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BUSINESS PROCESS REENGINEERING FOR THE BUILDING DEVELOPMENT REVIEW AND INSPECTION PROCESS IN SAN FRANCISCO

Business Process Reengineering (BPR) is a long established management analytical tool used to effect substantial improvements in large organizations with complex processes. It is a fundamental rethinking and radical redesign of business processes with the goal of achieving dramatic improvements in quality, timeliness and responsiveness in the delivery of services.

In May 2007, the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection (DBI), under the direction of Mayor Gavin Newsom and the Building Inspection Commission (BIC), embarked on an ambitious Business Process Reengineering initiative to examine the entire building development review, inspection and permitting process for the City and County of San Francisco. The primary goal was to analyze the existing permitting and inspection process city wide, understand its strengths and weaknesses, and then design a new process that will result in a streamlined, efficient process with a focus on delivering high quality and timely services to our citizens.

In June 2007, we invited key decision makers from the Mayor’s Office, city departments, and stakeholders from the public to convene as our BPR Executive Steering Committee. Four subcommittees were then formed: Plan Review and Permit Issuance; Inspections; Automation; and Performance Measures. Each subcommittee included staff representing city Departments involved in the review and inspection of developments, city union representatives, as well as representatives from industry, community organizations and individual customers. These subcommittees met on a weekly basis (and sometimes more frequently) for four months. During this period, several subcommittee members visited other cities, including San Diego, Sacramento, San Jose and Seattle to review their development review processes and compare those to current practices in San Francisco.

As you will see in the information provided in this report, each subcommittee went through an in-depth, detailed analysis of existing processes; identified key findings; and developed a series of specific recommendations that provide San Francisco’s departments involved in the permit review and inspection process with an excellent “roadmap” to achieve major improvements in the way we do our work. The focus throughout the BPR process remained on implementing changes intended to achieve a simpler, easier-to-navigate, permit process that improves turnaround times, ensures predictability in the process and provides accurate, consistent, and timely service with an emphasis on excellence in customer service.

As a result of the BPR process, a strong foundation and roadmap have been established to guide the implementation process. The recommendations will be prioritized for implementation along with stipulated staffing and budgeting requirements over the next 12 - 24 months. Cooperation and support by the Mayor’s Office, the Board of Supervisors, city departments and their respective Commissions will be essential to the success of this effort. Continued monitoring of the implementation of these improvements will enable us to maximize efficiencies and ensure substantial improvements in customer service.

Simultaneously with the BPR effort, the Department contracted with an independent, professional research company – Corey, Canapary & Galanis Research, in late July and in
August, to conduct **three focus groups** to elicit qualitative insights about the Department’s review and approval process from our customers. These focus groups represented a cross-section of the Department’s customers – specifically homeowners, building professionals and community and industry representatives – and provided us with additional current data related to public and customer service perceptions. Although we did not include the findings from these focus groups in the deliberations of the BPR subcommittees due to time constraints, the focus groups give us another verifiable source of research that substantiates many of the BPR recommendations. As we move forward with the Implementation Phase, the Department will utilize the insightful information produced from the focus groups’ research to ensure that we attain one of our primary goals: being aware of and responding effectively to the needs of our customers.

I am proud to point out that a major finding of our BPR effort is that the staff at DBI, as well as other city agencies, are highly professional, very competent, and possess a great deal of talent, experience and expertise. **The staff is hard working, highly motivated, creative, and committed** to providing high quality and timely service to our citizens.

We have completed this important BPR report, thanks to the dedicated and thoughtful efforts of the nearly **200 participants** listed in the appendix. I especially want to thank the DBI staff who graciously agreed to take on the additional responsibility of chairing and facilitating the BPR initiative, as well as those who participated on the subcommittees. Special thanks also go to our industry subcommittee co-chairs, John Schlesinger from the American Institute of Architects, who led the Plan Review and Permit Issuance Subcommittee; John O’Connor of the Residential Builders Association, who co-chaired the Inspection Subcommittee; Tony Sanchez-Corea of A.R. Sanchez-Corea & Associates, Inc., who co-chaired the Automation Subcommittee; and Gabriel Metcalf, Executive Director of San Francisco Planning + Urban Research Association, who co-chaired the Performance Measures Subcommittee. I also want to thank our customers, representatives of industry and community groups, and other city department staff who took time from their busy schedules to assist us in this invaluable endeavor.

Isam Hasenin, P.E., C.B.O.
Director
Department of Building Inspection
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The BPR Executive Steering Committee completed its review of recommendations forwarded by its four subcommittees in late October 2007. Over 180 recommendations were approved for inclusion in this Report. In addition to these key recommendations, “parking lot” issues were identified by the subcommittees, noting that these were outside of the scope of this initiative.

HIGHLIGHTS OF DBI BPR
KEY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. PLAN REVIEW AND PERMIT ISSUANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

This subcommittee examined the complex review and permit issuance process involving multiple city departments. Depending upon the scope of a proposed project, reviews often demand the time and resources of the Department of Building Inspection, the Planning Department, the Department of Public Works, the San Francisco Fire Department, the Department of Public Health, the Mayor’s Office on Disabilities, the Redevelopment Agency, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, the Municipal Transportation Authority, and others. The subcommittee mapped in detail the “As-Is” and “To-Be” process involved in real project scenarios – and identified the following Key Findings and Recommendations:

Key Findings:

- Automation and technology are not available and/or not fully utilized.
- Lack of well-defined turnaround time for project review.
- Unreasonably long review and processing times.
- Inconsistent plan submittal standards and requirements that vary among reviewing agencies.
- Duplication of plan reviews and rechecks by different reviewing agencies.
- Lack of adequate quality control, staff training manuals and operating procedures.
- Inconsistent application of rules and regulations.
- Inconsistent method of tracking customers in the building.
- Frequent breakdowns in permitting process for customers.
- Improper and inconsistent use of the Permit Tracking System.
- Complex bureaucratic process that still relies too heavily on paper.
- Too many loop-backs in the permitting process.
- Unnecessary hand-offs of customers in the review and processing of permits.
- Frequent bottlenecks at customer service stations.
- Overlapping and sometimes conflicting requirements from different divisions and/or agencies.
- Poor coordination among divisions resulting in a bureaucratic “siloh” mentality.
Key Recommendations:

- Create new permit technician classification, and/or retrain those in existing classification to obtain skills to streamline the review process.
- Implement parallel plan check process for all projects.
- Improve inter-agency and intra-agency coordination of reviews and communications.
- Develop, publish, and implement plan review turnaround times.
- Expand Over-The-Counter services and reviews.
- Install an automated customer tracking system in the Permit Center.
- Centralize intake/plan submittal process and develop better intake standards.
- Identify/eliminate redundant, unnecessary reviews, approvals, and regulations.
- Create/Remodel Permit Center to improve the customer’s experience.
- Create a true “One-Stop Shop,” to include all city review agencies.
- Reduce paper-based process and maximize the use of automation and technology.
- Expand web-based services.

II. INSPECTIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

Because multiple city departments and agencies are frequently involved in a wide range of inspections, coordination issues and time-consuming duplications were identified as areas in need of change. The subcommittee examined carefully the “As-Is” and “To-Be” review and approval process and steps involved in inspection services, and made the following Key Findings and Recommendations:

Key Findings:

- Lengthy turnaround times for inspections.
- Duplication of inspections by more than one agency.
- Automation and technology are not available and/or not fully utilized.
- Automation and technology are not consistently used across all disciplines.
- Inconsistent procedures for inspection requests between different disciplines.

