National Project Review Committee should be expanded to include other associations and governmental agencies that had not signed onto the project or had not received the initial invitation. The attendees agreed to work with NCSBCS and COSCDA to identify and encourage others to join.
4. It was agreed that since additional organizations would be sought for this project, that another work session for the NPRC would be held in Washington, D.C. in the spring.
5. NCSBCS agreed to prepare by December 24 a summary of the December 12 meeting and send it to all of the attendees and organizations that have signed onto this

5. NCSBCS agreed to prepare by December 24 a summary of the December 12 meeting and send it to all of the attendees and organizations that have signed onto this initiative. NCSBCS noted that the summary will include the list of the 16 regulatory reform problem areas generated during the day's session and that all of the program's participants would be asked to review and prioritize those items.
6. The attendees agreed to review and prioritize the problem areas identified, and to add to the list any other problem areas they thought had been overlooked. The attendees further agreed to do the following over the next two months to:
  - a. Review and submit to NCSBCS their comments on the roles of the NPRC and the project's proposed goals, structure, and timetable.
  - b. Review and comment on the two proposed model review forms included by NCSBCS in the NPRC workbooks. These had been distributed to each participating organization at the opening of the December 12 meeting.
7. The attendees agreed to come to the next NPRC meeting prepared to discuss and act on all the items mentioned in item #6 above.
8. The attendees agreed that they would send to NCSBCS by mid-January 1997 complete contact information (name, address, telephone, fax numbers, and e-mail addresses) for their primary and alternate representatives to the National Project Review Committee. NCSBCS agreed that once contact information had been received, NCSBCS would send a contact information list out to all partners to place in their NPRC notebooks (under the tab marked "Participating Organizations").
9. The attendees agreed that between mid-December and the next NPRC meeting that they would go back to their organizations/agencies, seek and then transmit to NCSBCS model administrative processes, procedures, rules, and regulations that they believe should be considered for use in this project.
10. NCSBCS noted that it would establish by mid-January a web-site for this project through which NPRC members could be kept updated on the project and into which information on appropriate streamlining models could be transmitted.
11. It was agreed that in soliciting other organizations/agencies to join in this project that:
  - a. Every effort would be made to clarify the fact that the initiative covers all types of construction: commercial, industrial, manufacturing, and institutional—not just housing; and
  - b. The project encompasses all regulations from initial zoning and land use to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for the building.



12. NCSBCS also noted that by the end of January it would identify six (or seven) organizations/agencies to serve on a steering committee for the project. The committee will include one representative each from the federal, regional, state and local levels of government and two or three associations representing the private sector of the construction industry.

Meeting - April 24, 1997

- Orientation of new members.
  - Introduction of Steering Committee members
  - Reviewed of the process by which the first models were forwarded to NPRC from the Regulatory Affairs Committee and its task groups.
  - Recommended modifications be made to the process as follows:
1. Some modifications need to be made to the four different model submission and review forms used in the project. These changes include:
    - a. The submission form should refer to percentage of savings the model achieves as well as a dollar amount.
    - b. The forms should be better coordinated in their format.
  2. The project's problem list should be expanded by the task groups, NCSBCS, and Council of State Community Development Agency's (COSCDA) staff.
  3. The project's original two-year timeline is too short to produce meaningful reforms and should include additional time for model/case study/best practice development, adoption, and implementation by going from two to four or five years in length.
  4. Additional stakeholders from the environmental, transportation, security, labor, and other groups must be added to the NPRC. Current NPRC members must assist NCSBCS and COSCDA in obtaining representation from these groups.
  5. Several recommendations were made as to how to attract more "models/case studies/best practices." This included all members of NPRC linking their homepages to the NCSBCS homepage "Streamlining" section and running articles on the project in their publications.
  6. The project is now and must remain bipartisan.
  7. The NPRC concurred with four other recommendations from the NCSBCS RAC.
    - a. Each model/case study/best practice that moves forward through the review process must have a staff-prepared executive summary. NPRC members should also have access to the complete submitted model.

- c. Task group leaders should attend the RAC meetings to serve as a resource to explain the forwarded models.
  - d. Additional staff resources must be made available to seek out “models/case studies/best practices.”
8. The project’s Steering Committee was charged with receiving all the recommendations from the April 23-24 meetings and to take the following actions:
- a. Develop a “draft” implementation plan for the NPRC to consider for adoption at the next meeting;
  - b. Make revisions to all forms and review processes;
  - c. Identify strategy for bringing more “stakeholders” to the NPRC; and
  - d. Transmit results of work in above items a-c to all members of NPRC for their concurrence and written commitment to actively support the fulfillment of these actions for the project.

Meeting - November 6, 1997

- Developed strategy for the implementation and outreach program for models.
- Identified stakeholders.
- Defined NPRC role.
- Suggested modifications to what an executive summary should contain, and information needed from task groups and Regulatory Affairs Committee.
- Established 1998 meeting schedule.

## 6) MILESTONES

- 12/12/96; Introductory NPRC Meeting
- 4/7/97; Steering Committee Meeting
- 4/23/97; Task Group, RAC, and NPRC Meetings
- 5/13/97; Steering Committee Meeting
- 6/17/97; Steering Committee Meeting
- 7/25/97; Steering Committee Meeting via Teleconference Call
- 8/26/97; Steering Committee Meeting via Teleconference Call
- 9/8/97; Task Group Meeting (28 Models Reviewed, 21 Forwarded)
- 10/8/97; RAC Meeting (21 Models Reviewed, 11 Forwarded)
- 11/6/97; NPRC Meeting (5 Models Reviewed)

## 7) SUMMARY

Over the past year the initial goals of the Streamlining project have been met as planned. The organization of the project and its model development processes have been tested and refined so that all committees and participants are clear about their roles. This process includes the soliciting of potential streamlining programs to determine their suitability to the project, and

that all committees and participants are clear about their roles. This process includes the soliciting of potential streamlining programs to determine their suitability to the project, and eventual distribution and adoption of approved models. During the past year, each of these phases were tested and refined to ensure that the programs submitted in following years will be processed with little or no confusion. The year's main achievement, the development and establishment of project procedures, was accomplished as scheduled during this, the first phase of the project.

Approximately one hundred programs were submitted during the year from various organizations at different levels of government. After a thorough review process, eleven of these programs are presently being considered by the National Project Review Committee for adoption and implementation. Now that the program review process has been refined to a point where it efficiently processes streamlining models, one can expect to see many more successfully reach the implementation level. Once achieving this, the Streamlining project objectives of enhancing economic development, public safety, and environmental quality through better management practices of the nation's building regulatory practices should be attained within the projected time frame.

**ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT FOR  
STREAMLINING THE NATION'S BUILDING REGULATORY PROCESS PROJECT**

**SUMMARY OF "NEXT STEPS"  
PROPOSED PROJECT DELIVERABLES FOR YEAR TWO  
-NOVEMBER, 1997 - OCTOBER, 1998 -**

1. Finalization of regulatory areas ultimately to be covered by project and the identification and processing of 200 case studies into 50 streamlined models for national distribution.
2. Expansion of implementation strategy to facilitate adoption and use of model processes, procedures, rules and regulations developed in this project. Gain adoption and use of models by one or more jurisdiction in each state.
3. Identify areas of regulatory overlap, duplication, or inefficiency where no current streamlined models exist and develop process for use in Year 3 of project to begin to develop streamlined national models.

**Projected dates for specific project deliverables:**

- a. January 31, 1998 - Model processes developed during first year of project are released for national use. Executive summaries and text of models also available on Streamline Website through NCSBCS ([www.NCSBCS.org](http://www.NCSBCS.org))
- b. February 15, 1998 - Project Matrix completed and available for use by partners. Matrix defines scope and breadth of project by showing regulatory areas covered by this project and models submitted, under review, or finalized for national distribution.
- c. February 19-20, 1998 - Meeting of the Task Groups to begin to process next round of case studies into models.
- d. April 1-2, 1998 - Meeting of the Regulatory Affairs Committee to process into models the case studies forwarded by task groups. The models will then be forwarded to the National Project Review Committee to develop implementation strategies.
- e. June 4-5, 1998 - Conducting a national symposium on Streamlining the Nation's Building Regulatory Process and the meeting of the National Project Review Committee to develop implementation strategies for each of the models forwarded by the Regulatory Affairs Committee. NPRC effort includes speaking schedule at national meetings of partners organizations/agencies to facilitate national adoption and use of models.

- f. July 15, 1998 - Update of website to include all models developed in Spring round of model development process.
- g. July 31, 1998 - Publication of first streamlining project Guidebook containing executive summaries of all models developed in project and listing of contacts to facilitate adoption and implementation of models. (Guidebook also available on NCSBCS website). Regulatory areas needing streamlining when no current models exist developed and reviewed by task groups.

# **ATTACHMENT A**

## **PROGRAM/MODEL STATUS**

## ***PROGRAMS/MODELS SUBMITTED AND REVIEW DATES***

<b><i>Code</i></b>	<b><i>Title</i></b>	<b><i>City</i></b>	<b><i>State</i></b>	<b><i>Date Rec</i></b>	<b><i>TG Rev</i></b>	<b><i>RAC Rev</i></b>	<b><i>NPRC Rev</i></b>
1	Industrialized Building Commisio				A		
2	Kitsap County	Port Orchard	WA	3/31/97	A		
3	Srtat Reporting of Housing Autho	Maysville	KY	3/31/97	I		
4	Code Enforcement Bureau	Alexandria	VA	3/27/97	9/8/97	10/8/97	
5	Comcheck EZ Code compliance	Washington	DC	4/11/97	9/8/97	10/8/97	11/6/97
6	MECcheck Code compliance	Washington	DC	4/11/97	9/8/97	10/8/97	11/6/97
7	Project Success	Independence	MO	4/10/97	I		
8	PZ&B Permit Center	W. Palm Beach	FL	3/1/97	9/8/97	10/8/97	11/6/97
9	Murray City Building Inspection	Murray City	UT	3/1/97	A		
10	Texas Accessibility Code	Austin	TX	3/1/97	9/8/97	10/8/97	
11	Customer Oriented etc	Fairfax	VA	3/1/97	9/8/97	10/8/97	
12	Permits in 5 Minutes	Sanford	FL	4/11/97	A		
13	Residential Site Improvement St	Trenton	NJ	3/1/97	A		
14	MD Bldg Perf Stds	Annapolis	MD	3/1/97	9/8/97	10/8/97	11/6/97
15	JardinesPaloma Blanca Project	San Jose	CA	3/1/97	I		
16	Dwight Street Homes	Jersey City	NJ	3/1/97	I		
17	Oregon Manuf. Dwelling Std	Salem	OR	4/1/97	A		
18	Customer Assistance Munuf Ho	Salem	OR	4/1/97	A		
19	Oregon Hometrac Data Base	Salem	OR	4/1/97	A		
20	Reciprocal Agreements	Salem	OR	4/1/97	A		
21	Super Good Cents	Salem	OR	4/1/97	A		
22	Repair Operation Cert. Under Q	Salem	OR	4/1/97	A		
23	Chicago Self Cert. Program	Chicago	IL	4/1/97	A		
24	Process 2000 - San Diego	San Diego	CA	4/1/97	9/8/97	10/8/97	
25	MD Bldg & Fire Code Computer	Crownsville	MD	5/1/97	9/8/97	10/8/97	11/6/97
26	Permits in 5 Minutes-Seminole C	Sanford	FL	5/1/97	A		

