



**BUILDING INSPECTION COMMISSION (BIC)
Department of Building Inspection (DBI)**

SPECIAL MEETING

Wednesday, October 7, 2010 at 9:00 a.m.

City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 416

Aired Live on SFGTV Channel 78

ADOPTED April 20, 2011

MINUTES

The special meeting of the Building Inspection Commission was called to order at 9:15 a.m. by President Murphy.

1. Call to Order and Roll Call - Roll call was taken and a quorum was certified.

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mel Murphy, **President**

Kevin Clinch, **Commissioner**

Criss Romero, **Commissioner, excused**

Debra Walker, **Commissioner, excused**

Ann Aherne, **Commission Secretary**

Reuben Hechanova, **Vice-President**

Robin Levitt, **Commissioner**

Frank Lee, **Commissioner**

D.B.I. REPRESENTATIVES:

Vivian Day, **Director**

Edward Sweeney, **Deputy Director**

William Strawn, **Communications Manager**

Rosemary Bosque, **Chief Housing Inspector**

Pamela Levin, **Administration & Finance Division Supervisor**

Sonya Harris, **Secretary**

CITY ATTORNEY REPRESENTATIVE

John Malamut, **Deputy City Attorney**

2. President's Announcement.

President Murphy did not have any announcements.

3. Director's Report.

a. Update on activities affecting administration of the Department.

Director Vivian Day stated that she did not have an update on the administration of the Department, but had an update on the Permit Tracking System. Ms. Day said that the Department gave the Request for Proposal (RFP) to the City Attorney's Office and other City agencies that are reviewing it, so DBI should have it back before the end of the month for publication. Ms. Day

said that the Q-matic system, the customer queuing system within the Department, has been installed but DBI is waiting for one more piece of equipment to be installed on the fifth floor before it is put into production which will hopefully be around November 1. President Murphy asked Director Day how many bids DBI was going to get on the Permit Tracking System. Director Day stated that she did not know but there are several companies that are now doing this type of software programming work. Ms. Day said that the Department is hoping to get a sufficient number of bids. President Murphy stated that he hopes there is also some good pricing. Secretary Aherne called for public comment on the Director's report.

Mr. Henry Karnilowicz of the SFCRG stated that he would like to see how Q-Matic is going to work and said he has concerns about how the routing is going to be so customers do not get stuck waiting for the architectural plan check and then not have any other stages checked. Mr. Karnilowicz said that customers have not been involved in this process and said that the customers should review the process before it is implemented; once it is implemented it will be very difficult to make any changes.

Director Day said that the next Public Advisory Committee (PAC) meeting is scheduled for later this month on the 21st and there will be a demonstration of the Q-matic system. Vice-President Hechanova asked if there had been any material change from where it began earlier this year compared to what is going out now. Director Day stated that the Q-matic system is just a queuing system and the original queuing system was set up back during the BPR process which was over two years ago and has been tweaked internally. Ms. Day said this is to make sure that if a station is available for review and another station is on hold that the customer would be routed to the station that is available first, so DBI will be testing it before it is put into full implementation with test cases as soon as all of the equipment gets installed.

Vice-President Hechanova asked if the full body of the Permit Tracking System was going out. Director Day said that Commissioner Hechanova was talking about the RFP and she stated that the body of the RFP has changed significantly with DBI taking over control of the core system, the core software system and other City departments coming on as modules to that system. Ms. Day said that the Department will be purchasing that hardware, the core system and enterprising license for the whole City, in other words maintaining both the hardware and software for the City and special implementation will be done for each department as they join the system.

Secretary Aherne stated that there was a question at the last meeting regarding the PAC minutes, and said that those meeting agendas and minutes are on the DBI website so she just wanted to make that clear. Secretary Aherne said that Carolyn Jayin, the Director's secretary, takes care of those meetings and if anyone has questions about how to find it on the website they could give Carolyn a call.

4. Public Comment: The BIC will take public comment on matters within the Commission's jurisdiction that are not part of this agenda.

There was no public comment.

Secretary Aherne announced that items numbers seven and eight would be heard out of order regarding the CAPSS Program, so that ATC can give their presentation.