Key Recommendations:

- Develop, publish, and implement turnaround times for inspections to be within two business days of request, with a later goal of one business day.
- Eliminate duplicate inspections by defining explicit inspection responsibilities for each agency and agency divisions.
- Improve coordination between DBI inspections and other agencies such as PG&E, Water Department, SFPUC, DPW-BSM, DPH, etc.
- Centralize and automate inspection scheduling for all disciplines, with all city agencies to adhere to uniform time, hours and methods of inspections.
- Improve consistency and uniformity between inspection staff and/or agencies.
- Schedule Board of Permit Appeals cases to be heard within 45 calendar days to expedite inspections’ process.
III. AUTOMATION SUBCOMMITTEE

This subcommittee focused on the identification and application of state-of-the-art and appropriate technologies, including areas where more accessible and more convenient web-based/online services can be provided, and communications with customers can be improved. It examined in detail the permit review and inspections’ process steps where automation and/or new technology tools can make substantial improvements in terms of accuracy and consistency of data collection, and provide the systemic means to improve the process for those using the system both within city government and the public. The subcommittee identified the following Key Findings and Recommendations:

Key Findings:

- Databases of agencies involved in permit reviews and inspections are not linked.
- Lack of an automated system to track customers in the Permit Center.
- Inconsistent use of the Permit Tracking System by staff.
- Inability of the current Permit Tracking System to provide holds, and accountability sign-offs.
- Inability of the current Permit Tracking System to provide accurate information that shows online/real-time status of any project, including identifying which staff person within a specific agency is currently reviewing that project.
- Too much reliance on paper forms, permits, etc.
- Lack of online plan review and limited online permitting processes.
- Lack of automated transfer of inspection information between field sites and the administrative office.

Key Recommendations:

- Develop city-wide automated permit tracking system to track the entire development, review, permit, and inspection process.
- Integrate databases from all departments involved in permit review and inspections.
- Create a “smart” permit numbering system for simplified, more accurate, tracking of projects.
- Provide updated online services covering all pertinent information for any property, its permit history, construction type, complaints, violations, conditions of approval, etc.
- Expand the availability, use, and scope of online permits.
- Provide field staff with mobile device capable of receiving/transmitting/updating information between the field and office database.
- Pilot electronic plan submittal and plan review.
- Implement an automated customer tracking system in the Permit Center.

IV. PERFORMANCE MEASURES SUBCOMMITTEE

This subcommittee focused on the identification and development of quantifiable and measurable criteria applicable to all city agencies involved in the application and plan review, permit issuance and inspection processes. Charged with setting reasonable, practical and achievable goals/performance standards city wide, and
thereby setting the baseline from which ongoing changes may be measured and acted upon, the subcommittee identified the following **Key Findings and Recommendations**:

**Key Findings:**

- Lack of established turnaround time targets for plan reviews.
- Lack of established turnaround time targets for inspections.

**Key Recommendations:**

- Implement the following performance measures and turnaround times.
- Provide quarterly and annual reports to evaluate actual performance against established measures and objectives.

**Target:**

1. To complete and issue to the project sponsor the **initial comprehensive** plan review comments within established turnaround times as described below, for at least 90% of projects. These turnaround times will apply to **all review disciplines** unless otherwise noted.

   a. **Small Projects:** 10 business days from arrival date to review discipline.
      - Simple one or two-story single family and duplex on level lot.
      - Minor modifications and additions to single multi-family residential, commercial and industrial buildings.
      - Signs with structural calculations.
      - Commercial tenant-improvements with minor structural calculations.
      - Site retaining walls.
      - Foundation repairs.
      - Storage racks.

   b. **Medium Projects:** 20 business days from arrival date to review discipline.
      - Three-story or more single family dwelling or duplex.
      - Custom, unusual single family dwelling including hillside with steel substructure and/or concrete piers or caissons.
      - Two, three or four-story multi-family, commercial or office buildings.
      - Simple four-story multi-family residential project over a concrete podium.
      - Complex commercial and office tenant improvements with or without structural calculations.
      - Parking structures (up to three stories).
      - Assembly occupancies (churches, schools, restaurants with multiple dining rooms, etc.).
      - Excavation and shoring.
      - Indoor swimming pool.
c. Large Projects: Turnaround times to be determined on a case by case basis determined and provided to project sponsor at submittal time for all reviewing agencies (excluding Planning Department and SFRA). **Note:** These projects must go through completeness review by appointment only before intake.

- Complex four or more stories commercial/office buildings or multi-family project including buildings over a concrete podium.
- High rise buildings.
- Multiplex theatres/auditoriums.
- Multi-story shopping centers/malls.
- Convention centers.
- Airport.
- Wastewater and water treatment plants.
- Projects subject to peer review.

2. **For building permit application**, Planning Department and SFRA to complete and issue the initial comprehensive plan review comments/corrections, within **15 business days** of arrival date, for **90% of projects**.

3. To schedule all rechecks within **three business days** of request for at least **90%** of projects.

4. To **distribute all submitted drawings** to next review station within **one business day** for **90%** of projects.

5. To schedule **pre-application meetings** for all city agencies, excluding Planning Department and SFRA, within **three business days** of request and to be held within **10 business days** for **90%** of projects.

6. For **Planning Department and SFRA**, to schedule **pre-application meetings** within **three business days** of request to be held within **15 business days** for **90%** of projects.

7. For **all city agencies**, to perform field inspections associated with DBI permits within **two business days** of request for **90%** of projects with a long-term goal of **one business day**.

8. For **DBI and SFFD**, to **respond to life hazards/life safety/lack of heat complaints** within **one business day** for **100%** of requests.
REPORT METHODOLOGY
To provide a framework of review and actions, each of San Francisco’s BPR subcommittees applied the following key principles to business process reengineering. These were:

- **“SWOT”** is an acronym for the identification of the **Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats** impacting an organization. The BPR subcommittees conducted a SWOT analysis which enabled them to make accurate and focused strategic decisions and to prioritize reengineering steps.

- **Gather and analyze existing data** to get a clear understanding of how the work processes currently operate within the city, as well as collect information from other agencies. The BPR subcommittees for Plan Review and Permit Issuance, Inspections, Automation, and Performance Measures developed data questionnaires pertaining to their respective areas of expertise and requested data input from **31 jurisdictions** for benchmarking purposes, as well as obtained **stakeholders’ qualitative reviews** of the existing process to assist in identifying process areas of key customer concern.

- **Create Process Flow Mapping** – a tool that visually displays an entire process in a logical sequence of events from beginning to end. Subcommittees produced both **“As-Is”** and **“To-Be”** process maps – which may be seen in the “Mapping” section of this Report. These maps provide a structure for thinking through an often complex process in a simplified manner, which can then be analyzed. Process Flow Mapping enabled the subcommittee participants to ask questions about the process such as:
  - Why?
  - What happens if …?
  - Do we have to …?
  - What is the consequence of not doing…?
  - What does this mean?
  - How did that get started?
  - What is the purpose for that?
  - What is the value-added? (Steps that are relevant/contribute to effectiveness)
  - What is the non-value added? (Bottlenecks, barriers, breakdowns, etc.)

- **Recommendations** – As a result of the detailed analysis of existing processes; **“As-Is”** and **“To-Be”** Process Flow Mapping, a series of specific recommendations were developed that provide San Francisco’s departments involved in the permit review and inspection processes with an excellent **“roadmap”** to achieve major improvements in the way we do our work.
SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS
PLAN REVIEW
AND
PERMIT ISSUANCE
SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT
The Plan Review and Permit Issuance Subcommittee analyzed how all city agencies currently review building permit applications, methods used for permit tracking and issuance, and which practices should be changed to improve these processes. This was done by detailed mapping of both the “As-Is” and “To-Be” process. More than 120 recommendations are included in this report to meet the goals of better utilizing the professional expertise of city staff, streamlining the processes within city agencies and vastly improving customer service.

I. SWOT ANALYSIS

During the SWOT Analysis meetings, the subcommittee found the strongest elements of the permit process in San Francisco were the tools that made the permit process customer friendly. The weaker elements included confusing policies and procedures, and inconsistent information within and among departments.

Strengths

- **Online** electrical and plumbing permits.
- **Complaint** Tracking System.
- New Over-The-Counter (OTC) process.
- Professionalism and knowledge of DBI staff.
- Frequent training for both staff and public.
- DBI pre-application conferences.