***Tuesday, December 09, 1997***

***Page 1 of 4***

***A: Additional Information Required***

***I: Inappropriate to Project***

***TG: Task Groups***

***RAC: Regulatory Affairs Committee***

***NPRC: National Project Review Committee***

<i>Code</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>City</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>Date Rec</i>	<i>TG Rev</i>	<i>RAC Rev</i>	<i>NPRC Rev</i>
27	Administration & Enforcement	Trenton	TN	5/23/97	A		
28	Private/Public Partnership for Bld	Ellicott City	MD	5/1/97	9/8/97	10/8/97	11/6/97
29	QA Program - Las Vegas	Las Vegas	NV	5/22/97	A		
30	Permit Issues	Maryland Heights	MO	5/1/97	A		
31	Admin & Enforcement	Wateska	IL	5/1/97	A		
32	Construction Codes - Washingto	Hillsborg	OR	5/1/97	A		
33	In-Plant Prog/Trust Acc- Washin	Hillsborg	OR	5/1/97	9/8/97	10/8/97	11/6/97
34	Automation - Washington Count	Hillsborg	OR	5/1/97	9/8/97	10/8/97	11/6/97
35	Over the Counter Permitting	Las Cruces	NM	5/1/97	A		
36	Streamlining of Forms & Applica	Ridgewood	NJ	5/1/97	A		
37	Automated Code Enforcement in	Big Rapids	MI	5/1/97	A		
38	Case Mngr for Permit Application	Etobicoke	Ont.,	5/1/97	A		
39	Information Kiosk - Branford, CT	Branford	CT	5/1/97	A		
40	Rules & Regs of Arch Access Bo	Boston	MA	5/1/97	9/8/97	10/8/97	
41	Implementation of Bldg Code Gu	LeMars	IA	5/1/97	9/8/97	10/8/97	
42	Bar Codes for Bldg Inspectors	Campbell	CA	5/1/97	9/8/97	10/8/97	11/6/97
43	Permits By Mail	Riverside	CA	5/27/97	9/8/97		
44	Voice Response Auto Insp. Syst	Cedar Park	TX	5/27/97	A		
45	Code Hearing Program	Vernon Hills	IL	5/27/97	9/8/97		
46	Inter Local Agreement	LaPeer	MI	5/27/97	A		
47	Customer Service Program	Vernon Hills	IL	5/27/97	A		
48	Express Services	Raliegh	NC	5/28/97	9/8/97	10/8/97	11/6/97
49	1997 Dallas Development Guide	Dallas	TX	5/30/97	9/8/97	10/8/97	11/6/97
50	Large Bldg Permit Cards	Tuskaloosa	AL	6/2/97	A		
51	Issue Permits by Computer	Mandan	ND	6/3/97	A		
52	Where to Obtain Current Bldg &	Middletown	CT	6/3/97	A		
53	No Information	Huntley	IL	6/3/97	A		
54	HSS/CABO/NFPA Codes Study f	Falls Church	VA	6/4/97	9/8/97	10/8/97	
55	Process Reform	Sacramento	CA	6/6/97	A		

*Tuesday, December 09, 1997*

*Page 2 of 4*

*A: Additional Information Required*

*I: Inappropriate to Project*

*TG: Task Groups*

*RAC: Regulatory Affairs Committee*

*NPRC: National Project Review Committee*



<i>Code</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>City</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>Date Rec</i>	<i>TG Rev</i>	<i>RAC Rev</i>	<i>NPRC Rev</i>
56	Code Enforcement Process	Franklin	NH	6/6/97	A		
57	Educ of Bldg Inspectors in Utah	West Jordan	UT	6/9/97	9/8/97		
58	Bldg Permits Auto Storage	Martinsburg	WV	6/9/97	A		
59	Automation of Permits/Insp	Aurora	CO	6/9/97	9/8/97		
60	Better Comm. Between Boeing	Seattle	WA	6/9/97	A		
61	Customized Plan Review & Per	Phoenix	AZ	6/9/97	9/8/97	10/8/97	
62	Privatization of Bldg Reg Proces	Melbourne	Aus	6/10/97	A		
63	Bldg Permit Automation	Rock Island	IL	6/9/97	A		
64	Bldg Processing Streamlining	Irvine	CA	6/17/97	A		
65	Compr Land Use & Zoning	Edwardsville	KS	6/17/97	I		
66	Designated Campus Fire Marsha	Oakland	CA	6/17/97	A		
67	Proper Tribal Land Insp for Cons	Suttons Bay	MI	6/20/97	A		
68	Expedited Plan Processing	Fairfax	VA	6/24/97	9/8/97	10/8/97	
69	Elec Util Serv Entr Req Manual	Ben Lomond	CA	6/25/97	9/8/97		
70	Reduction of Costs for Fire Sprin	Highland	CA	6/27/97	A		
71	Castille-Perry Intermunicipal Coo	Perry	NY	6/30/97	A		
72	Bangor Gas Works/Shaw's Supe	Bangor	ME	7/7/97	I		
73	Visual Presentation of Code Req	El Segundo	CA	7/15/97	A		
74	Econ Dev Ation Team (EDAT)	Fullerton	CA	7/15/97	9/8/97	10/8/97	
75	Residential Wall Sections	Zanesville	OH	7/21/97	A		
76	Residential Pole Building Design	Zanesville	OH	7/21/97	A		
77	Utah Affordable Housing Plannin	Salt Lake City	UT	7/28/97	9/8/97		
78	Lead Poisoning Prev.	Poplar Bluff	MO	8/20/97			
79	Minor Subdiv. Process	Silver Spring	MD	8/26/97			
80	Expedited Envir. RFP Process	Alpine County	CA	8/26/97			
81	City of Springfield Coop. Permitti	Springfield	MO	9/17/97			
82	Deerfield Beach Public Safety Im	Deerfield Beach	FL	9/17/97			
83	Dev. Review:Regulatory Reform	Bellevue	WA	9/24/97			
84	Oceanside Dev. Perm. Streamlin	Oceanside	CA	9/29/97			

*Tuesday, December 09, 1997*

*Page 3 of 4*

***A: Additional Information Required***

***I: Inappropriate to Project***

***TG: Task Groups***

***RAC: Regulatory Affairs Committee***

***NPRC: National Project Review Committee***

<i>Code</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>City</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>Date Rec</i>	<i>TG Rev</i>	<i>RAC Rev</i>	<i>NPRC Rev</i>
85	Growth Management Planning R	Olympia	WA	10/1/97			
86	Curing Minor Setback Violations	Salem	NH	10/3/97			
87	Plans Management Branch	Kansas City	MO	10/15/97			
88	Rehab, Hist Pres & Demo	Montreal	Que	10/16/97			
89	Accessibility	Montreal	Que	10/16/97			
90	Min. Habitability Stds Enforceme	Montreal	Que	10/23/97			
91	Upgrading of Existing Blds	Montreal	Que	10/23/97			
92	Building Permit Application	Omaha	NE	10/27/97			
93	Building Permits-Town of Cromw	East Berlin	CT	10/27/97			
94	Grand Prairie Planned Dev Sit PI	Grand Prairie	TX	11/4/97			
95	Development Review Process	Portage	MI	11/4/97			
96	Superior Special Area Mgmt Pla	Superior	WI	11/4/97			

---

*Tuesday, December 09, 1997*

*Page 4 of 4*

***A: Additional Information Required***

***I: Inappropriate to Project***

***TG: Task Groups***

***RAC: Regulatory Affairs Committee***

***NPRC: National Project Review Committee***

## **ATTACHMENT B**

### **PROGRAMS FORWARDED TO TASK GROUPS**

## ***ACCESSIBILITY PROGRAMS FORWARDED***

<b><i>Code</i></b>	<b><i>Title</i></b>	<b><i>City</i></b>	<b><i>State</i></b>	<b><i>Govt Level</i></b>	<b><i>Program Focus</i></b>
10	Texas Accessibility Code	Austin	TX	State	State Level Disability Code
40	Rules & Regs of Arch Access Boar	Boston	MA	State	State Level Disability Code

## ***ADMIN, ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS FORWARDED***

<b><i>Code</i></b>	<b><i>Title</i></b>	<b><i>City</i></b>	<b><i>State</i></b>	<b><i>Govt Level</i></b>	<b><i>Program Focus</i></b>
4	Code Enforcement Bureau	Alexandria	VA	Local	Permit Process
8	PZ&B Permit Center	W. Palm Beac	FL	Local	Comprehensive Permit Process
11	Customer Oriented etc	Fairfax	VA	Local	Comprehensive Permit Process
14	MD Bldg Perf Stds	Annapolis	MD	State	Adoption of a State Wide Building Code
24	Process 2000 - San Diego	San Diego	CA	Local	One Stop Automation
28	Private/Public Partnership for Bldg Code Complianc	Ellicott City	MD	Local	Fast Permit Process for Priv. Entity
33	In-Plant Prog/Trust Acc- Washington County	Hillsborg	OR	Local	Fast Permit Process for Priv. Entity
41	Implementation of Bldg Code Guide	LeMars	IA	Local	Code Compliance on Small Projects
42	Bar Codes for Bldg Inspectors	Campbell	CA	Local	Automated Bar Codes for Bldg Inspections
43	Permits By Mail	Riverside	CA	Local	Roofing Permits by Mail
45	Code Hearing Program	Vernon Hills	IL	Local	Code Vilation Notice Procedures
48	Express Services	Raliegh	NC	Local	One Day Plan Review
49	1997 Dallas Development Guide	Dallas	TX	Local	Comprehensive Development Review Process
54	HSS/CABO/NFPA Codes Study for Health Care Fac	Falls Church	VA	Regional	Model Codes' Versions of Life Safety Code
61	Customized Plan Review & Perm App. Process	Phoenix	AZ	Local	Streamlined Plan Review
64	Bldg Processing Streamlining	Irvine	CA	Local	One Stop Permit Process
74	Econ Dev Ation Team (EDAT)	Fullerton	CA	Local	City Planning & Bldg Permit Process