7. Update on Community Action Plan for Seismic Safety (CAPSS).

Mr. Tom Tobin from the Applied Technology Council (ATC) gave a Power Point presentation on the Community Action Plan for Seismic Safety (CAPSS). The main topics that Mr. Tobin discussed were the approach, status, and next steps to be taken. Mr. Tobin also talked about the objectives after future significant expected earthquakes as well as estimated life losses, estimated housing losses, and estimated economic losses. Mr. Tobin gave recommendations and discussed the status of products and the next steps. Mr. Tobin showed a flow chart outlining the Task 2, Task 3, and Task 4 CAPSS Reports.

The Commissioners had the following questions and concerns:

- Since the report is complete, does it mean that it is ready to issue? Not ready to issue yet, but once the conclusions are done and everyone agrees with them it will be.
- BIC asked for target timelines and noted that some of these are not accelerated at the end: Is there a reason? In April the report was reviewed and project was terminated before completion, and this report did not take proximity of buildings into account. Also, it took several months to run loss estimates and HAZUS was used which is an older software program to run the report.
- Not sure if CAPSS report addressed property owner's issues and not sure if owners/tenants have been justly represented? Issues were discussed and it was stated that there were representatives from BOMA and the S.F. Apartment Association.
- Have illegal units been addressed with the CAPSS project, especially soft story buildings? Not sure if CAPSS is directly addressing this issue.
- Any support for tenants that are displaced from soft story buildings, especially non-profits, and will they be temporarily relocated: Small businesses could be forced out and property rented out at higher price? Rent control has been discussed and some buildings are already at maximum price that can be charged, but some others could go up. Also, issue of how long small businesses would have to be closed and suggestion of retrofit being tied to term of lease.
- Under finance and repair has there been discussion on the possibility of areas where there are higher at risk zones that there could be a pooling of insurability of those property owners: Should be some incentives for those property owners where there is an aggregate insurance premium. Mr. Tobin has not heard of pooling of insurance for particular areas, and insurance is regulated by the state.
- Was there any discussion as to an alternative type of insurance, because the CAC has talked about it at times? Only 10% of San Franciscans have earthquake insurance because it is so expensive.
- Retrofitting is the clear way to go. There should be some type of incentive for property owners in areas where there is going to be damage.

President Murphy called for public comment.

Mr. Luke O'Brien of the SFCRG said that he has been involved in some of the CAPSS meetings and it is clearly going to be an impact on the City and a lot of work is going into it. Mr. O'Brien said that a couple of brief points are: He would like to suggest that the calculation gets somewhat simplified, as he could say from experience that the process for estimating a capital pass through when doing an improvement to a rental building is very complicated. Mr. O'Brien stated that as a result of a new rent, new foundation, retrofitting, whatever the owner has done, sometimes The Rent Board do not even take on the initiative to answer a question because they are afraid that they may give the wrong answer. Mr. O'Brien said that he knows for a fact that there are a few members of the landlord community who just do not do the rent pass through because the work involved is more than it is worth, especially because a landlord could end up potentially leaving themselves open for getting the wrong amount and can be sued or a claim can be made against them for those damages. Mr. O'Brien stated that he has had experience doing retrofitting, not mixed use, but for strictly residential and interestingly the one set of tenants that he lost was because of the noise that was generated from the machines used for doing the steel work and the foundation during that period of the project. Mr. O'Brien stated that with commercial property the only way it is going to be possible to retrofit is if the business can relocate. Mr. O'Brien said that if everyone waits for the big earthquake the decisions will be made for owners or businesses as buildings will be red tagged and there will be no control or time for mitigation.

8. Discussion and possible action regarding Request for Extension of CAPSS Program.

Deputy Director Laurence Kornfield stated that he wanted to call the Commissioners attention to the CAPSS timeframe and wanted to discuss the need to do a no cost time extension to this contract. Mr. Kornfield said that the contract would end on the December 3. Mr. Kornfield stated that the contract says ATC would be done in the 24-month period, but that has already been extended because of the Mayor's program and now the Department needs to just make sure that the contract properly reflects the reality of the additional few months. Mr. Kornfield said that according to the schedule the timeline of this actual work was started was in 1999, and preparation actually started in 1997 so it is now close to the end since it is already October. Mr. Kornfield stated that this is a no fee extension, but the approval of the Commission is needed to officially complete this part of the CAPSS contract revision. President Murphy asked how much of an extension Mr. Kornfield was requesting. Mr. Kornfield stated that it would be from the official termination of the contract which is the beginning of this month through the end of September or until December 31. President Murphy called for public comment.