Weaknesses

- **Lack of communication** among Plan Review Services and Inspection Services.
- Mostly serial vs. parallel plan review process.
- **Lack of accountability** of work performed by staff.
- Low staffing levels.
- Confusion between permit number vs. permit application number.
- Revision, renewal, and extension policies.
- **Lack of established guidelines** for different disciplines.
- No online permits for simple building permits.
- Limited number of Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) on website.
- **Lack of centralization** of permit and plan review functions.
- **Lack of interdepartmental** notification procedures.
- **Misrouting** of permit applications.
- Difficulty in obtaining general answers to code questions, both in person and online.
- **Lack of** advertising, notification of services.
• Problem identifying **recurring mistakes in plan review**. Lack of adequate quality control, accountability among supervisors and staff.
• **Lack of standards** of quality of work required of permit applicants.
• Lack of proper **nametags** to identify city staff to the public.
• **Lost plans and permit applications**, resulting in the need for duplicate permit applications and plans to be provided by customers.
• **Inconsistent requirements** among departments, resulting in confusion.
• **Too much paper** being used, rather than using automated systems.
• Confusion regarding **conditional use** posting requirements by Planning Department and DBI appeals processes.
• **Inconsistent policies** related to Temporary Certificate of Occupancy (TCO) and Certificate of Final Completion and Occupancy (CFC).
• Lack of follow up of **contractors' information** on permit applications.
• Inconsistent valuation of **scope of work**.
• Difficulty in finding and **obtaining records** at the Planning Department.
• **Inconsistent standards** among departments for quality of materials required for applications.
• Confusion over **permit numbers and scope of work** when revisions are required for a project that has already received permits.
• Lack of **consistent turnaround times** for project review.
• Confusing permit renewal and extension **policies**.
• **No in-house** training manuals, operating procedures, etc.
• **Rechecks** performed by more than one division.
• **Too many tasks** performed by staff causing bottlenecks and longer lines of waiting customers.

**Opportunities**
• **Centralize** application and plan review functions.
• Improve the **working relationship** among agencies.
• Increase the amount of **automation and paperless** transfer of information.
• **Changes to City Charter** as required to streamline the process.

**Threats**
• **Lack of willingness** to change the culture and operating procedures within multiple city agencies.
II. ANALYSIS OF BENCHMARKING SURVEY AND STAKEHOLDER SURVEY

Benchmarking Survey from Other Cities:

Of 31 jurisdictions that were contacted, representatives from six responded, only one of which was within California.

The respondents were from:
- Montreal, Quebec, Canada
- St. Paul, Minnesota
- Honolulu, Hawaii
- Portland, Oregon
- Miami, Florida
- Los Angeles, California

Findings:

1. Most had some sort of customer greeting by staff with some knowledge of the process.
2. Most had some kind of tutorial for the public on the permit process.
3. Very few had tutorials for the public on code issues.
4. Intake standards varied among municipalities, depending upon department size.
5. Only a few had an internal permit tracking system. Those that did often released drawings to the applicant after initial review.
6. All plan examiners were responsible for reviewing more than one discipline.
7. No departments had a separate agency for reviewing disability access for publicly funded projects.
8. All departments required additional permits when there were changes to the existing scope of work.
9. All departments had some form of OTC review and approvals.
10. Only a few had enhanced permit review services and these were normally due to third party plan checking services.
11. All departments had a central cashier station.
Stakeholder Survey from Customers:

As of August 29, 2007, there were 57 responses from the solicitation of 350 repeat customers, as well as walk-in customers at the Permit Center. The profiles of the respondents were as follows:

- Large architecture firm: 6
- Small architecture firm: 7
- Large contracting company: 7
- Small contracting company: 8
- Permit consultant: 5
- City Planner: 1
- Attorney: 1
- Utility/Telecom Company: 1
- Unknown, but knowledgeable about the process: 8
- Unknown, but not knowledgeable about the process: 5
- Unknown: 8

**TOTAL 57**

Findings:

1. The bar charts that accompany the online survey generated by SurveyMonkey.com are misleading, as they do not accurately gauge the sentiment of the respondents. It is more important to look at the individual responses and manually analyze the trends.

2. Generally, the respondents gave staff of DBI high marks for being courteous and trying to be helpful. There were mixed reviews regarding the Planning Department staff.

3. Respondents were more favorable when obtaining simple or OTC permits. Those frequent customers that obtain more complex permits were much more critical of the system, but made a distinction between reacting favorably towards city employees vs. the process, which they reacted to unfavorably.

4. There was a universally favorable response regarding DBI’s training program for both staff and the public.

5. There was a universally favorable response regarding DBI’s Public Service Division.

6. Those that were aware of recent changes at DBI since Director Hasenin’s arrival were favorable.

7. **Primary complaints about the process**, particularly for the more complex permit applications included:
   
a. Inconsistent instructions and code interpretations by permit reviewers.
   
b. Inconsistent interpretation and instructions by Planning Department staff, due to the discretionary nature of all Planning Department submittals. Long delays in permit processing at the Planning Department and long waits for cases to be calendared at hearings.
c. Lack of pertinent processing information and contact information on websites or handouts from DBI, Planning Department and other agencies, such as Department of Public Works - Bureau of Street Use and Mapping (DPW-BSM), Redevelopment Agency (SFRA), San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD), Department of Public Health (DPH), Mayor’s Office on Disability (MOD), San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), etc.

d. Most architects and permit consultants were concerned about retribution.

e. Lengthy delays at the Central Permit Bureau (CPB) to obtain permit and pay fees.

f. Rechecks of the same information by different stations or divisions. The lack of online permit applications.

Recommendations from Stakeholders:

The recommendations from stakeholders were quite similar to those developed by the subcommittee. They have been incorporated into the subcommittee recommendations, immediately following this section. They include:

1. Make the permit review process more streamlined, including providing more OTC possibilities.

2. Provide more web-based solutions to permit tracking and permit applications.

3. Reduce unnecessary rechecks of plans.

4. Ensure faster turnaround times for submitted permit applications.

5. Provide more opportunities for enhanced services for additional fees.

6. Ensure more consistency in code interpretations and standards for what is required on drawing submittals.
III. PLAN REVIEW AND PERMIT ISSUANCE SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

A. PLAN REVIEW AND PERMIT ISSUANCE: OVERALL PROCESS

1. **New Permit Center** on one or two floors for all agency review; perhaps at a new building location in the future.

2. Initial staff contact must be familiar with the whole process – identify needs for permit and give **consistent answers**.
   a. Provide more frequent regularly scheduled in-house training to improve knowledge base of all staff and improve consistency of interpretations. These trainings should be hands on and job specific.
   b. Improve recruiting and hiring policies to improve technical expertise.
   c. Increase written policies and procedures for plan reviewers.

3. All staff at all agencies to have **nametags**.

4. Provide more **quality control** throughout review process.

5. Maintain adequate staffing levels at all public counters to meet customer demands, including full time hours, **“buddy system”** for on-call back up technicians.

6. Make location of application more clear to the public through the Permit Tracking System (PTS). Use **“buddy system,”** to prevent submittals from lingering on people’s desks during vacation or leave times.

7. Install an **automated customer tracking system** to provide comprehensive routing and screening, inquiries/questions from the public, etc.
   a. Identify customer by name and track throughout while the customer is in the building, as well as while the project is being reviewed.
   b. Identify staff and track each staff action throughout the review process.
   c. Ensure appropriate customer flow to eliminate bottlenecks.
   d. Provide a mechanism to inform the customer of the average turnaround review time (How long it will take for a plan reviewer to start looking at a set of plans when the application is submitted today).

8. **Develop a better process** to identify need for permit versus those items that may not need a permit.

9. Provide better **internal communications** among staff, between divisions and between agencies. Provide cross training between divisions and departments.