## ***AUTOMATION PROGRAMS FORWARDED***

<b><i>Code</i></b>	<b><i>Title</i></b>	<b><i>City</i></b>	<b><i>State</i></b>	<b><i>Govt Level</i></b>	<b><i>Program Focus</i></b>
4	Code Enforcement Bureau	Alexandria	VA	Local	Permit Process
8	PZ&B Permit Center	W. Palm Beach	FL	Local	Comprehensive Permit Process
11	Customer Oriented etc	Fairfax	VA	Local	Comprehensive Permit Process
24	Process 2000 - San Diego	San Diego	CA	Local	One Stop Automation
25	MD Bldg & Fire Code Computer Sys	Crownsville	MD	State	Data Base of State Building Codes
34	Automation - Washington County	Hillsborg	OR	Local	Inspections via Telephone Automation
42	Bar Codes for Bldg Inspectors	Campbell	CA	Local	Automated Bar Codes for Bldg Inspections
59	Automation of Permits/Insp	Aurora	CO	Local	Inspections w/Hand Held Computers

# ***CONSTRUCTION CODES PROGRAMS FORWARDED***

<b><i>Code</i></b>	<b><i>Title</i></b>	<b><i>City</i></b>	<b><i>State</i></b>	<b><i>Govt Level</i></b>	<b><i>Program Focus</i></b>
8	PZ&B Permit Center	W. Palm Beach	FL	Local	Comprehensive Permit Process
14	MD Bldg Perf Stds	Annapolis	MD	State	Adoption of a State Wide Building Code
28	Private/Public Partnership for Bldg Code Complianc	Ellicott City	MD	Local	Fast Permit Process for Priv. Entity
41	Implementation of Bldg Code Guide	LeMars	IA	Local	Code Compliance on Small Projects
54	HSS/CABO/NFPA Codes Study for Health Care Fac	Falls Church	VA	Regional	Model Codes' Versions of Life Safety Code
69	Elec Util Serv Entr Req Manual	Ben Lomond	CA	Regional	Uniform Requirements for Elec Utilities

## ***EDUC/CERT PROGRAMS FORWARDED***

<b><i>Code</i></b>	<b><i>Title</i></b>	<b><i>City</i></b>	<b><i>State</i></b>	<b><i>Govt Level</i></b>	<b><i>Program Focus</i></b>
57	Educ of Bldg Inspectors in Utah	West Jordan	UT	State	Education&Cert. Program for Inspectors
68	Expedited Plan Processing	Fairfax	VA	Local	Education/Certification/Plan Review



## ***ENERGY PROGRAMS FORWARDED***

<b><i>Code</i></b>	<b><i>Title</i></b>	<b><i>City</i></b>	<b><i>State</i></b>	<b><i>Govt Level</i></b>	<b><i>Program Focus</i></b>
5	Comcheck EZ Code compliance	Washington	DC	Federal	Envelope, Mech., Lghtg Compliance Guide
6	MECcheck Code compliance	Washington	DC	Federal	Model Energy Code

## ***ENVIRONMENTAL, FLOOD PLAIN PROGRAMS FORWARDED***

<b><i>Code</i></b>	<b><i>Title</i></b>	<b><i>City</i></b>	<b><i>State</i></b>	<b><i>Govt Level</i></b>	<b><i>Program Focus</i></b>
8	PZ&B Permit Center	W. Palm Beach	FL	Local	Comprehensive Permit Process
49	1997 Dallas Development Guide	Dallas	TX	Local	Comprehensive Development Review Process

## ***HEALTH PROGRAMS FORWARDED***

<b><i>Code</i></b>	<b><i>Title</i></b>	<b><i>City</i></b>	<b><i>State</i></b>	<b><i>Govt Level</i></b>	<b><i>Program Focus</i></b>
8	PZ&B Permit Center	W. Palm Beach	FL	Local	Comprehensive Permit Process
54	HSS/CABO/NFPA Codes Study for Health Care F	Falls Church	VA	Regional	Model Codes' Versions of Life Safety Code

## ***INFRASTRUCTURE AND FEES PROGRAMS FORWARDED***

<b><i>Code</i></b>	<b><i>Title</i></b>	<b><i>City</i></b>	<b><i>State</i></b>	<b><i>Govt Level</i></b>	<b><i>Program Focus</i></b>
8	PZ&B Permit Center	W. Palm Beach	FL	Local	Comprehensive Permit Process
33	In-Plant Prog/Trust Acc- Washington County	Hillsborg	OR	Local	Fast Permit Process for Priv. Entity
49	1997 Dallas Development Guide	Dallas	TX	Local	Comprehensive Development Review Process

## ***LAND USE, ZONING PROGRAMS FORWARDED***

<b><i>Code</i></b>	<b><i>Title</i></b>	<b><i>City</i></b>	<b><i>State</i></b>	<b><i>Govt Level</i></b>	<b><i>Program Focus</i></b>
8	PZ&B Permit Center	W. Palm Beach	FL	Local	Comprehensive Permit Process
11	Customer Oriented etc	Fairfax	VA	Local	Comprehensive Permit Process
49	1997 Dallas Development Guide	Dallas	TX	Local	Comprehensive Development Review Process
77	Utah Affordable Housing Planning	Salt Lake City	UT	State	Zoning & Affordable Housing

## ***REHAB, HIST PRESERVATION, DEMO PROGRAMS FORWARDED***

<b><i>Code</i></b>	<b><i>Title</i></b>	<b><i>City</i></b>	<b><i>State</i></b>	<b><i>Govt Level</i></b>	<b><i>Program Focus</i></b>
49	1997 Dallas Development Guide	Dallas	TX	Local	Comprehensive Development Review Process

## **ATTACHMENT C**

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARIES**

**CASE STUDY #02**  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**(REVISED)**

**KITSAP COUNTY BUILDING PERMIT PROCESS**

The two major aspects of this program fall within the Administration & Enforcement and Land Use & Zoning regulatory areas. The Administration & Enforcement section is essentially a one stop building permit process and makes up the bulk of the submittal.

Included in the single stop permitting program are five pages of flow charts. These should have some accompanying information to clarify the processes they are depicting. Some of the time estimates for the different flow chart (such as 68 days for site Plan approval) do not appear to be within the overall goals of the Streamlining project.

Following the flowcharts are several pages of "Guidelines" which clearly layout the requirements for the building permit application forms. However, it also states that separate applications and permits are required from other agencies. Among these are Energy, Environmental, Public Works, Electrical permit (from the Department of Labor and Industries), Health District, and Sewer & Water. Further information from Kitsap County would be helpful in clarifying several concerns about the program.

Also submitted by Kitsap County is information regarding a Geographic Information System (GIS) for maps that are required for each permit application. An example of GIS is given at the end of the original program submittal, and is further described on page 3 of the fax dated 3/31/97. This system could be adapted as part of an Automation, an Administration, or a Land Use & Zoning model.



**CASE STUDY # 04**  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**(REVISED)**

**CODE ENFORCEMENT BUREAU - CITY OF ALEXANDRIA**

This case study centers around a Task Force Report commissioned in 1992 by the City of Alexandria due to broad dissatisfaction with the existing building permit and building code enforcement procedures. The primary goal of the Report was to submit recommendations for improving the City's Code Enforcement Bureau. The case study can be broken down into the following parts (though they are not presented in the same order shown below):

- 1) A memorandum, dated 3/6/92, officially establishing the Task Force and outlining its objectives.
- 2) The actual Task Force Report.
- 3) A memorandum, dated 3/11/93, listing the changes in the Code Enforcement Bureau since the receipt of the Task Force Report (This memorandum immediately follows the Task Force Report).
- 4) A one page guide of a "One Stop Shop For Tenant Improvements" program, dated in 1996.

The Task Force Report gives a well organized review of the Bureau's existing conditions and problems. It then continues with seven pages of recommendations, including numerous ways to streamline the existing processes.

The Report is immediately followed by the City of Alexandria Memorandum dated March 11, 1993. This details the changes in the City's code enforcement since the submission of the Report. The changes are broken down into the categories of Administration, Plans Review, and Inspections. There are also City Wide Initiatives which include an Internal Permit Process Committee, comprised of representatives of all departments involved in code enforcement, that meets quarterly in an effort to continue to improve the coordination and streamlining of the City's building permit process. Increasing the use of automated systems such as telephone answering systems, fax machines, and computerization for processing and tracking permits and inspections is also stressed.

Also included in the case study is the "One Stop Shop For Tenant Improvements" program. This gives members of the business community with small tenant improvement projects the opportunity to have their permit (if submitted properly ) approved within a forty-five minute time frame.

It has been reported that most of the implemented reforms have proved successful in saving time and monies. However no documentation depicting these improvements has yet been submitted. Overall there are numerous positive streamlining suggestions contained in the Code Enforcement Bureau case study that could be implemented in other local level jurisdictions either individually or as a group.

**CASE STUDY # 05**  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**(REVISED)**

**COMcheck-EZ, Compliance Guidelines - US Dept. Of Energy**

This case study is a compliance tool created by the Department of Energy to assist builders in demonstrating compliance with energy codes. The package includes both a manual and a DOS-based software program that address three areas of code compliance: (1) Envelope, (2) Mechanical, and (3) Lighting. The manual includes guides to assist builders in navigating the code compliance process. Also provided in the manual are several attachments including a Field Inspection Checklist, Climate Maps of all 50 US states, and "Prescriptive Packages" containing tables for determining insulation requirements, etc.

The software goes one step further, allowing the user to input their building location to the city level, and displaying compliance information keyed to that jurisdiction. Users can also take advantage of the program's tables and arithmetic functions in assembling their own personalized compliance packages. The program and its updates can be obtained from the Department of Energy's special web site, [www.energycodes.org](http://www.energycodes.org).

COMcheck-EZ proclaims to meet or exceed requirements set forth by ASHRAE/IES. It is meant for use by architects, engineers, designers, contractors, plans reviewers, inspectors, and building officials. It appears to be both comprehensive and user friendly. When used for projects involving simple buildings, no additional resources or reference books are necessary. A drawback of the system is that it currently applies only to simple or small commercial buildings.

**CASE STUDY # 06**  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**(REVISED)**

***MECcheck* Code Compliance**  
**Materials & Software**

The Model Energy Code (MEC) was originally designed by the Department of Energy (DOE) and is maintained by the Council of American Building Officials (CABO). The materials submitted with this Executive Summary were designed to help the user comply with the MEC. The MEC contains energy related building requirements applicable to many new U.S. residences. The main focus of the MEC are the provisions dealing with building envelope insulation and window requirements as well as heating and cooling systems, water heating systems, and air leakage. Presently the code is being enforced by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the Rural Economic and Community Development (RECD), and several states.

Included in the submitted package are:

- 1) The *MECcheck* Manual, which gives an overview of the entire line of *MECcheck* materials including forms to facilitate the compliance process. Chapters 6 and 7 are specifically geared toward building department and enforcement personnel.
- 2) The *MECcheck* Prescriptive Packages, which gives detailed directions on using the prescriptive package approach. This includes all 50 state maps with climate zones and corresponding insulation requirement tables.
- 3) The *MECcheck* software and software user's guide. The software was designed to quickly determine compliance for a particular building.
- 4) Three examples of legislation from states that have, or are in the midst of, adopting the MEC (attached to the Program Submission Form).