Mr. Luke O'Brien of the SFCRG said that he would like to get a brief summary of what remains to be done and how it may be achieved in the months between now and the end of the year so that it is realistic and everyone is comfortable that CAPSS can achieve what they are being given the extension for. Mr. O'Brien stated that he would appreciate if it was possible to get some feedback on that, and said he thought that the Commission could make a more informed decision on a vote to extend it or not.

Commissioner Lee asked if it was possible to shorten the timeline, instead of going all the way to December could it possibly be finished in November. Mr. Kornfield said that the Department needs time to review it as Mr. Tobin went over the deliverables and the schedule is already

tightly crunched. Commissioner Lee stated that the project was extended once before and everyone is anxious to have the project completed.

Vice-President Hechanova asked if there was a possibility of voting on the contract extension or tabling it to the next meeting, because he was not exactly sure when the contract expires on its own terms. Mr. Kornfield replied that the contract was for a 24-month period from the date of the notice to proceed, and then adding to that the previous extension would have required it to terminate on September 30 but that only terminates upon the Department’s action. Mr. Kornfield said that it does not automatically terminate, and they have not taken action to terminate the contract obviously because they are trying to finish the work.

President Murphy made a motion, seconded by Vice-President Hechanova, to table the extension of the CAPSS Program contract. The motion carried on a vote of 4 to 1.

The Commissioners voted as follows:

President Murphy	Yes	Vice-President Hechanova	Yes
Commissioner Lee	Yes	Commissioner Mar	No
Commissioner Romero	Excused	Commissioner Walker	Excused
Commissioner Clinch	Yes		

RESOLUTION NO. BIC 049-10

5. Update and discussion on how the Department of Building Inspection and the Department of Public Works are working to improve communications around the permit process.

Director Vivian Day said that she works with all of the different Department heads on the permit process, and DBI is working to put together the Request for Proposal (RFP) for the Permit Tracking System to better consolidate the permit process to be all inclusive. Director Day stated that some of the functions that are being performed at 875 Stevenson Street by the Department of Public Works (DPW) are going to DBI to incorporate more of the actual permitting process that are required such as street encroachments into the DBI process, and to be able to issue them through the DPW people at DBI. Director Day said that the Department is also working to improve the actual way that lot line adjustments and condominium maps are processed to make sure that everything is addressed up front, rather than at the end or when permits are required. Director Day stated that it was part of her addressing memo, that when a new lot is created the address must be assigned at the time it is created so that when someone comes in to pull a building permit for a new parcel, the lot is in DBI’s system and staff will not have to go find it in DPW’s system. Director Day said that the Department is working towards a better coordination effort with the Assessor’s office as well, due to the recording of the final maps and the lot line adjustments.

President Murphy asked what the average turnaround time was for the Public Utilities Commission (PUC). Director Day asked if President Murphy was talking about the turnaround time on plans, and he said yes. Director Day stated that since July 1 DBI is actually sending out

all of the plans to all of the departments at the time they are submitted, so that is one of the reasons for requiring eight sets of plans. Director Day said that the Department is getting back responses from the PUC within the first 30 days if it is not over the counter, so everyone is responding back to DBI within 30 days. President Murphy asked if the PUC had staff on the fifth floor at DBI, and Director Day said yes they have two desks there and their staff actually has a work area located on the fourth floor. Director Day stated that there are two full-time PUC staff members at DBI, and they have been there for years now but they also have furlough days and one is normally stationed at the fifth floor or can be available at the fifth floor if they are working in their office there is a way to call them.

Vice-President Hechanova asked if there are any outstanding MOUs with the respective departments, will there be an amendment to those MOUs, and will there be a structure of how the billables for administrative services that DBI will be rendering relative to the RFP? Vice-President Hechanova stated that he is basically asking how the system works. Director Day stated that the work orders are established with all of these departments except DPW that reside at DBI, and the Department is looking into passing on all of the costs that DBI has technically and historically absorbed internally so staff will be dealing with the departments directly on the MOUs at the end of this year. Vice-President Hechanova asked if the cost of the software was fully coming out of DBI's out-of-pocket costs. Director Day said no actually the general fund is contributing to the implementation of the software for the City departments, and DBI is contributing the hardware and the ongoing maintenance. Director Day stated that the ongoing maintenance is paid by the Department of Technology fee, and that is a charge that was implemented a couple of years ago by the Building Inspection Commission so that DBI could actually pay for the ongoing maintenance and licenses for the software.