10. **Eliminate duplicate reviews** that result in overlapping work. Separate tasks within stations to eliminate overburdening of staff and reduce turnaround time for customer.
a. Make parallel plan review process available for all projects.

b. Within the parallel plan review process, provide multi-agency approach to notify customers of general information, pre-application conferences, plan review and plan check comments.

c. Provide consistency in code interpretations and submittal requirements among plan reviewers.

11. Give **technical staff** the authority to route/assign applications. This requires better initial screening with more technical expertise.

12. Increase the opportunity for the customer to **obtain permits and access general information and other customer services online.**

   a. Provide online fee estimation calculation.
   b. Provide permit application submittal guidelines and checklists, including clear written process for permit application and review.
   c. Provide a comprehensive organizational chart for each agency – Planning Department, DPW-BSM, DBI, SFFD, MOD, SFRA, SFPUC, DPH, etc. Help guide people on how to connect to the correct information and city staff resource. Include SFRA jurisdiction maps to be available online to all.
   d. Provide automated notification of customers including via email.

13. **Intake/permit review:**

   a. Improve the process with more up-front screening.
   b. Have clear and integrated automation process; including:
      o A combined street/address/verification process.
      o Fewer, more accurate application and customer information forms.
      o One permit/project number, so entire process may include digitized/electronic submittals.

14. Create **permit application submittal guidelines, checklists** from each department and make them available online and in hard copy.

15. Demand an **improvement to the quality of work** coming in. Follow the lead of other cities (“If not good enough or missing info, come back when you are ready.” “If we are raising the bar for ourselves, we are also raising the bar for our customers.”)

   a. Guidelines and checklists should be available in hardcopy and online.
   b. Include specific agency interpretations such as Federal Fair Housing Act requirements.

16. Create a **unified permit and complaint system** for better tracking.

17. **Improve coordination** among plan review and inspections, to reduce in-house field changes.

18. **Shorten turnaround times** for project application reviews.
19. **Centralize all cashier functions**, except for the following:

   a. Records management (reproductions of drawings or records).
   b. Planning Department services (Conditional Use, Variance, Discretionary Review, and Major Environmental Analysis).

20. **Separate the cashier function** from all other tasks that have traditionally been performed by Central Permit Bureau employees, to prevent extensive wait times.

   a. **DBI Records** – Retain separate cash transactions, due to location of service at permit center. Retain **five business days** turnaround.
   b. **Planning Department records** – Retain the transaction for obtaining copies through the clerical staff at the Planning Department, providing there is a maximum **five business days** turnaround.

21. **Create a database** of city buildings, including easements.

22. **Re-evaluate and continue to improve** the process beyond what is established as a result of the BPR process.

**B. DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION: PERMIT CENTER**

1. **Station 1 - Registration**: Provide initial check in station to identify needs of the customer with general information and registration functions.

   **General Information Counter functions**: customer may choose one of two options:

   - **Option 1**: First station is to be used by all customers for all agency matters – to be called the **Registration Counter** – one central station for all needs.
   - **Option 2**: Would allow frequent customers to use a self check-in process at a kiosk in lieu of the registration counter above.
   - **Both options** would be connected to a newly installed automated customer tracking system to track all customers (permits, inspections, complaints, records, etc). Enable customer priority in the queue for next day if process not completed the same day.
   - General screening personnel must be familiar with **entire process** to determine customer needs, answer general questions, direct customer to person who can answer more specific questions, permit application, plan review, inspection, etc.
   - If permit related, then route customer to next station (see Station 2 below).
   - Total time for interacting with customer not to exceed **60 seconds**.

2. **Station 2 – Initial Permit Review (IPR) Station**: Customers applying for permits are to be sent by **Registration Counter** or self-help kiosk to this station. This counter is to be staffed by a new classification level with expertise between Building Inspectors (6331) and Principal Clerks (1408); to be called **“Permit Technician”**. This staff will enter all information into PTS (all permit applications will now be paperless), determine routing to subsequent stations for review, depending on the type of permit application, check for completeness of submittal
(both digital application forms and drawings), check Housing Inspection status, check for registered violations on PTS, checks general information such as block, lot, occupancy class, use, metes.bounds, address or adds new address to PTS, agent disclosure information, owner-builder declaration, inclusionary housing requirements, determine fee valuations, check approval of green recycling program, check status of San Francisco Business Tax Registration, Workers’ Compensation and Contractor’s information from the Contractors State License Board database, and approve simple permits.

Other staff responsibilities at counters that are part of Station 2 (may be done by newly trained 1408 clerks): Provide plans under 15 calendar days hold to view, organize and mail 300 foot radius notices when required, handle expired permit renewals, send notice of permit cancellation or letters of disapproval, process permit withdrawals and refunds, provide bilingual translation services, change owner/contractor information on permit applications when necessary.

Additional Recommendations:
- All applications and forms are to be electronic, so they may be entered into PTS.
- Track staff comments, answers, determinations, requirements, etc. Tie tracking system to PTS.
- Provide better access to Assessor’s Office database to cover all address issues and access to other city agencies’ databases.
- When projects are required to be reviewed by the Planning Department, they should be routed there first. After the Planning Department has reviewed the application, a “shotgun” or parallel plan check review process (depending on type of permit) is to be performed at other stations.
- Maintain express window for electrical and plumbing permits.
- Permit Technician: last sign-off station, checks for completeness of set and sign-offs from other stations, stamps approved drawings and issues them to applicant.
- Note: IPR station is to have multiple staff with differing skills (express, submittals, etc.) to minimize bottlenecks.

3. **Station 3 – Cashier**: provide separate cashier station for all transactions except DBI and Planning Department records.

4. Install a customer **Self-Help Center** with amenities including: copy machine, fax, phone, computer, available forms, online access, office supplies, plan layout and work area.

5. Increase opportunities for **online permit application filing and issuance**, such as some DPW-BSM and simple DBI permits.

C. **PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

1. **Separate tasks** between telephone duty, intake, general questions, records management, and complaint filing to speed up the lines and ensure better customer service.
2. Handle **triage during initial screening** at the IPR station, to enable better answers, rather than having a customer wait in line, only to be told to come back with proper information.

- Provide checklist for DBI staff to properly check for completeness of submittal.

3. Offer pre-application meetings with written decisions by staff for both residential projects, and for larger projects, that include a multi-disciplinary review. The caveat remains that all Planning Department applications are discretionary.

4. **Form a Task Force with DBI** to address:
   - The problems and conflicts with **replacement windows** in existing structures.
     - Define when and where wood clad windows, vinyl clad windows and aluminum clad windows may be used. Training is needed for both DBI and Planning Department staff members to provide consistency in interpretations.
     - Provide online and published public notification, once this has been established.
     - Establish clear delineation of Planning Department requirements, including the building locations where this policy will be enforced. Currently there is great inconsistency.
     - The conflicts with existing **property line windows** on adjacent properties where revocable easements have not been recorded and where new construction will obstruct these windows. This will address many cases that currently result in discretionary review filings. This will be resolved in the near future by the Zoning Administrator issuing a letter of determination.
     - The allowable use of **“imminent collapse”** claimed in demolition permits.
     - The definition and application of the Planning Department’s **definition of demolition**, to avoid the stopping of work during construction, particularly when there is an increase to the scope of work as a result of damage discovered after obtaining the building permit.

5. **Coordinate the notification requirements**, using a Universal Planning Notification (UPN) process between DBI and Planning Department for those projects that include both demolition and:
   - Variance
   - Conditional Use
   - Planning Code Section 311-312 Notifications

6. **Eliminate delays** in project reviews before notices have gone out, before hold periods begin and hearings occur, as well as after hearings have been completed and drawings are ready to be transferred to DBI.

7. **Average turnaround times** for appointments for conditional use, variance, environmental review applications to be **10 business days**.
D. DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS - BUREAU OF STREET USE AND MAPPING (DPW-BSM)

1. Have **permanent presence at the new Permit Center**, including additional staff to conduct some Over-The-Counter (OTC) application review.
   a. Provide check list for DBI staff to properly check for completeness of submittal.