The MEC is a very detailed and comprehensive code. The materials included in this package help clarify the implementation and enforcement of the code. The *MECcheck* Manual is particularly well organized and descriptive. Included here are the basic energy requirements for residential buildings, and the three different compliance approaches (Prescriptive Package, Trade-Off, and Software). Not only is each Approach described, but each is also compared with the pros and cons of others, as well as discussing how each is best applied.

It appears that the MEC could be adopted effectively at most levels throughout the US. If such a program could be adopted on a large scale, the benefits of such uniformity should be considerable. According to the DOE when implemented, the code could save the federal government approximately \$1,000,000 a year in operating costs alone. The requirements in the MEC have been determined technologically feasible and justified economically and ecologically.

**CASE STUDY # 08**  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**(REVISED)**

**PALM BEACH COUNTY (Unincorporated Area) PERMIT CENTER**

In order to simplify the building permitting process for both the users and the Palm Beach government, the Planning, Zoning and Building (PZ&B) Department Permit Center (see attached Users Guide) was created in 1995. The Permit Center allows building permit applicants to submit required forms at a centralized permitting location, thereby eliminating multi-stop visits and reducing application paperwork needed to be submitted to each reviewing agency. This case study was created as a joint effort including the Palm Beach PZ&B Administrative Consultants and several evaluation committees comprised of local regulators and industry representatives.

The Palm Beach County Permit Center case study is a "One Stop" centralized program. The main strengths of this case study include the following: (1) the identification of all regulatory agencies involved in the Building Permit Process, (2) the establishment of a comprehensive application submission checklist for all categories of building occupancy and construction types, (3) the establishment of the processes for routing and coordinating all affected agency reviews and approvals, and (4) the establishment of responsibilities for inter-agency coordination and documentation for the issuance of building permits.

One of the major accomplishments of this case study was to bring all the agencies involved in the Palm Beach building permitting process together physically under one roof (or at least the roof next door). The agencies involved include: Addressing; Building; Business and Professional Regulations; Environmental Resources Management; Fire Rescue; Health Unit; Land Development; Landscaping; and Zoning.

The centralized Permit Center allows for concurrent review in which regulatory agencies process only applicable portions of a permit application necessary for approval. The Permit Center coordinates, distributes, routes, and re-consolidates application packages when the permit is ready for issuance.

The process includes the self certification of the permit package by the user. If done properly this can save a considerable amount of time for all involved parties. However, if part of the package is missing or done incorrectly the County Administrators have found that several long, inconvenient delays can be experienced.

The most significant tool of the Permit Center is the Application Matrix. This is provided in Appendix C of the Users Guide and explained on pages 66-67. The Application Matrix is a checklist of requirements of the separate permit types that must be included in all permit applications. This process can begin only after all required platting or rezoning approvals have been secured. Following page 67 there are 10 pages of tables where an applicant can determine which

Type of construction their project is, the submittal requirements, and approximately how long the permit process should take. Immediately following these are the required detailed Checklists for each type of construction, as determined in the previous tables.

Although the case study is very detailed, it is difficult and imposing for a first time user or a home owner. Someone new to this process may need several hours to understand and appreciate the Permit Center case study.

Besides Administration and Enforcement, other Regulatory Areas included within the Palm Beach County submission, and can be found on the pages shown below:

- Automation, pgs. 43-45
- Construction Codes, Appendix C (Permit Checklists)
- Environmental & Flood, pgs. 19-28, 31-37
- Health, pgs. 14-18
- Infrastructure & Impact Fees, pgs. 46-64(Appendix A)
- Land Use & Zoning, pgs. 38-42

***CASE STUDY # 09***  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**(REVISED)**

**MURRAY CITY, UTAH BUILDING INSPECTION POLICIES**

This case study is comprised mostly of the forms utilized by the Murray City, Utah Building Inspection Division. A list of each form is provided on the cover letter from Anne von Weller, CBO, dated March 26, 1997.

The building permit process in Murray City is "one stop" in that the customer only has to submit a complete set of stamped plans and permit application at one location, Public Works. From Public Works the plans will be circulated to any other departments from whom approval is required.

The remainder of the forms and checklists cover the requirements for any building project in Murray City. Most of these forms are very detailed, self explanatory and are fairly typical of most building departments. Several of these could be considered as potential models either individually or with others.

Also included with the package of forms is the Insurance Services Office (ISO) questionnaire, filled out for Murray City. This supplies a great deal of background data about the jurisdiction including statistics regarding the building department.

**CASE STUDY #010**  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**(REVISED)**

**TEXAS ACCESSIBILITY CODE**

In September of 1996 the US Department of Justice certified the Texas Accessibility Standards (TAS) as meeting or exceeding the Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG). As a result, any building or construction project that complied with the Texas statute would also be in compliance with the ADAAG. Any modifications or waivers to the Texas code would not be considered in compliance with the ADAAG.

Local Texas jurisdictions are not required to adopt the TAS so several different accessibility standards (such as; ANSI, or the three model codes) are presently being enforced at the local level. Problems arise because of lack of uniformity and occasional noncompliance with the ADAAG and the TAS. Ideally every local jurisdiction would adopt a single form of the ADAAG, thereby ensuring uniformity of enforcement. This would benefit all involved agencies and constituents. As it exists, the statewide code eliminates the federal level and can more stringently and efficiently enforce the standards.

The fact that the Justice Department approved the Texas Accessibility Code is a strong indication that the code is thorough and well detailed. The standards are closely based on the ADAAG. Italics indicate a variation from the ADAAG. Within the case study, prior to the actual accessibility standards, are two short sections (both are entitled "Architectural Barriers") which describe the state level management of the code. The first article is a Texas Civil Statute; the second is the Administrative Rules of the Texas Department of Licensing and Regulation. These define and refer to different administrative entities and functions.

The state of New Mexico has adopted a similar version of the TAS, and Nevada is also considering adopting it in the near future.

***CASE STUDY # 011a***  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**(REVISED)**

**FAIRFAX COUNTY RESIDENTIAL INSPECTION PROGRAM**

During accelerated construction activity in the 1980's, the Fairfax County Department of Environmental Management (DEM) received a mandate from the local governing body and the construction industry to improve the building construction inspection program:

- (1) By ensuring high quality code enforcement through increased inspection time,
- (2) By performing all inspections on the day requested, and
- (3) By implementing a cost-effective program.

Moreover, the sheer volume of construction in the burgeoning 400-square-mile urban county compelled a change in operations. During the 1980's the average annual value of construction was \$1.5 billion; average annual building inspections, 340,000; average annual permits, 30,000. It was not unusual for an inspector to carry a workload of 50 inspections per day. County inspectors spent a disproportionate amount of time driving between inspection sites versus actually performing inspections because inspectors from each of the four disciplines (building, electrical, mechanical and plumbing) had to visit each site numerous times. If multiple inspections could be performed on a single visit, significant savings in travel time and money could result, and increased time would be available for inspections.

DEM developed a program to replace single-discipline inspections of the four trades with multiple-discipline inspections. The combination inspection program was implemented incrementally using positions vacated by attrition, and involved the design and conduct of an intensive, six-month cross-training program leading to national certification of single-discipline inspectors in all four trades. Inspectors who receive the required certifications are promoted. Initial classroom training is performed by a contractor. Continuing training is provided through DEM's state-accredited training center. An enhanced computer system separates combination from conventional inspection requests, groups requests by geographic grid, and bundles inspections. Quantifiable results include a decrease in mileage, an increase in inspection time, and a reduction in rejected inspection and homeowner complaints. Over 95 percent of all inspections requested are performed on the day the request is made. If the County were to provide the same level of service with single trade inspectors over a twelve-year period, it would have to expend an additional 12 million dollars.

There are currently 31 cross-trained inspectors on staff. Recently the program was expanded and enhanced. Residential inspectors who obtained certifications in all commercial trade inspection disciplines expanded their inspections responsibility. Residential inspection staff now inspect woodframe multi-family construction. This expansion of responsibility has allowed the Division to better balance its workload. Now, when residential inspection workloads are low and commercial workloads are high, the multi-family projects can be performed by residential staff or single trade commercial inspection staff.



To further enhance customer service, residential inspectors and supervisors are evaluating an enhanced work schedule. Approximately half of the inspection staff volunteered to work a 4 day a week 10 hour a day rotating schedule. Others in the branch continued to work on the 8 hour per day 5 days week schedule. This enhanced work schedule created expanded field coverage and resulted in a reduction in overtime worked, leave taken, and an increased inspection time.

The results of the enhanced work schedule have improved inspection services to our customers. Flexible work schedules prove to have positive impact on the quality of life for staff at no additional costs to the County or its citizens.

**CASE STUDY # 011b**  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**(REVISED)**

**CODE ENFORCEMENT THROUGH TRAINING (CETT)**

A municipality has a responsibility to regulate construction through code enforcement, meaning that government employees review plans and inspect the resulting construction. When deficiencies are observed, they are corrected by the designer or builder and reinspected for compliance. This process, while effective, costs both the city and the builder time and money. Both parties seek code compliance and will benefit if the road to such compliance is efficient. Fairfax County implemented the CETT program, which focused on code compliance through education, outreach, and training of the design and construction community. It is intended to improve the quality of the plans submitted and the structures constructed without relying on the old "reject and correct" method.

CETT involves three elements: (1) industry briefings, (2) printed brief sheets, and (3) formal training. Industry briefings are conducted by County staff bimonthly. The meetings are advertised widely among builders, owners, designers, material suppliers and private inspectors. These meetings are used to introduce code requirements, explain recent code interpretations, disseminate evaluation reports and discuss routine deficiencies or other current issues. Attendees leave with a better understanding of the codes and of how problems are being addressed on other projects.

Printed material takes the form of both informational letters to industry members and handouts covering procedural and technical matters, such as retaining wall or residential deck construction. Handouts are available at the permit application and plan review areas. Informational letters explain code or policy changes and information regarding the acceptability of construction materials.

Formal training of the industry is the most effective element of the CETT outreach program. The County presents training in a classroom environment using adult education techniques and covers new code adoptions, structural design, energy calculations, etc. In the last two years, 425 industry representatives have received almost 2000 hours of training. The training is prepared by the Department of Environmental Management's (DEM) technical experts under the guidance of DEM's own Training Center's staff.

These elements have proven to be the key to code compliance for the construction industry. CETT provides designers and builders with the knowledge and understanding of the codes, where before they relied on a County reviewer or inspector to inspect, reject, and then correct. Plans are approved in less time and projects are completed with fewer delays caused by non-compliance.