President Murphy asked when DBI gets the online system if it will speed up time with the Department of Public Works, and if it will be able to go from 30 days to 15 days. Director Day said that she is hoping that the electronic plan check will do that so staff can send out plans to all of the departments electronically at one time. Director Day stated that this is a project that will be going out for RFP in January that will be tied into the Permit Tracking System, however that is a system that can be implemented now rather than waiting for the PTS so the electrical plan check will help and aid in the communication between the departments on the actual plan sets, and it will reduce the paper cost. Director Day said that it is a green way to go with new technology and all of the plan review departments and, also DBI is making this software available to them to expedite processing. Director Day stated that DBI is offering this system to anyone such as DPW, that has a process that relates to permits for lot lines and it is critical for some of the Department's plan check. Director Day said if the lot line does not go through and it is on hold then DBI cannot approve the permit, so the process is held up and the customer is held up until that lot line adjustment goes through. Director Day stated that DBI is looking for a way to combine forces and now DPW has a new manager for that division which DBI will be working with very closely.

President Murphy called for public comment.

Mr. John Keogan of the SFCRG said that he would like to discuss a recent application for an electrical permit. Mr. Keogan stated that last Monday an electrical contractor got his electrical permit online and it went very smoothly as it always does now with the online system. Mr.

Keogan stated that the customer paid his fee and then a short time later called in for the inspection. Mr. Keogan said that the earliest date the customer was given was a full 10 days later and this contractor is still in shock considering that the permit was for temporary power for a building for construction and after having gone through a very lengthy process in the Planning Department. Mr. Keogan stated that this customer is now ready to go to DBI for some of the permitting and is worried about this kind of a bottleneck.

Mr. Henry Karnilowicz of the SFCRG stated that one of the issues that came up is the delay of even getting a curb cut permit, and right now there is a five-week delay. Mr. Karnilowicz said that with the economy being in the doldrums why does a person have to wait five weeks to get a curb cut done which is really extreme. Mr. Karnilowicz said that he hoped that it is impressed upon the Commissioners that this really does not cut it. Mr. Karnilowicz stated that he could understand that if a customer has to do a lot split and conversion or a project that takes a lot of time however just for a curb cut waiting five weeks is a bit extreme.

Mr. Luke O'Brien of the SFCRG said that he is also speaking as a member of the Small Business Commission and wanted to discuss how DBI and DPW are working to improve communications around the permit process. Mr. O'Brien stated that this is an agenda item that marginally comes up with the Small Business Commission, and he is a member of the sub-committee called the permitting committee and one of the things that they are trying to implement is some sort of improvement to the overall permitting process for anybody trying to open up a small business in San Francisco or deal with the permitting processes in any way. Mr. O'Brien said that he thinks it ties in with that along with a discussion about the online permitting system, and he noted with interest that the Director has the ability right now to electronically format the process for departments today without any need for software coming in or new applications being brought in. Mr. O'Brien stated that he thought this was pretty significant and would be great if this could be on the same system in every other department. Mr. O'Brien said that the Mayor was talking about implementing a new task force that would get involved with improving communications in general with all the various departments, and they actually were talking about announcing a free consultation for every permit applicant to help deal with the different departments and improve the process. Mr. O'Brien stated one of the reasons this is coming up around the Building Department is the inconsistencies in information received from different Inspectors at the job sites and different requirements. Mr. O'Brien said that if somebody starting a restaurant they are seeing other kinds of problems with DPW and said that DPW's interpretation of Code is all over the place. Mr. O'Brien stated that one thing worth repeating would be that there some sort of a schedule or timeline on what is going to be achieved, especially with this RFP and the target, goals and objectives of what that system is going to do and implement and then a time frame that can be referenced to see the progress being made. Mr. O'Brien said that he actually thinks that is the first step in the process and it is pretty easy for DBI to get the system up and running, and all the Department has to do is build in the connections to support the other departments when they want to come online. Mr. O'Brien stated that he would like to see some sort of schedule come up.