2. **Create a Task Force** at the Director level to discuss potential policy changes between DBI, Planning Department, DPW-BSM, and PG&E to come up with solution regarding underground vaults in sidewalks.
   a. Pre-application required for PG&E vault within **seven business days**.
   b. Recommend that the Office of the City Attorney determine PG&E obligations to the city and customers for maintaining their distribution.
   c. Office of the City Attorney to investigate legality of PG&E practices/obligation to city, especially charging property owners for multi-use network vaults.
   d. Problem: Major design issue as it conflicts with Planning Department guidelines. Need policy-level discussion on multiple demands for vaults under sidewalks.
   e. Problem: Installing sidewalk vaults – lack of coordination among PG&E, DPW-BSM and Planning Department. Current criteria: usually allowed when serving more than one developer. Need to address single developments. The smaller the development and the narrower the street exposure, the greater impact utility closets have on the ground floor street frontage.
   f. Solution: Develop a process for pre-application meetings with PG&E, DPW-BSM, and Planning Department within **five business days**, so that project sponsor can obtain approvals for vaults at the front end of the entitlement process.

3. **Change review for some permits** (such as sidewalk replacement with no changes) to be OTC without plans. Change the review of other permits (such as simple sidewalk permits without special encroachments) to be OTC with plans.

E. DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH (DPH)

1. **Provide permanent presence at the new Permit Center**, including additional staff to conduct some OTC application review.
   a. Provide checklist for DBI staff to properly check for completeness of submittal.
F. REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY (SFRA)

1. Provide permanent presence at the new Permit Center, including additional staff to conduct some OTC application review.
   a. Provide check list for DBI staff to properly check for completeness of submittal.

G. MAYOR’S OFFICE ON DISABILITY (MOD)

1. Create an on-call service to enable a representative from MOD to be available for the OTC and parallel plan checking processes.
   a. Provide checklist for DBI staff to properly check for completeness of submittal.

H. SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT (SFFD)

1. Identify plan review responsibilities, more specifically between the SFFD and DBI, to avoid overlap and recheck of some items.

I. SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION (SFPUC)

1. SFPUC requires plans to show fixture counts and calculations to determine fees.
   a. Include information at pre-application conferences.
   b. Transfer some plan review responsibilities to DBI, to avoid overlap and recheck of some items. Provide checklist for DBI staff to properly check for completeness of submittal.

J. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Access State Contractor’s License Board and Workers’ Compensation information.
2. DBI’s ability to issue a new business license.
3. DBI needs to have real time access to streamline registration, renewals, and verification.
4. New SFPUC fees and regulations: DBI staff to continue to meet with SFPUC BPR participants to address the following issues:
   a. Clarify SFPUC requirements for types of buildings based on fee changes beginning January 1, 2008.
   b. Clarify Water Department issue of “new” versus “existing” service if it is a remodel or new construction. Water Department relies on DBI’s designation, which may not be correct.
   c. Tie fees for water/wastewater capacity charges when permit is issued.
   d. Wastewater capacity charge paid at permit issuance, as of January 2008. Follow newly adopted procedures by the SFPUC.
      • SFPUC to send general information and criteria for IPR station to have during initial screening.
• Pre-application conference will be necessary to tag items that have not yet been adopted as agency policy, but are part of the negotiations during the entitlement process.

5. **Further coordination among SFFD and DBI** is needed to eliminate overlapping plan review functions and rechecks.

   a. Solution: SFFD is to provide checklist criteria for IPR staff to check or completeness. SFFD staff will still need to be part of IPR process, to review items in question, solely under the purview of the SFFD. Once checklist has been established, SFFD is to work with DBI on which plan check items will be checked and rechecked by the respective agencies.

6. **Conflicts between DBI demolition policy and Planning Department’s Discretionary Review Policy** regarding the definition of demolition, substantial alteration, replacement building, etc.

   a. A **task force is to be created** with representatives from each Commission to evaluate and recommend changes to eliminate conflicts.

7. The need to **improve** the coordination of Planning Department **conditions of approval** (results of conditional use, variance, CEQA appeals, discretionary review or other hearings), so they are properly identified with the permit application numbers at DBI during plan review.

8. The Planning Department has requested that an additional copy of the approved site permit drawings be retained at the Planning Department to ensure that the drawings processed at the processing station matches the originally approved drawings.

   a. Solution: **additional third set of drawings** is required to be submitted for approval by the customer. The Planning Department retains one copy, while the other two copies are forwarded to the processing station for customer pick up and use for the addendum submittal.
IV. MAPPING

USING THE MAPS

There are separate maps for each of five general types of plan review and permitting processes, including Over-The-Counter Without Plans, Over-The-Counter With Plans, Residential Alterations and Additions, Residential Demolition and New Construction, and New High Rises. There is also a map for electrical and plumbing permits. With the exception of mapping for the Central Permit Bureau functions and electrical and plumbing permits, each plan review and permitting process has an “As-Is” map, showing the existing plan review and permitting procedures and a “To-Be” map, showing proposed plan review and permitting procedures.

After each “As-Is” and “To-Be” map, there is a list of primary “issues” in the process that were discovered during SWOT analysis and data gathering efforts, and a narrative describing the step-by-step “To-Be” process.
A. CENTRAL PERMIT BUREAU

Due to the reorganization of CPB’s functions, its tasks will be shown within the “To-Be” Mapping of each of the typical “To-Be” maps.
BPR - Plan Review and Permit Issuance Subcommittee As-Is Mapping: Central Permit Bureau (CPB) Simple Permit without Plans – Over-The-Counter (OTC)

Simple Permit without Plans OTC

1. Sign in on Pink Clipboard
   Wait time: 20 minutes - 2 hours

   Central Permit Bureau
   8:00 AM - 4:30 PM
   558-6070

   1408 Clerical Staff
   Reviews for completeness and accuracy

   Verifies signatures and proper routing on form.

   Check date entered by Station 2
   OTC counter or 4th Floor is correct

   Assigns Permit Application Number

   If problem, send to original plan reviewer

   Corrects

   Returns to CPB

   Plan Examiner corrects

   Wrong information

   Verifies general information such as block and lot, address, occupancy class.

   Returns to CPB

   Plan Examiner corrects

   No supporting documents.

   More research must be done to find/address address

   Block and Lot, occupancy class, unit count research on AVS, maps, permit history, etc.

   Enters all information into Permit Tracking System, including valuation, routing of review process, other information from Agent Disclosure Form, R-1 Tenant Dislocation Form, Owner-Builder Declaration

   Contracts required

   State Contractor's License Board
   Tax Collector's Office
   City Hall

   City Hall
   Tax Collector's Office
   8:00 AM - 5:00 PM

   Insurance

   First time Contractor applying
   With no proof of documentation or
   Expired licenses/insurance

   State Contractor's License Board
   Must renew and return with proof

   Check State Contractor's License, SF Business Tax Registration, and Workers Compensation (if needed) in Contractor Information Database

   Permit with Contractor Undeclared

   Must renew and return with proof

   Payment by cash, check, Visa or MasterCard.
   Enter data into PTS, Process on POS.