Costs involved with this program are associated with the staff time needed to prepare for and present training, prepare written materials and attend briefings. These costs are offset by the staff time no longer used to reinspect deficiencies and re-view plans. CETT is viewed as a proactive and positive approach to code enforcement by the local design and construction professionals. It redefines the role of code enforcement officials from a finder of code deficiencies at the last and worse possible point in a construction time table to a co-partner and valuable resource at the front end of a project.

**CASE STUDY # 011c**  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**(REVISED)**

**TARGETED INFORMATION BROCHURES**

The targeted information brochures are one part of a comprehensive customer service initiative instituted by the Fairfax County Department of Environmental Management (DEM). The initiative also included eliminating unnecessary steps to the permit process, putting a green dot on the permit applications of new customers to alert all review agencies that the customer may not be familiar with County permit procedures, and providing counter staff with customer service training.

When DEM evaluated the most effective way to provide permit information to citizens and the development community, it chose to develop a series of brochures, each of which was targeted to a specific audience. This approach was chosen as an alternative to a single cumbersome book that addressed all aspects of the development process. For example:

- **Homeowners:** Fairfax County has an expanding residential population. Consequently many homeowners apply for permits to build decks, additions and swimming pools, finish basements, enclose carports, etc. To make the permit process as painless as possible for citizens, DEM created specialized brochures describing the documentation required and the procedures to follow to obtain permits and inspections for each type of home improvement project. Several of the brochures include sample plans that the homeowner may use in lieu of preparing their own individualized plans.
- **Businesses:** The County also has a large office and retail sector, resulting in numerous applications for tenant-layout permits. DEM experienced a high plan rejection rate due to incomplete or non-code compliant plans. The department created a brochure describing the building, electrical, mechanical and plumbing components that must be included on tenant-layout plans. It also includes copies of forms required by the Fire Marshal and other County Offices. The brochure is useful for both laymen and professionals who apply for tenant-layout permits.

DEM has also developed a brochure aimed at the commercial building industry entitled "How to Make the Permit, Plan Review and Inspection Process Work for You." The brochure offers hints to help minimize the time spent during the permit application, plan review and inspection phases of construction.

- **Churches and non-profit organizations:** Churches and non-profit groups often utilize volunteers or persons unfamiliar with construction to obtain permits. Frequently, they experience frustration maneuvering through the development process. DEM created a guide to the development process which addresses the

issues that impact many projects initiated by churches and non-profit organizations.

These targeted informational brochures are extraordinarily popular with both homeowners and industry professionals and are available at the Permit Information Counter, through the mail and through the Internet via the DEM Web Page. The brochures are stored on the DEM computer network and can be easily changed to update information or to incorporate code changes upon adoption of a new edition of the Virginia Uniform Statewide Building Code.

The brochures have reduced the time it takes applicant to obtain permits:

- Customers understand the steps in the permit process.
- Customers know what will be required to obtain the permit and will bring the correct information with them.
- Plan review is either eliminated through use of County plan details or reduced because the plans are approved upon the first submission.

The brochures have also reduced staff time expended on educating customers

- Staff spends less time explaining the permit requirements and the permit process to applicants both over the telephone and in person.
- Plan review staff spends less time reviewing plans that are incomplete or non-code compliant.
- Department management spends less time handling complaints from applicants who run into unexpected requirements or delays.

***CASE STUDY # 014***  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**(REVISED)**

**MARYLAND BUILDING PERFORMANCE STANDARDS**

Prior to the adoption of the Maryland Building Performance Standard, each jurisdiction within the state of Maryland was allowed to implement any building code that it chose. Most local jurisdictions adopted several different versions of the Building Officials and Code Administrators International (BOCA) code, while others opted for the Southern Building Code Conference International (SBCCI). This lack of uniformity led to inefficiencies, wasted time and money at all involved levels of government as well as for builders and industry statewide.

To remedy this situation, the Maryland Building Performance Standard requires all state agencies to adopt the same, most recent issue of BOCA. Localities are permitted to make amendments necessary to adjust the code to their special conditions, such as managing historical structures within a historic district. All amendments made to the code are placed into a state managed database, fully accessible to other localities as well as the public at large.

With this code system, a design professional, developer, or contractor would have at their fingertips the exact modifications that any local jurisdiction may have in place, and they would be assured that the code is up to date. Other jurisdictions could compare amendments made by their neighbors for potential implementation in their own localities. For purposes of a case study, this system could be adapted by using a publication, by placing the information on the internet, or by installing the database on an existing information system.

The system saves time and money by creating an instantly accessible resource, and ensures frequent updating and modification by virtue of its shared access to public and private parties. Resultant savings include a reduced number of stop work orders, violation notices, and, most importantly, change orders.

***CASE STUDY # 015***  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**(REVISED)**

**THE JARDINES PALOMA BLANCA PROJECT**

The Jardines Paloma Blanca Project won a NAHRO award for providing 43 handicapped accessible, low income housing units. There was particular stress placed upon making the units accessible to senior citizens.

Although the submission is excellent in describing the overall scope and objectives of the program, additional information would be required detailing the processes and criteria involved in the development and/or construction of the units. Only if this is provided could the program be useful to the Streamlining project.

***CASE STUDY # 023***  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**(REVISED)**

**CITY OF CHICAGO DEPT. OF BUILDINGS - SELF CERTIFICATION PROGRAM**

The goal of this program is to save time and costs in the plan review process by allowing self certified professionals to approve projects under certain conditions. These conditions include prior Department of Buildings approval of an identical building type and project and an absence of life-safety issues.

This type of program could be very effective in the Administration/Enforcement area of many local level building departments. It would save time particularly for the plans review staff as well as the customer. Several of the forms the Department submitted would be useful in setting up a prototype, such as the "Statement For Self-Certification", the "Sample Mason's Letter", and the schedule of permit fees.

However, there appear to be several other required forms, as well as additional information regarding implementation (ie. how the program was put in place) which have not been supplied. Unfortunately, attempts to contact the Department at the furnished telephone number have been unsuccessful.

**CASE STUDY # 024**  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**(REVISED)**

**PROCESS 2000, CUSTOMER SERVICE THROUGH INNOVATIVE PROJECT  
MANAGEMENT AND TECHNOLOGY; CITY OF SAN DIEGO**

The City of San Diego created this program to deal with the regulatory maze that builders faced when initiating new projects. Builders had multiple regulatory levels to navigate, numerous codes and regulations with which to understand and comply, and several unconnected contact points of which to keep track. Often, builders were frustrated by contradictions and inconsistencies in the application of codes, duplication and voids of information, and the lack of a clear method to reach decisions on issues in the process.

Process 2000 addresses the problems of the old system in several ways. There is a single entry point into the system, review teams that handle the different regulatory issues together, information stored on one common computer system, and a Project Manager with decision-making authority. Also, the builder has the opportunity to define their project in a single submission as opposed to filing multiple permits.

The submission is excellent in describing the overall design of the program. This includes a descriptive table outlining the main changes in the system, making clear the improvements that were implemented. It also stresses the concept of the customer having a "project" managed at one location, rather than applying for a series of different permits requiring processing at several different locations.

Evaluation of the system, which was first implemented in 1994, is shown on the final page of the submission and lists very favorable responses to the program from the customers. Costs for the program are detailed, and conditions that would have to exist in order to adopt the program (such as upper management support and financial commitment) are also discussed.

The role of computers is also considered essential for the program to work effectively. There were previously 12 fragmented automation systems in use as opposed to a single system, making all project information easily accessible. Process 2000 utilizes several technologies and software packages, including a Geographic Information System (GIS), imaging, and a sophisticated windows-based client-server project tracking system.

It would be helpful if additional information could be provided by the City of San Diego Development Services to elaborate on how the program is implemented, the different agencies affected, and other pertinent information that would be helpful to jurisdictions wishing to emulate the program. Although this program touches most of the regulatory areas, it is primarily concerned with Administration & Enforcement and Automation (The Automation area is also secondary in this instance, as it is essentially used as a tool to assist the Administration area).



**CASE STUDY # 025**  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**(REVISED)**

**BUILDING AND FIRE CODE COMPUTER SYSTEM**  
**MARYLAND CODES ADMINISTRATION**

This program consists of a database, maintained by the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD), containing Maryland's Building Performance Standards, Building Code, and Fire Prevention Code. Eventually, the database will also include Energy and Electric codes. The database allows anyone involved with building in the state of Maryland to access readily the most recent and prevailing building codes and standards being enforced. This is the same database used in conjunction with case study code # 014, Maryland Building Performance Standards.

Although the most recent BOCA building code has been adopted state-wide by Maryland, modifications to the code can be made at the local level. All of these changes must be reported to the DHCD and placed in the database. If a builder wants to determine whether the codes being enforced in one local jurisdiction have any variations from the codes in another locality, they could find out quickly through the DHCD database.

This database can be used for any application that may have a central information base that must be modified by multiple entities to include the most up-to-date content. The system is also relatively easy to create. It stores information on personal computers instead of a central computer, uses off-the-shelf software packages, and can be accessed with standard modems. The system also uses a modem-accessible bulletin board system for jurisdictions that do not have connections to the internet, enabling users of all types of computer systems to benefit from the package.

The cost of the database is \$180 annually, and is downloaded from DHCD onto the user's computer. The only time one would be required to use a modem for access would be for the original download, to obtain any future updates, or to read and discuss relevant topics via the bulletin board system.

The actual legislation used to enact this program is also attached and should be very helpful to prospective users. To be used as a model, however, specific information would be needed on the software and hardware requirements, costs, and any other additional details needed in the implementation of a similar database.

**CASE STUDY#028**  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**(REVISED)**

**PRIVATE/PUBLIC PARTNERSHIP TO ENSURE BUILDING CODE COMPLIANCE**  
**HOWARD COUNTY (MD), DEPARTMENT OF INSPECTIONS**

This program is a partnership between the local building department and a large private, not-for-profit entity, the Johns Hopkins Applied Physics Laboratory (APL). The partnership, which encompasses the Administration & Enforcement and Construction Codes regulatory areas, was established to save time and money within the permit and building code compliance processes for non-major interior renovation projects involving only the APL. Since these are relatively small projects, only the Department of Inspections is involved, not Zoning, Public Works, or other agencies usually concerned with the regulatory process.

Much of the program is based on procedures followed by the modular construction industry, which incorporates rigorous self-inspection and third-party compliance inspections. To ensure accountability, the county reviews the third-party inspection materials and has the right to conduct unannounced random inspections.

A "Building Code Compliance Assurance Manual" was designed in order to facilitate the quality assurance process. This document is comprised of several sections corresponding to the construction phases of a typical renovation project. This includes; process flow overview, plan review, construction inspection, occupancy inspection, documentation, personnel qualifications, and applicable codes and manuals.

This article is very clear and gives an excellent review of the program. For future consideration, a copy of the "Building Code Compliance Assurance Manual" should be submitted as well as any additional information detailing the procedures involved in implementing the program.