President Murphy stated that after some discussion and reading some of his notes he wanted to take another look at Item eight, "Discussion and possible action regarding Request for Extension of CAPSS Program". President Murphy said that he thinks the implications that he has in front of him is that the Commission may have gone a little too far as far as not extending the contract, so

his suggestion is to make another motion rescinding the previous motion. *President Murphy made a motion rescinding the previous motion on Item 8, seconded by Commissioner Hechanova. The motion passed unanimously.*

RESOLUTION NO. BIC 050-10

President Murphy made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Hechanova, to extend the CAPSS contract until the November 17 meeting.

Pamela Levin, Deputy Director of Administrative services, said that President Murphy’s original motion would have meant that DBI could not have paid the contract and it would have been over so the Department could not pay them for any work that they did and the Commission would not get any more deliverables. Ms. Levin stated that if this is done on a month-to-month basis it takes a significant amount of staff work to draft the documents, get it through the contract administration and get signatures on it. Ms. Levin said that she wanted to make it clear that there is an administrative burden.

Commissioner Mar said that he would like to propose his original motion to extend the contract to December.

Commissioner Lee stated that his concern is if the contract is extended all the way to December, what happens if it is not finished in December; is it going to get extended again? Commissioner Lee said that his thought is to finish the work as quickly as possible. President Murphy asked if there was any comment from the vendor on this issue.

Deputy Director Laurence Kornfield said that he believed December 31 was a reasonable date, and said that he believed the work could be completed by then since there are enough scheduled meetings and so on. Mr. Kornfield stated that he hoped there would not be any further extensions beyond December 31 and it just seems like a reasonable completion date.

The Commissioners voted as follows:

President Murphy	Yes	Vice-President Hechanova	Yes
Commissioner Lee	Yes	Commissioner Mar	No
Commissioner Romero	Excused	Commissioner Walker	Excused
Commissioner Clinch	Yes		

The motion carried on a vote of 4 to 1.

RESOLUTION NO. BIC 051-10

6. Update on how DBI determines permit fees charged for Planning services

Director Day stated that the Planning Department has a fee schedule for permits, and the Planning Department determines their fees based on the valuation of the job.

President Murphy asked if DBI determines what the Planning Department's fees are. Director Day said no DBI does not determine the fees as Planning does their own nexus study and sets their own fees, as does every other department. Director Day stated that DBI collects the fees for Planning, but does not determine the amount of the fees. President Murphy said that DBI essentially writes the check for what the Planning Department says they want, and he asked if this has ever been questioned.

Director Day stated that the Planning Department brings their fees to the Board of Supervisors, and they have the same process as DBI does: Director Day stated that Planning has a fee schedule that the Planning Commission first approves and then it is forwarded to the Board of Supervisors. Director Day reiterated that Planning would take their proposed fee schedule to their Commission for approval and then take it to the BOS for incorporation if they are changing the fees or increasing them.

President Murphy said he sees what Director Day means, and he mentioned that the Planning Department's fees are extraordinarily high. Director Day stated that she did not know what they based their fees on, because she has not reviewed their nexus study. President Murphy asked if the BIC could get a report from the Planning Department on how they base their fees. Director Day said that they can have someone from Planning's Administration department come over and explain how they determine their fees, and possibly have this as a future agenda item.

Director Day stated that DBI does charge the Planning Department a slight administration fee for its accounting, and that fee is charged to any department that DBI collects fees for. Commissioner Lee asked if this fee was passed on to the customer. Director Day stated that DBI is not charging customers for that fee, but they are charging the Planning Department, and whether they incorporate what DBI charges into their fees is questionable.

President Murphy called for public comment.

Mr. Henry Karnilowicz of the SFCRG said that some time back he applied for a permit to replace windows and the Planning Department charge was \$800, and however they determined the fees it was really sky high then they said wait a minute and dropped it down to \$400. Mr. Karnilowicz stated that recently he had a very upset client who got a building permit and it was just for the Planning part of it for a stairs and a bathroom. Mr. Karnilowicz said that the job itself was much larger but the cost of that portion of the job was about \$10,000, and the Planning fee was about \$2,700 so he does not know how DBI gets this fee from Planning. Mr. Karnilowicz stated that he is at a loss that he never saw anyone from Planning saying what their determination of their portion of the work is, or what they are signing off on. Mr. Karnilowicz said that he would think that Planning would look at their portion of the work and that would be how they evaluate the fee, but to determine the whole project if that is what they are doing, then there is something wrong with that. Mr. Karnilowicz stated that he would like to see how their department is really doing it because their fees seem really unjustified, and again he had a very unhappy client when they saw that just the Planning part was \$2,700.