   Permits Plate, Fill out Job Card with application number and expiration date, Attach other information such as “General Information about Construction in San Francisco” and SF Environment brochure on Construction/Demolition Waste

   Storage Room to be Microfilmed
   Picked up by Public Services Division Staff

   Storage Room to be Microfilmed
   Picked up by Public Services Division Staff

   Issues permit, Job Card, and gives to customer

   Calls District Inspector to Start Work

   WORK UNDERWAY

Other CPB Duties:
- Answer miscellaneous questions
- Address assignments
- Provide plans under 15 calendar days hold to view
- 300' Mail of principal portion (DBI policy)
- Expired permit renewals
- Extension of permits still under filing
- Notice of Permit Cancellation / Letter of Disapproval
- Permit withdrawal
- Maintain list of notifications
- Bilingual translation
- Change owner/contractor
- Refunds
- Meetings, trainings

August 14, 2007
BPR – Plan Review and Permit Issuance Subcommittee As-Is Mapping: Central Permit Bureau (CPB) Simple Permit with Plans – Over-The-Counter (OTC)

**Simple Permit with Plans OTC**

1. **Take a number**
   - Waittime: 30 minutes ~ 2 hours

2. **Central Permit Bureau**
   - 8:00 AM – 4:30 PM
   - 558-6070

3. **1408 Clerical Staff**
   - Reviews for completeness and accuracy

4. **Verify signatures and proper routing on form. Look at plans for correct/ completeness/accuracy**

5. **Verify general information such as block and lot and address, occupancy, etc.**

6. **Block and Lot, occupancy class, unit count research on AVS, maps, permit history, etc.**

7. **Returns to CPB**
   - Wrong information
   - No supporting documents
   - More research must be done to find/address

8. **Check State Contractor's License Board**
   - Must renew and return with proof

9. **First time Contractor applying**
   - With no proof of documentation or Expired licenses/insurance

10. **Check State Contractor's License, SF Business Tax Registration, and Workers' Comp (if needed) in Contractor Information Database**

11. **Assigns Permit Application Number**

12. **Enter all information into Permit Tracking System, including valuation, routing of review process, other information from Agent Disclosure Form, R-1 Tenant Dislocation Form, Owner-Builder Declaration**

13. **Print Permit, Fill out Job Card with application number and expiration date. Attach other information such as "General Information about Construction in San Francisco" and SF Environment brochure on Construction/Demolition Waste procedures**

14. **If paying by Company Credit Card, Must have Company's Authorization Letter**

**Other CPB Duties:**
- Address assignments
- Answer miscellaneous questions
- Provide plans under 15 calendar days hold to view
- 300’ Mail of principal portion (DBI policy)
- Expired permit renewals
- Extension of permits still under filing
- Notice of Permit Cancellation / Letter of Disapproval
- Permit withdrawal
- Maintain list of notifications
- Bilingual translation
- Change owner/contractor
- Refunds
- Meetings, trainings

---

**August 14, 2007**
BPR – Plan Review and Permit Issuance Subcommittee As-Is Mapping: Central Permit Bureau (CPB) Filing - Additions

START

Horizontal/Vertical Addition Ready for Inake/Filing

Take a number
Waittime: 30 minutes ~ 2 hours

Central Permit Bureau
8:00 AM – 4:30 PM
558-6070

1408 Clerical Staff
reviews for completeness and accuracy

Verify signatures and proper routing on form. Look at plans for correct/ completeness/discrepancy

If problem, send to original Plan Examiner

Returns to CPB

Corrects Made
Returns to CPB

Wrong info

Plan Examiner corrects

Verifies signatures and proper routing on form.
Look at plans for correct/completeness/discrepancy

Returns to CPB

Verifies general information such as block/lot and address occupancy class

Block and Lot, occupancy class, unit count research on AVS, maps, permit history, etc.

No supporting documents. More research must be done to find/ add address

Assigns Permit Application Number

Enters all information into Permit Tracking System, including valuation, routing of review process, other information from Agent Disclosure Form, R-1 Tenant Dislocation Form, Owner-Builder Declaration

Other CPB Duties:
- Answer miscellaneous questions
- Address assignments
- Provide plans under 15 day hold to view
- 300' Mail of principal portion (DBI policy)
- Expired permit renewals
- Extension of permits still under filing
- Notice of Permit Cancellation / Letter of Disapproval
- Permit withdrawal
- Maintain list of notifications
- Bilingual translation
- Change owner/contractor
- Refunds
- Meetings, trainings

STOP

State Contractor's License Board
City Hall
Tax Collector's Office
Insurance

First time Contractor applying
With no proof of documentation or
Expired licenses/insurance

Check State Contractors' License, SF Business Tax Registration, and Worker's Comp (if needed) in Contractor Information Database

Permit with Contractor Undeclared

Check Engineer/Architect's license number stamped on all sheets of plans

If missing stamps

Write Permit Application number at end of plan sheets

Payment by cash, check, Visa or MasterCard. Enter data into PTS. Process on POS.

Hard writes Plan Check Receipt and gives to Customer. Customer fills out Yellow Postcard

Sends Permit Application and Plans to next station on routing slip

Check data entered by 4th Floor is correct

Check Engineer/Architect's license number stamped on all sheets of plans

Write Permit Application number at end of plan sheets

Payment by cash, check, Visa or MasterCard. Enter data into PTS. Process on POS.

Hand writes Plan Check Receipt and gives to Customer. Customer fills out Yellow Postcard

Sends Permit Application and Plans to next station on routing slip

STOP

August 15, 2007
BPR - Plan Review and Permit Issuance Subcommittee As-Is Mapping: Central Permit Bureau (CPB) Filing New Construction with Demolition

START

Reading for Filing

Take a number
Waittime: 30 minutes ~ 2 hours

Central Permit Bureau
8:00 AM – 4:30 PM
558-6070

1408 Clerical Staff
reviews for completeness and accuracy

Verify signatures and proper routing on form.
Look at plans for correct/ completeness/discrepancy

If problem, send to original Plan Examiner

Correction Made

Returns to CPB

Plan Examiner corrects

Block and lot, occupancy class/use,
metes/bounds, diagram on permit application

Check address or Create New Address

Address Problem

Assigns Permit Application Number

Check data entered by 4th Floor is correct

Check Engineer/Architect’s license number stamped on all sheets of plans

Check State Contractors’ License, SF Business Tax Registration, and Worker’s Comp (if needed) in Contractor information Database

Demolition Notice: 2 sets of mailing stickers, affidavit, 300’ radius map, mailing list for file

PAYMENT BY CASH, CHECK, VISA OR MASTERCARD.
Enter data into PTS.
Process on POS.
Hand write Plan Check receipt and give to Customer
Customer write Yellow Postcard

If paying by Company Credit Card,
Must have Company’s Authorization Letter

Other CPB Duties:
• Answer miscellaneous questions
• Address assignments
• Provide plans under 15-day hold to view
• 300’ Mail of principal portion (DBI policy)
• Expired permit renewals
• Extension of permits still under filing
• Notice of Permit Cancellation / Letter of Disapproval
• Permit withdrawal
• Maintain list of notifications
• Bilingual translation
• Change owner/contractor
• Refunds
• Meetings, trainings

STOP

First time Contractor applying
With no proof of documentation or
Expired licenses/Insurance

Insufficient documents

More research must be done to resolve issue

State Contractor’s License Board
City Hall
Tax Collector’s Office
8:00 AM – 5:00 PM

Permit with Contractor Undeclared

Check data entered by 4th Floor is correct

Check Engineer/Architect’s license number stamped on all sheets of plans

Write Permit Application number at end of plan sheets

Payment by cash, check, Visa or MasterCard.
Enter data into PTS.
Process on POS.
Hand write Plan Check receipt and give to Customer
Customer write Yellow Postcard

Send Permit Application and plans to next station on Routing Slip

FINISH
BPR – Plan Review and Permit Issuance Subcommittee As-Is Mapping: Central Permit Bureau (CPB) - Bounced Check

START

Paid for FILING a submittal permit and plan review

WORK UNDERWAY

Central Permit Bureau
1660 Mission Street
1st Floor

Permit Issued
by check payment
Called to Start Work

Check bounces!