***CASE STUDY # 032***  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**(REVISED)**

**CONSTRUCTION CODES - WASHINGTON COUNTY, OREGON**

This program is a single modification to the local Washington County building code. It makes less restrictive the structural requirements on framing members (2" x 4" and 2" x 6") used to construct residential housing. Implementation of this modification should result in greater savings to both the local industry and consumers.

Taken alone the Washington County construction code modification is not substantial enough to be used as a single model. There is possibility, however, for it to be utilized as a single part of a larger model within the Construction Codes regulation area.

**CASE STUDY# 033**  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**(REVISED)**

**IN-PLANT PROGRAM/TRUST ACCOUNT**  
**WASHINGTON COUNTY**

This program is a cooperative arrangement between the Washington County building department and a large private entity, the Intel Corporation. Since its inception four years ago, as a result of the program's success, several other large companies within the jurisdiction have reached similar arrangements with the building department. The arrangement, which encompasses the Administration & Enforcement regulatory area, was established to save time and money within the permit and building code compliance processes. Another part of the program deals with Impact Fees (see below).

The County found that it was much more cost effective for them, and preferable to Intel, for a "Strategic Engineering Team" made up of appropriate County plans reviewers and other personnel to meet at Intel to review each project and the County requirements. The Intel staff is familiar with the permit requirements, and holding the review meetings on site has saved time and improved overall compliance with building code requirements. It has been suggested that this type of program is only suited to a larger community, such as Washington County, that has a building department staff of more than 80 personnel.

Another important aspect of the program is a permit fee structure that was designed to be fairer to the customer. The fee concept is based more closely on the services rendered by the building department rather than, for example, on the percentages of the value of a piece of equipment being worked on, as was previously done in Washington County. The Fee Schedule is listed on pages three and four of the program submission.

Also included in the submittal are several flowcharts that help clarify Washington County's permitting process. These can be utilized for most construction projects, not just those with the Intel Corporation. Additional information further clarifying the submitted program would be helpful. In reading the submission, it is not always clear whether the procedures refer specifically to the Intel projects, or to any construction project proposed in Washington County.

**CASE STUDY# 034**  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**(REVISED)**

**WASHINGTON COUNTY - AUTOMATED TELEPHONE ANSWERING SYSTEM**

The first goal of the Washington County Automated Telephone Answering System is to provide a hardware/software system capable of automatically performing routine but critical telephone interaction with the public, specifically dealing with building inspection information delivery. The second goal is to decrease the amount of staff time necessary to accommodate the telephone load, while simultaneously increasing the acquisition speed and accuracy of the information requested by the public and contractors dealing with the building and land development divisions.

The comprehensive submission package begins with several Washington County inter-department correspondences dealing with certain administrative procedures required to implement the system. This is followed by an overall description of the program (entitled "Land Development Building Permits System"), which includes discussions of goals, identifiable problems, resolutions, ways to adapt to the existing system, a cost summary, and cost savings and productivity enhancements. The Cost Summary details the costs for the required hardware and software, the costs for implementing and maintaining the system, and a brief description of how the program funding will be attained through user fees.

The next section of the submission includes ten segments detailing the more technical intricacies of the program. This includes computer language and technical critical path method diagrams that would probably be better left to the programming and MIS professionals involved with the installation of the program's computer hardware and software.

Finally, there are several sections designed for the end user of the system depicting the information flow and the control of system when the "host" is unavailable. There is also user friendly step by step instructions on how to access the Inspector Line. This illustrates how relevant information can be more conveniently and efficiently transferred between inspectors and customers through the automated answering service.

**CASE STUDY # 036**  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**(REVISED)**

**RIDGEWOOD, NEW JERSEY - ADMINISTRATIVE FORMS**

This program is a collection of forms from the Village of Ridgewood Building Zoning Departments. The forms are fairly self-explanatory and were created to decrease the amount of time that was required to fill out the original forms. The actual forms submitted by the Building Department include the following:

- Certificate of Continued Occupancy Application
- Fence Application
- Real Estate Sign Application

The form submitted by the Zoning Board is the Application for Development. Originally a similar form had to be submitted to the Planning Board as well. With the adoption of this form, submission was required only from the Zoning Board.

There was not enough information submitted to forward this project, but it may be worthwhile nevertheless. Additional information of value would include a more detailed synopsis of how the new system is an improvement over the old system, as well as a "big picture" of how this new system operates.

***CASE STUDY # 039***  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**(REVISED)**

**INFORMATION KIOSK - TOWN OF BRANFORD, CONNECTICUT**

This program consists of the installation of a rack on the wall of a building department, containing forms and information applicable to the construction permit processes. While this program will not stand alone as model, it is a worthwhile and simple concept that may be overlooked by a building department attempting to adopt something more complex. Therefore, it would be worth consideration by the Administration Task Group to add this concept to a larger program if it is already not a part of it.

***CASE STUDY# 040***  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**(REVISED)**

**RULES AND REGULATIONS OF ARCHITECTURAL ACCESS BOARD (521 CMR)**  
**COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS**

The submitted Rules and Regulations appear to meet or exceed all requirements of the American Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG). However, 521 CMR has not received certification from the Department of Justice. The reason is that the Department of Justice will not consider certification if the submitted code does not apply to places of employment (as is the case with 521 CMR). Over the past four years legislation has been pending with the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to change this situation. Until this legislation is actually passed, however, any construction in the Commonwealth is required to comply with both the ADAAG and the Massachusetts Rules and Regulations.

Legislation has been passed to require compliance to 521 CMR at the local level throughout the Commonwealth. With regard to enforcement of the code, this is performed by local building departments.

There are several accessibility codes throughout the country that meet or exceed the ADAAG. However uniformity and efficient enforcement of the codes are issues that need to be addressed by this Task Group. One should ask (1) who enforces the code, (2) how is it enforced, and (3) whether this the most efficient and effective means of meeting the ADAAG.



***CASE STUDY#041***  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**(REVISED)**

**CITY OF LEMARS, IA - BUILDING DEPARTMENT**

This program was developed in 1996 to help clear up certain confusion that existed within the City of LeMars building permit application process. One of the program's goals is to make the building permit process easier and more accessible for the average person to understand and utilize.

To achieve this end, several of the more commonly encountered construction areas/projects are shown with the code requirements expected by the City of LeMars Building Department. Most of these requirements were developed by using the Uniform Building Code (UBC), state codes, and local codes in an effort to specify most closely local needs.

The breakdown and location of each section is clearly and conveniently listed in the Index on the second page of the submittal. The first section, Organization and Enforcement on page 2, is taken almost directly from the UBC, and deals mostly with code administration. The remainder of the submittal details different construction areas from site work to electrical and fire alarm work. There are also sections dedicated to Permit Fees, Accessibility, and Water Supply.

This probably should not be submitted as an independent model, however, there is potential for it, or parts of it, to be considered as a smaller section of a larger model.

**CASE STUDY # 042**  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**(REVISED)**

**BAR CODES FOR BUILDING INSPECTORS**  
**CITY OF CAMPBELL, CA**

The Bar Codes for Building Inspectors submission is an automated system that affects the administration process of building inspections. The program was developed to solve the problems of unreadable field notes, and to lower the overall costs of the building inspection process. Along with the computer, the central tool used to accomplish this task is the Videx TimeWand. This is an inexpensive, credit card sized bar code scanner that can store relevant information from a day of inspections. At the end of each day the information from the scanner is downloaded directly into the computer.

The first page of the submission is an article by Frank Cauthorn (the submitter of the program) entitled *Bar Codes for Building Inspectors*. This is an excellent summary of the program, describing the bar code system and what it does, how it was initially implemented in his jurisdiction, and the costs and benefits of the program. It also includes the name and telephone number of the company hired to install the system.

The pages following the introduction article include actual examples of how the Bar Codes are used in the City of Campbell building department. These include examples of Bar Code Display Sheets, different tables, cross reference files and management reports. Typical information processed through the system include the Permit Number, the type of inspection, and the result of the inspection.

Following the City of Campbell information is more detailed literature from several installers of the Bar Code systems, as well as a four page article entitled *Bar Codes and the TimeWand* by Videx, Inc., the manufacturer of the scanner used by the City of Campbell.

The Bar Codes for Building Inspectors program is an exceptionally effective streamlining tool that can be utilized by any local level building department in both the Automation and Administration & Enforcement regulatory areas. This is, however, a somewhat limited program in that it only addresses one aspect of the building permit process (inspections).

***CASE STUDY # 043***  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**(REVISED)**

**PERMITS BY MAIL (ROOFING)**  
**CITY OF RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA**

This is an administrative streamlining model that allows roofing contractors or owners/builders to secure re-roofing permits by mail. On the attached Re-roofing Permit Application form the contractor is required to make: (1) a Licensed Contractor Declaration, (2) an Owner-Builder Declaration, (3) a Worker's Compensation Declaration, (4) information on the Construction Lending Agency, and (5) various information relating to the actual project.

Although this appears to be an effective streamlining program, it is too limited with regard to the overall scope of the Administration & Enforcement regulatory area. It could, however, be used as a small section of a larger program.

**CASE STUDY # 045**  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**(REVISED)**

**CODE HEARING PROGRAM**  
**VILLAGE OF VERNON HILLS, ILLINOIS**

The Code Hearing Program was created to address the problem of code enforcement dispute cases being heard before inappropriate officials. The legislation that passed with the program created a specific position of a Hearing Officer to preside over code violation hearings. A list of forms was also created for the Code Hearing Program and are used throughout the process.

There is a very specific formal notice requirement which informs the party in violation, and determines the date and time of the hearing in front of the Hearing Officer. If the party served with the notice does not request a continuance (only one is allowed) and does not appear at the hearing, the case is forwarded to the courts. The court will rule only on the technical aspects of the case, such as proper service, appropriateness of penalties, etc. The party served does not have opportunity to defend themselves in the court, as this right was forfeited by refusing to appear at the initial code hearing.

A one page *Violation Notice Procedure* describes the various steps required in bringing building code offenders into the Hearing process. This is followed by four forms utilized in achieving this end in an uncomplicated and efficient manner. Finally, a copy of the legislation legalizing and defining the program is attached.

This is a fairly narrow issue, but it does streamline the building code dispute process by essentially eliminating the Courts from the process.

**CASE STUDY # 048**  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**(REVISED)**

**EXPRESS SERVICE**  
**CITY OF RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA**

The Express Service program was developed to reduce the time necessary for plan review and permitting. Rather than the usual long periods of time required to attain an approved plan review, under this process the entire review can be completed in a single day, so long as the plan is properly prepared. This is possible if the builder/designer arranges to meet with the appropriate plans examiners on a previously scheduled Tuesday or Thursday evening. If all the plans are prepared to the reviewer's satisfaction, approval can be expected that same evening.