Mr. Luke O'Brien of the SFCRG stated that primarily he wanted to support what the previous speaker said because he thinks it is a legitimate point. Mr. O'Brien said that the Department

should definitely put some effort into reviewing the fees that are charged by Planning, and he thinks he can infer from part of what Director Day said that Planning tells DBI what those fees are so DBI is merely following or executing orders. Mr. O'Brien stated since DBI is the collector of the fee that is going to engage DBI in the process of trying to revisit the fee schedule, so he thinks it is a great idea that the Director has somebody come to the BIC to explain the Planning fees. Mr. O'Brien said that everyone tries to understand how to read a cell phone bill and understand all the taxes, but just usually give up and are just at the mercy of the big corporations, but for something as local as the Planning Department he does not think it is too much to ask that customers have a fee schedule that is clear cut and easy to understand. Mr. O'Brien stated that as simple as a contractor might charge a client to do a job, time, materials, dollars per hour, etc. but it should be pretty straight forward and it is not right now. Mr. O'Brien said that it should be put in the discussion that these fees are easy to understand for people to reference later, and he thinks the Planning Department is going to struggle a little bit to justify some of the fees.

9. Commissioner's Questions and Matters.

- a. Inquiries to Staff. At this time, Commissioners may make inquiries to staff regarding various documents, policies, practices, and procedures, which are of interest to the Commission.**

Commissioner Lee stated that he was wondering if the BIC needs to nominate people to the three subcommittees. Secretary Aherne said that she submitted the information to the website and she will follow up on it today. Vice-President Hechanova requested an update on 135 El Camino Del Mar. Secretary Aherne stated that this is an Abatement Appeals Board item and Deputy City Attorney Francesca Gessner said that since it has been over a year that it would be good to schedule an AAB hearing in November, and to notice the building again and to have the people involved in 135 El Camino Del Mar come forward for a full hearing. Secretary Aherne said that the parties will be notified and the building will be posted.

President Murphy called for public comment.

Mr. Henry Karnilowicz said that he commends DBI for the 5th floor and that it does work, so he wants to commend DBI and Director Day for providing that service.

President Murphy thanked Director Day for setting up the PAC meeting and for clarifying issues for users and customers on a regular basis, and said that all the department heads will be there. Director Day said that she could not guarantee that the department heads would be there, because they usually send representatives of the department and actually John Kelly was attending at one point, but now she does not know who is scheduled to attend from Planning. President Murphy asked if there was someone to coordinate to let people know when the meeting would be. Director Day said yes there is a regular agenda that is posted and the PAC meeting is normally held on the third Thursday of every month, so the next meeting would be on October 21. President Murphy asked if there was an attendance sheet. Director Day said that there is a sign-in sheet and the original BPR list and notices are sent to everyone on that mailing list, and also people are added to the list upon their request. Director Day stated that an agenda is mailed out to everyone before the meeting and is also emailed to everyone. Commissioner Lee asked if the

BIC could have a copy of the sign-in sheet. President Murphy asked if it could be included in the BIC package each month. Director Day said that is no problem and staff can also include the minutes from the meeting if the Commissioners want them in printed form, and she mentioned that the agenda and minutes are also online.

- b. Future Meetings/Agendas. At this time, the Commission may discuss and take action to set the date of a Special Meeting and/or determine those items that could be placed on the agenda of the next meeting and other future meetings of the Building Inspection Commission.**

Commissioner Clinch stated that he will not be available to meet on October 20.

Secretary Aherne said that the next regular meeting will be on November 17.

10. Adjournment.

Vice-President Hechanova made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Clinch to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. BIC 052-10

The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sonya Harris
Assistant Secretary

Edited by

Ann Marie Aherne
Commission Secretary

SUMMARY OF REQUESTS BY COMMISSIONERS OR FOLLOW UP ITEMS	
Report from the Planning Department on how they determine their fees. – President Murphy, Director Day	Page 9