City Hall Tax Collector’s Office
Notifies Central Permit Bureau about bounced check

Central Permit Bureau
1660 Mission Street
1st Floor

Issue resolved
Updated on Division Applications
OK for Inspections

Building Inspection Division
1660 Mission Street
3rd Floor

PLUMBING INSPECTION DIVISION
1660 Mission Street
3rd Floor

Electrical Inspection Division
1660 Mission Street
3rd Floor

Flags on Division Applications – Contractors Information System — No other permits may be issued to this applicant

City Hall Tax Collector’s Office
Notifies District Inspector(s)
No inspection until issue is resolved

Applicant returns with permit fee and additional $50 penalty fee. Payment by money order, cashier check or cash ONLY

Sends Warning Letter
10 calendar days to clear with $50 bank service fee or case will be sent to Collection Agency in 30 calendar days and Permit will be suspended if already issued or flagged
DO NOT ISSUE and subject to cancellation

If Contractor, Profile will be flagged on Contractor Information Screen

Name on check
Payee

No Response. Permit suspended or cancelled

No Response. No Inspections.
PermitExpires

No Response. No Inspections.
PermitExpires

No Response. No Inspections.
PermitExpires

For Non Issued Permits:
Pay issuance fee

STOP

ISSUED

STOP

STOP

STOP

STOP

STOP

STOP

STOP

STOP

STOP

STOP

STOP

STOP

STOP

STOP

STOP
B. ELECTRICAL AND PLUMBING PERMITS

Electrical and plumbing permits will be handled similarly to the OTC without plans. However, the option for obtaining these permits online will remain as shown on the “As-Is” map and the personnel reviewing the applications that need greater scrutiny may be electrical and plumbing inspectors, to which the customer is routed by the IPR Permit Technician.
Contractor with valid specialty license record (Plumbing: C36, C4, C20, etc. and Electrical: C10, C7, C11, C20, C45, C46, C53, D28, D34) obtain permit for work of their specialty. Licensed Contractors with proof of valid Contractor License, Worker’s Compensation and SF Business Tax License Registration Certificate or already on DBI Contractors Information System

---

### Electrical/Plumbing Permits

#### Plumbing Inspection Division
1600 Mission St, 3rd Floor
- 7:30 AM - 4:00 PM
- Clerk and Sr. Inspector
- New, Renewal or Amendment permits done by homeowners.
- Checks for B-Licensed Contractors only.
- Clerk will call to pick up permit or problems.
- Speak with Inspector (6242) or Sr. Inspector (6486) to get an approval.
- Upon approval, clerical support will process the permit.

#### Electrical Inspection Division
1600 Mission St, 3rd Floor
- 7:30 AM - 4:00 PM
- Clerk and Sr. Electrical Inspector
- For homeowners of SFFD, work to be performed by homeowner.
- Speak with Inspector (6242) or Sr. Inspector (6486) to get an approval.
- Upon approval, clerical support will process the permit.

#### Central Permit Bureau
1600 Mission St, 1st Floor
- 8:00 AM - 4:30 PM
- 1408 Clerical Staff
- Calls for next customer
- Checks information on DBI Contractors Information System
- Processes Permit
- Obtains fees
- Issues Permit

---

### Online Permits

Online Permits
http://www.sfgov.org
Online Services Information on CPB database.
Registers Online
Receives Log-in/Password
Applies Online!

---

### Contractors

- Qualified to issue for “Owner’s Permit” Electrical / Plumbing permits issued at 3rd Floor Electrical Inspector Counter upon approval by inspector.

---

### Field Inspection

Field Inspection
FINISH

---

### Contractors Information Updated

- Contractors information updated

---

### Any expired licenses, Workers’ compensation, Active complaints or Notices of Violation on property

Reject Any expired licenses, Workers’ compensation, Active complaints or Notices of Violation on property

---

### Customer Service

Customer Service

---

### Electrical Permit for Contractors:

- C10, C45, D28, D34

### Plumbing Permit for Contractors:

- C36, C20

---

### Online Permits

- Online Permits
http://www.sfgov.org
Online Services

---

### Field Inspection

Field Inspection
FINISH

---

### Online Permits

Online Permits
http://www.sfgov.org
Online Services

---

### State Contractors License Board

City Hall
Tax Collector’s Office
1 Dr. Carlton
Goodlett Place

---

### BPR – Plan Review and Permit Issuance Subcommittee As-Is Mapping: Electrical/Plumbing Permits

---

### August 10, 2007
C. OVER-THE-COUNTER WITHOUT PLANS

“As-Is” Mapping Issues:

- No tracking of customer.
- Rechecking required at Station #2, causing bottlenecks.
- Lack of proper screening if the application requires other agencies, resulting in more rechecks and rejected applications.

“To-Be” Mapping Narrative:

1. Registration or self-help kiosk, directed to Records or Initial Permit Review (IPR). No more than 60 seconds.

2. Help Desk is available for general questions and procedures for all categories listed below.
   a. Obtaining records.
   b. Registration or self help kiosk (no more than 60 seconds), routed to records station.
   c. Triage and recheck appointments, non-DBI submittals, records, applications (example: Planning conditional use or variance applications).
   d. Registration or self help kiosk (no more than 60 seconds), routed to station.

3. IPR Permit Technician determines if application complies with OTC rule (less than one hour of review per station), and determines routing to other disciplines at other stations as required. IPR Permit Technician determines initial fee valuation and sends customer to cashier for filing and plan review payment, prior to any plan review work being performed.

4. Customer returns with receipt from cashier to continue processing.

5. IPR determines if application needs to be routed to Planning Department, SFFD, DPH or other disciplines (can call upon inspector/plans examiner to review if simple sign-off required).

   If not, IPR Permit Technician handles all other functions (including DPW-BSM). If Planning Department review is required, then this station is always the first station that the customer visits via the automated customer tracking system. If the Planning Department rejects the submittal or if it requires additional information, customer returns with necessary additional information, signs in at registration and proceeds via the automated customer tracking system directly to the Planning Department station.

   If routing is required to the SFFD, DPH or another discipline after Planning Department, customer visits these stations via the automated customer tracking system. If any discipline rejects the submittal or if it requires additional information, customer returns with necessary additional information, signs in at registration and proceeds via the automated customer tracking system directly to the appropriate station for final sign-off.
Once all approvals have been obtained, customer proceeds to Permit Issuance Station.

6. IPR Permit Technician performs all other tasks listed in this Report Section III B, “Department of Building Inspection: Permit Center, Station 2” and determines final plan review valuation and sends customer to cashier for final fee payment to obtain permit and job card.

   a. To ensure early tracking of SFPUC wastewater/water capacity charges, drawings must include information such as square footage, fixture count, etc. for all permit applications.
### DBI OTC No Plans Counter Review (1st Floor Station 2)

- **Applicant takes a number**
- **8:00 AM – 3:45 PM**
- Calls out number for the next customer
- 1408 Clerk, 6331 Building Inspector
- Review application forms for completeness
- Check for DBI violations, Planning Historical significance, Block and Lot information on Division
- Applications – Permit Tracking
- System
- Determine routing requirements
- Establish form type (Form 3 or Form 6)
- Sign off

### Planning Department Information Counter (1st Floor Station 1)

- **8:00 AM – 5:00 PM**
- Take a number (5 – 60 min. wait)
- Check if planning approval is necessary
- Verify property info on Planning Department database
- If historical, customer must talk to a Historical preservationist – Historical preservationists are only at the counter 2.5 hours per day
- Check BBN, Planning violation, ½ fee, etc.
- Verify routing
- If OK, stamp with fee stamp on front of permit application form, sign back of application form

### DBI BID/IDEED (3rd Floor) or DB CES

- **8:00 AM – 5:00 PM**
- Clerk and Sr. Building Inspector
- Customers sign in on clipboard and wait to be called (5-30 minutes wait)
- Customer must call inspector on telephone if no clerk is at the desk
- Required if there are any building electrical, plumbing, violations that have not been abated
- Applicants must clear any related violations before with permit before submitting any other permit applications for any scope of work
- DBI will abate any old cases that are not related to the work if possible (Example: An active case concerning a noise complaint from 1996. If DBI assures that noted violation is no longer a concern, a Sr. Building Inspector will abate the case)
- Access any necessary fees (Scope of work or x1)
- Sr. Building Inspector Stamp/Sign if issue is resolved and/or not required (issues not related to current application)