Two forms are required, the *Express Plan Review Request* and the *Express Plan Review Application*, and are shown at the end of the submission. Prior to these forms are the descriptions of the General Requirements, which include when and how to schedule an Express Review, the costs, and the number and types of plans required. This is followed by the Express Services Process which lists the appropriate contacts, and describes how one should proceed whether the plans are approved or disapproved.

Although the program does reduce time, it does little to aid the builder/designer in preparing for the meeting. The requirements sheet specifies that plans must meet city codes before the project can be approved, pressuring the builder/designer to bring a complete package to the one meeting. A benefit, though, is that if the plans are denied at the meeting, the builder/designer can schedule another Express Service meeting at a later date. Information on percentages of plans denied at Express Service meetings, as well as any steps taken to help customers get their packages together, would be helpful.

**CASE STUDY# 049**  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**(REVISED)**

**1997 DALLAS DEVELOPMENT GUIDE**

The 1997 Dallas Development Guide is a development review process encompassing several regulatory areas relevant to the Streamlining Project. These include: Administration and Enforcement, Land Use and Zoning, Environmental and Flood Plain, Infrastructure and Impact Fees, and Rehabilitation, Historic Preservation & Demolition. Despite covering numerous areas, it is relatively easy for a customer to find their way around the guide. Each section is clearly divided into the following subsections:

- Location (point of contact)
- Information to provide (required forms, fees, plans, etc.)
- Who may be involved (other government agencies)
- How the process works (a flow chart detailing the process is on the Following page)
- How long it will take
- Cost (Appendix 111)

Tying all the regulatory areas together is the One-Stop Permit Center and the Business Assistance Center described on pages 3 to 6. This allows individuals to conduct most of their business at a single convenient location. The list of the different types of construction work permits and applications from other agencies are listed on page three. There is also assistance for people opening or expanding a business, or for dealing with the development process.

Descriptions of each of the regulatory areas involved are given on the following pages:

- Administration and Enforcement: pg. 32-39, 76-77, 87-88
- Land Use and Zoning: pg. 7-29, 66-69
- Environmental and Flood Plain: pg. 48-55, 74-75
- Infrastructure and Impact Fees: pg. 44-47, 56-57, 59-65, 70-73
- Rehabilitation, Historic Preservation and Demolition: pg. 40-43

At the end of the guide, the Appendices provide a Directory of involved City Staff, Building Inspection Permit Fees and Service Fees, a description of an Automated Inspection Request System, a copy of a standard building Permit Application, a Standard Agreement for sidewalk installation, and a list of Landscape Requirements.

Each section within the Dallas Development Guide provides clear and concise guidelines for their respective programs. In regard to the actual implementation of such a potential model, there could be many details that are not shown here. However, that would most likely have to be the responsibility of the implementing jurisdiction, to ensure that the model in its final form is

tailored to meet their specific needs. Having too much detail would probably exclude a model from being adaptable in many jurisdictions.

***CASE STUDY # 050***  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**(REVISED)**

**LARGE PERMIT CARDS**  
**CITY OF TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA**

The Large Permit Cards submission consists of a sample permit card and three pictures of the cards in use. The purpose of this is to save inspectors time in locating the permit cards by making them large and highly visible. This obviously cannot be submitted as an independent model. However, it could be considered as a small part of a larger model.



***CASE STUDY# 054***  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**(REVISED)**

**HHS/CABO/NFPA CODES STUDY FOR HEALTH CARE FACILITIES**

In 1993 the National Institute of Building Sciences (NIBS) completed a study entitled, "Report of the HHS/CABO/NFPA/Codes Study" (see attached), which concluded that the model codes (BOCA, ICBO, and SBCCI) offer protection comparable to the National Fire Protection Association's (NFPA) Life Safety Code for new health care facilities.

In other words, this is not really a program that could eventually be used as a model for the Streamlining project. Rather, it is a report suggesting that the life safety requirements for health care facilities codified by the three model code organizations could be used in lieu of the NFPA Life Safety Code.

The report itself has a brief introduction, then discusses the life safety code issues along the lines of New Construction, Existing Buildings, and Operations and Maintenance. Contained in the appendices are a list of the contributors to the Report, some relevant legislation, and independent reports from the NFPA and each of the three model code organizations.

This Report would be worth consideration by both the Construction Codes and the Health regulatory area Task Groups.

***CASE STUDY # 057***  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**(REVISED)**

**EDUCATION OF BUILDING INSPECTORS IN UTAH**

This education program was implemented to help the Utah state building inspectors attain certification from the International Conference of Building Officials (ICBO), while simultaneously improving their professional knowledge. Between the Program Submission Form and the attached article from the ICBO Magazine, the education program is very well summarized. Brief descriptions of what prompted the program, difficulties encountered while implementing it, how the program is funded, its benefits, and several positive results are clearly and succinctly described.

This appears to be a worthwhile and well run program with potential to be used as a model for the Streamlining Project. However, more detail would have to be provided by Utah or developed by the Task Groups prior to future distribution to other jurisdictions.

**CASE STUDY # 059**  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**(REVISED)**

**AUTOMATION OF PERMITS/INSPECTIONS**  
**CITY OF AURORA, COLORADO**

The Automation of Permits/Inspections submission is a report divided into three sections. The first section describes how a central computer in the main office, and hand-held computers used by individual inspectors, are efficiently used to manage all relevant building permit information. The information is first placed in the office computer, and later the appropriate information is downloaded onto the inspector's hand-held computer. The inspection results for each days work are entered into these hand-held computers by the inspectors. At the end of each day the hand-held computers are loaded into the network system, and the results automatically transferred into the network files that are then available for response to public inquiries at all work stations.

The second section elaborates on how the building department changed from a system of hard copy permits for each construction discipline to a single computerized permit form. The third section discusses how the printing of building department forms was switched to a more cost effective dotmatrix printer.

All three sections of the submission go into detail on the savings in both time and money realized by automating the building permit process, as well as some of the computer hardware and software requirements. The procedures of accomplishing work prior to the automation changeover are also described in each section.

This is a very comprehensive automation program in that it covers most of the building permit processes from permit application to inspections to completion of project. However, additional detail submitted in a different format would be required to make this a more meaningful model.

**CASE STUDY # 061**  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**(REVISED)**

**CUSTOMIZED PLAN REVIEW AND PERMIT BY APPOINTMENT**  
**CITY OF PHOENIX, ARIZONA**

The Customized Plan Review (CPR) and Permit By Appointment (PBA) programs address streamlining of plan review procedures in an effort to provide building permits in a faster, more customer-friendly manner. A narrative of the program is given as detailed responses to the NCSBCS Case Study Submission Form. Details discussed include program objectives, results, benefits, involved personnel and departments, etc. References are made to attachments lettered A to N, provided at the end of the responses.

The CPR is the plan review process used for large construction projects while the PBA is utilized on tenant review and commercial remodeling review. For large projects under the previous system, approval was required from three different departments: Site Planning, Project Engineering, and Building Safety. Under the CPR procedures, all three sections work together in order to permit projects quickly and efficiently. The difference in the time required to attain a permit via the traditional plan review process and the time needed through the CPR and PBA processes are illustrated with sample time lines and accompanying descriptions on Attachment A. Attachments B through E graphically display how successful and effective the two programs have been since their inception.

Attachments E and F are flowcharts of each program. These lay out a clear and simple process that **could** be imitated in most jurisdictions. Attachments G through I list the responsibilities and requirements for successful CPR and PBA reviews. Letters from various private organizations praising the programs are contained in Attachment L.

Attachment M is an application form for a seminar intended to introduce any interested party to CPR and PBA. Attachment N is all the handouts, and literature provided in the seminar. Some of this has already been included in the previous attachments, while additional information is also provided. The manner in which these handouts are presented could be a useful guide for other jurisdictions presenting these programs for a first time.

**CASE STUDY # 064**  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**(REVISED)**

**BUILDING PROCESSING STREAMLINING**  
**CITY OF IRVINE, CALIFORNIA**

The Building Processing Streamlining submission is a comprehensive Administration and Enforcement program. It has been developed over the years as an on-going process in an effort to streamline the City of Irvine's entire building permit process. An important concept discussed on page 1 of the submission involves the centralized one-stop permit processing and how placing representatives at a single counter does not necessarily save time and money. The City of Irvine believes their program is a true one-stop process in that it incorporates all involved departments and relevant phases into a single systematic approach.

The different phases of the process are each briefly summarized in the following order:

- 1) One-Stop Permitting Process
- 2) Self Service Permit Processing
- 3) Computer Screen Permit Application Status Inquiry
- 4) Fees
- 5) Plan Review Turnaround Time
- 6) Inspection
- 7) Interactive Telephone System
- 8) Permit Records
- 9) GIS Mapping
- 10) Information Bulletins and Communications
- 11) Customer Surveys

Included after the above are two sheets outlining the costs and savings related to the program.

For this program to stand alone as a model the City of Irvine would have to submit additional information and forms showing in greater detail the phases listed above. However, the list of phases itself could be useful in outlining a comprehensive Administration & Enforcement process.

**CASE STUDY# 068**  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**(REVISED)**

**EXPEDITED PLAN PROCESSING**  
**ENGINEERS AND SURVEYORS INSTITUTE - FAIRFAX, VA**

The Engineers and Surveyors Institute (ESI) is a non-profit organization of public and private sector PEs and land surveyors committed to improving Fairfax County's permitting process. It was initially created to address a growing adversarial relationship between public and private sector engineers over the approval of land development plans. This is mainly an Education & Certification program, though it could also fall within the Administration & Enforcement area.

As stated in the attached responses to the Case Study Submission Form, this program is a "three pronged trust and cooperation building approach." The first prong is the Education Program, comprised of the following two sub-programs: a basic education program emphasizing the plan approval process for land development, and a continuing education program keeping practitioners informed on current issues and developments. The course outlines and individual courses are described in greater detail in the attached literature.

The second phase of the program is the Peer Review of Plans. This consists of an ESI led team checking of site development submissions for quality and completeness prior to the submittal of the plans to the County. The third phase is an Expedited Review of Plans. This allows individuals certified by the County as Designated Plans Examiners (DPE) to review site development plans prior to submission to the County. Taking a certain number of courses from the Education Program is required for all participants of these expedited plan reviews.

Both of these processes have proven successful in saving time within the plan review procedures. Experience has shown that once a set of plans receives peer approval from a DPE, it is on the fast track to County approval.

An attached article from the Engineering Times entitled *County's PEs Decide to Make Peace, Not War*, further elaborates on how the program was originally initiated. This also presents some statistics comparing the time taken for plans submitted through the DPEs and plans submitted through the normal permitting process.

Additional information, such as a flowchart more clearly outlining the entire process, would be helpful in further describing the Expedited Plan Processing program.

***CASE STUDY # 069***  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**(REVISED)**

**ELECTRIC UTILITY SERVICE ENTRANCE REQUIREMENT MANUAL**  
**NATIONAL ELECTRICAL MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION (NEMA)**

The EUSERC (Electric Utility Service Equipment Requirements Committee) is composed of, and the membership open to, electric utilities located nationwide. Associate membership is open to organizations associated with utility service and metering activities. The utilities participating as members and associate members are listed in Section 100.

The purpose of the EUSERC is to promote uniform electric service requirements among the member utilities, to publish existing utility service requirements for electric service equipment, and to provide direction for development of future metering technology. The EUSERC associate members provide liaison between the member utilities, state and federal agencies, manufacturers, contractors and electrical testing laboratories.

The goal of this organization is to support the development of metering and service equipment that is safe and cost effective to the serving agencies and their customers, and to establish manufacturing and installation requirements for metering and service equipment that are acceptable to all member utilities.

These requirements and installation guides are based on, and replace, the requirements previously published by the WUESSC and the PUESRCC. They are intended for the use of serving agencies, metering and service equipment manufacturers, consulting engineers and architects. The EUSERC requirements book contains information concerning electric service and metering facilities generally provided and installed by the customer. Each serving agency will provide specific information pertaining to metering and service requirement for the territory it serves. Consultation with the appropriate utility prior to new or reconstruction is advised. Individual member utility acceptability of EUSERC requirement drawings is listed in Section 200.

**CASE STUDY # 073**  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**(REVISED)**

**A VISUAL PRESENTATION OF CODE REQUIREMENTS**  
**CITY OF EL SEGUNDO, CALIFORNIA**

A Visual Presentation of Code Requirements is an education program geared to teaching the Uniform Building Code (UBC) Means of Egress sections in a format that is relatively easy to understand. The main pedagogical tools used to achieve this end are 432 color slides, representing various code provisions that are intended to enhance the student's learning while simultaneously creating a more stimulating educational environment. The computer software used to develop these slides was Microsoft Power Point.

In the Background section of the submission the state legislation requiring a minimum of 45 hours of continuing education every three years for all Building Department employees is discussed. Following the *Background and Solution* page are several examples of different slides showing specific code details and how flexible the slide presentations can be arranged.

Although somewhat limited in scope, this program potentially could be an effective model for the educational aspects it does address.



***CASE STUDY # 074***  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**(REVISED)**

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACTION TEAM**  
**CITY OF FULLERTON, CALIFORNIA**

The Economic Development Action Team (EDAT) program was initially implemented in an effort to attract more businesses to Fullerton by adjusting the local Building Permit process within the Administration & Enforcement regulatory area.

The primary action taken was to create a committee of senior staff members from the following city departments: Economic Development, Planning, Building, Engineering, and Fire Protection. This group meets once a week to provide a prompt and coordinated response by explaining services and fee structures, reviewing processes, discussing permits, providing access to financing, technical, employment and training resources, and answering other specific questions from the business community. The Team acts on an as-needed basis to aid in expediting the process for the "client."

The program submission is presented in the form of answers to the questions posed on the NCSBCS Case Study Submittal Form. While these responses provide a good general overview of the program, additional information better detailing its structure and processes would be helpful.

***CASE STUDY # 075***  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**(REVISED)**

**RESIDENTIAL WALL SECTIONS**  
**CITY OF ZANESVILLE, OHIO**

The Residential Wall Sections submission is an Administration and Enforcement program designed to streamline the plan review process of building permits. It is strictly for basic wall sections (from foundations to roofs) of residential construction projects.

On the first page is a list of construction details of a standard residential wall section that are required for plan review by the Zanesville Building Department. Each item has a reference number adjacent to it referring to the OBOA, which is similar to CABO. The following three pages are sample cross sections to give the customer a graphic description of required details for a typical wall, a typical crawl section, and a typical slab on grade section.

While this is an effective streamlining program, it would not stand by itself as a model. It could, however, be utilized as a smaller section of a larger model within the Administration and Enforcement regulatory area.

***CASE STUDY # 076***  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**(REVISED)**

**RESIDENTIAL POLE BUILDING DESIGN**  
**CITY OF ZANESVILLE, OHIO**

The Residential Pole Building Design submission is an Administration and Enforcement program designed to streamline the plan review process of building permits. It is strictly for basic Pole-Type Residential Accessory Structure (garage/storage) construction projects.

On the first page is a Design Questionnaire for a standard residential pole-type structure required for plan review by the Zanesville Building Department. The questions ask for details on basic structural members (posts, trusses, and rafters), and other basic information (roofing, doors, windows, electric, and heating). The following ten pages are sample diagrams to give the customer a graphic description of required details of the various building sections.

While this is an effective streamlining program, it would not stand by itself as a model. It could, however, be utilized as a smaller section of a larger model within the Administration and Enforcement regulatory area.

***CASE STUDY # 077***  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**(REVISED)**

**STATE OF UTAH AFFORDABLE HOUSING PLANNING**  
**STATE OF UTAH**

The State of Utah Affordable Housing Planning submittal is a Land Use & Zoning program designed to bring uniformity throughout the State of Utah with regard to local planning of low-income housing. Unfortunately, this program is still in the developmental stages but the implementors will be available for future contact if the Task Group deems the basis of this program worthy of consideration.

Legislation was passed requiring local jurisdictions to adopt an affordable housing plan that will meet basic guidelines. To assist the localities in this task, the State is presently in the process of developing the following aids:

- An Affordable Housing Planning Manual
- A series of 25 technical workshops to be conducted in all the regions of the State
- Seven different model demonstration plans adopted by other local governments

Although there will be a wait for the above details, which would be required for further model development, the basic concept of this program seems well worth consideration.



## **ATTACHMENT D**

### **RAC MODEL EVALUATIONS**

## REGULATORY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE MODEL EVALUATION

### STAND ALONE MODELS

No. 5; COMcheck-EZ Code Compliance

No. 6; MECheck Code Compliance

These two models are tools with which to comply with energy code and are applicable to all levels of government. **RECOMMENDED ACTION: Forward as Stand Alone Models.**

No. 11; Customer Oriented, Fairfax County, VA

**RECOMMENDED ACTION: Put on hold to get more information. Send it to Education and Certification Task Group.**

No. 25; Maryland Building & Fire Code Computer System

This model can be used by all levels of government, but was implemented only at the state level. The question was raised of whether this model could be implemented locally if there was no state legislation. Implementation is envisioned at the statewide level, but should also be useful at the local level. Provides code search capabilities. Good tool for any state that has a state code that is not mini/maxi. **RECOMMENDED ACTION: Forward as Stand Alone Tool.**

No. 34, Automation, Washington County, OR

Applicable to state and local levels. **RECOMMENDED ACTION: Forward as Stand Alone Tool.**

No. 42, Bar Codes for Building Inspectors

Applicable to state and local levels. **RECOMMENDED ACTION: Forward as Stand Alone Tool.**

No. 48, Express Services, Raleigh, NC

Applicable to state and local levels. **RECOMMENDED ACTION: Forward as Stand Alone Tool.**

No. 49, Dallas Development Guide

Applicable to all levels. **RECOMMENDED ACTION: Forward as Stand Alone Model for Administration & Enforcement only, and not for other subject areas. All other task groups will be asked if they want to pursue their questions. These task groups are: Environmental & Flood Plain, Infrastructure & Impact Fees, Land Use & Zoning, and Rehab, Historic**

## **Preservation & Demolition.**

### **FORWARD NOW AND COMBINE LATER**

No. 14, Building Performance Standards, State of Maryland

Applicable at federal, regional, and state levels. Change name to Code Model.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION: Change to Stand Alone Model.**

### **COMBINE NOW AND FORWARD**

No. 28, Private/Public Partnership for Building Codes, Elicott City, MD

No. 33, Construction Codes, Washington County, Hillsborg, OR

Nos. 28 and 33; are two variations on the same theme. It was suggested they be lumped under the same name: Public/Private Partnerships. Tailors a program to a large client. Can be used by all levels of government. **RECOMMENDED ACTION: It was the consensus to change to Stand Alone Models and to keep Nos. 28 and 33 separate.**

No. 33, In-Plant Prog/Trust Account, Washington County, OR

Tailors a program to a large client. Can be used by all levels of government.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION: Change to Stand Alone Model.**

### **HOLD FOR FUTURE WORK**

No. 4, Code Enforcement Bureau, Alexandria, VA

Administration & Enforcement Task Group would like additional details on organizational changes made and what the outcome was for this project. Can be applicable to state and local levels. **RECOMMENDED ACTION: Hold for more information.**

No. 8, PZ&B Permit Center, W. Palm Beach, FL

Comprehensive as to how process operates. It is cumbersome but contains many good points, such as checklists. Can be applicable to all levels of government.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION: It was the consensus to Forward Now and Combine Later. It will be forwarded as an Administration and Enforcement model. Suggestions for modifications should be included, i.e., make more user friendly; segment the guide to address customer's needs. Get feedback from other task groups reviewing this model.**

No. 10, Texas Accessibility Code

This is an example of a state accessibility regulatory system for a state without a statewide code. Questions were asked as to why do we need this. How does this



streamline government? Is this an alternative to ADA? **RECOMMENDED ACTION: Return to Accessibility Task Group to determine merits for streamlining process.**

No. 24, Process 2000, San Diego, CA

Administration & Enforcement Task Group indicated it was a good case study but requested more specific information to review, such as investment and resources needed and benefits achieved. The Automation Task Group requested more information on the automation features of this model. Perhaps it could be submitted as separate model for automation aspects. Would legislation be required to implement such a program? Copies of San Diego's forms and organizational charts would be helpful. **RECOMMENDED ACTION: Hold for the additional information required for the task groups to properly review.**

No. 40, Rules & Regulations of Architectural Access Board, Commonwealth of Massachusetts

The same concerns were expressed as for No. 10. This model has not been certified by the Department of Justice (DOJ). Should this be going forward without certification? **RECOMMENDED ACTION: Return to Accessibility Task Group with questions. Also ask them if there are some good pieces that could be extracted as case studies.**

No. 41, Implementation of Building Code Guide, LeMars, IA

It was felt this was an education issue and should be reviewed by the Education & Certification Task Group. **RECOMMENDED ACTION: Refer to Education & Certification Task Group for review.**

No. 54, HSS/CABO/NFPA Codes Study for Health

This seems to be more of a technical issue, not a process issue. It was suggested the RAC Subcommittee review this for technical overlap. **RECOMMENDED ACTION: Discuss this with Health Task Group as to their intent for moving forward.**

No. 61, Customized Plan Review & Permit Application, Phoenix, AZ

The Administration & Enforcement Task Group felt this was a good model but had numerous questions they would like answered. A presentation by someone from Phoenix should be considered. **RECOMMENDED ACTION: Hold for the additional information required for Administration & Enforcement Task Group to properly review.**

No. 68, Expedited Plan Processing, Fairfax County, VA

It was felt this case study should have been reviewed by the Administration & Enforcement Task Group before advancing. **RECOMMENDED ACTION: Refer to Administration & Enforcement Task Group for review.**