### DBI Central Permit Bureau

- **8:00 AM – 5:00 PM**
- Applicant uses the in-house phone and calls 8-6060 to be assisted
- DPW-BSM staff comes from behind the wall (their work cubical) to the Permit Station 4
- Review street space use is necessary (number of feet, curb cut, street blockage, etc.)
- Apply for street space permit – gives applicant another form which they need to fax to DPW-BSM on 875 Stevenson Street to activate

### Scopes of Works at Station 2

- **Dry rot repair. Termites report is optional. Must identify area and location**
- Re-roofing except cool roof
- Window replacement
- Garage door replacement (same size)
- Non Structural kitchen and bath remodel
- Replace repair siding, stucco
- Changing walls (Non-rated) from stucco to siding or vice versa (pictures are required by Planning Department)
- Installation of anchor bolts and plywood panels on the ground floor or residential buildings
- Notice of Violation compliance without plans

### DBP-BSM

- **(1st Floor, Station #4)**
- 8:00 AM – 5:00 PM
- Check BBN, Planning violation, ½ fee, etc.
- Verify routing
- If OK, stamp with fee stamp on front of permit application form, sign back of application form

### SFFFD

- **(4th Floor)**
- 8:00 AM – 5:00 PM
- Complete Fire inspection form
- Review application for SFFD code compliance
- Stamp/Sign application
- If OK, stamp with fee stamp on front of permit application form, sign back of application form

### DBI Housing Inspection Services (4th Floor)

- **(6th Floor)**
- 8:00 AM – 5:00 PM
- Review application for SFFD code compliance
- Stamp/Sign application
- If OK, stamp with fee stamp on front of permit application form, sign back of application form

### DBI Mechanical Plan Review

- **(4th Floor)**
- 8:00 AM – 5:00 PM
- If required for Mechanical review
- Stamp/Sign application
- If OK, stamp with fee stamp on front of permit application form, sign back of application form

### SFRA

- **1 South Van Ness**
- August 01, 2007
D. OVER-THE-COUNTER WITH PLANS

“As-Is” Mapping Issues:

- No tracking of customer; wait times vary. Bottlenecks occur.
- Not all agencies are in close proximity of each other; some agencies are not adequately represented at the Permit Center.
- Lack of proper screening until the specific station reviews the project, resulting in the need for more rechecks and rejected applications.

“To-Be” Mapping Narrative:

1. Registration or self-help kiosk, directed to Records or IPR (Initial Permit Review). **No more than 60 seconds.**

2. Help Desk is available for general questions and procedures for all categories listed below.
   a. Obtaining records.
   b. Registration or self help kiosk (no more than 60 seconds), routed to records station.
   c. Triage and recheck appointments, non-DBI submittals, records, applications (example: Planning conditional use or variance applications).
   d. Registration or self help kiosk (no more than 60 seconds), routed to station.

2. **IPR Permit Technician** determines if application requires routing to Planning Department. If routing is required to Planning Department, this station is always the first station the customer visits via the automated customer tracking system. If the Planning Department rejects the submittal, or if it requires additional information, the customer returns with necessary information, signs in at Registration and proceeds via the automated customer tracking system directly to the Planning Department station for final sign-off.

3. IPR Permit Technician determines if application complies with OTC rule (less than one hour of review per station). If it does not comply, customer proceeds to submit application under “Addendum Submittal” process.

   **If it does comply,** IPR Permit Technician determines if routing required to disciplines at other stations. Permit Technician determines fee valuation and sends customer to cashier for filing and plan review fee payment, prior to any plan review work being performed.

5. Customer returns with receipt from cashier to continue processing.

6. If IPR Permit Technician determines application needs to be routed to other disciplines, Technician can call upon inspector/plans examiner from other stations to review if simple sign-off is required. If no other disciplines are required to review application and drawings, IPR Permit Technician handles all other functions (**including DPW-BSM in some cases**).
7. IPR Permit Technician performs all other tasks listed in this Report Section III B, “Department of Building Inspection: Permit Center, Station 2.” If no other stations are required to review the application and drawings, IPR Permit Technician determines final plan review valuation and sends customer to cashier for final fee payment and to obtain permit and job card. While customer pays fee, Permit Technician stamps drawings. Customer returns with permit, job card and receipt from cashier and collects drawings.

   a. To ensure early tracking of SFPUC wastewater/water capacity charges, drawings must include information such as square footage, fixture count, etc. for all permit applications.

8. If other stations need to review application and drawings, IPR Permit Technician determines routing and sends customer to next station.

9. If other stations need to review application and drawings, customer carries drawings to each station for approvals. If corrections are needed, customer returns with corrections via a recheck appointment. If no corrections are needed, customer proceeds to permit issuance station.

10. Customer is responsible for collating drawings to make two approved sets. IPR Permit Technician at Permit Issuance Station verifies that all stations have approved the drawings.

11. IPR Permit Technician at Permit Issuance Station determines final plan review valuation and sends customer to cashier for final fee payment and to obtain permit and job card. While customer pays fee, Permit Technician stamps drawings. Customer returns with permit, job card and receipt from cashier and collects drawings.
BPR – Plan Review and Permit Issuance Subcommittee To-Be Mapping: Over-The-Counter (OTC) With Plans

**START**
- Fill out electronic application online or at Permit Center if able at customer area

**FREQUENT CUSTOMERS**
- KIOSK
  - Self check-in
  - Automated customer tracking system sends to next station (60 seconds or less)

**ALL CUSTOMERS**
- REGISTRATION
  - Check in
  - Automated customer tracking system sends to next station (60 seconds or less)
  - Permit History Required?
    - Yes, if requested
      - Proceed to IPR
    - NO
      - Permit History Required?
        - Yes, if requested
          - Proceed to IPR
        - NO
          - Help Desk
            - Code questions
            - Process questions
            - Policies and procedures
  - Pay Review Fee
  - Pay Review Fee
  - Return with Receipt to collect drawings.

**RECORDS**
- May be ordered online

**PAY FEE @ CASHIER**
- Approve

**FINISH**
- Finish

**APPROVED by**
- Planning Department

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT**
- Name called via Automated customer tracking system
  - Is Planning Department required?
    - YES
      - More stations?
        - YES
          - Go to "To-Be" mapping for Addendum submittal
        - NO
          - Reject / Further info needed
    - NO
      - Go to "To-Be" mapping for Addendum submittal

**HELP DESK**
- Code questions
- Process questions
- Policies and procedures

**INITIAL PERMIT REVIEW (IPR)**
- Name called via Automated customer tracking system
- Establish approval disciplines
- Determine customer routing
- Check for completeness
- Check Housing status
- Check for Notice of Violations (NOV)
- Check for block and lot/address
- Add address to Permit Tracking System (PTS), if necessary
- Check occupancy class, use
- Determine fee evaluations
- Check approval of Green Recycling Program
- Check Business Tax Registration, Workers Compensation, contractor info, etc.
- DPW/BSM preliminary review
- Check if Conditional-Use (CU) application
- SFFD preliminary review

**PERMIT ISSUANCE STATION**
- Checks drawings to make sure all sign-offs complete
- Determines final valuation and fees
- Sends customer to Cashier while drawings are stamped/ Approved

**ISSUE PERMIT and JOB CARD**
- Applicant collates drawings to provide final approved sets

**APPLICANT CARRIES DRAWINGS TO EACH STATION AS DETERMINED BY IPR ROUTING**
- Applicant carries drawings to provide final approved sets
- Drawing returns to desk for approval

**HELP DESK**
- Code questions
- Process questions
- Policies and procedures

**RECORDS**
- May be ordered online

**PAY FEE @ CASHIER**
- Approved by Planning Department

**FINISH**
- Finish

**NOTE:** All stations:
- Customer called via Automated customer tracking system
- 1 Hour maximum
- Approvals entered into PTS

**DBI Structural Plan Review**
- MECHANICAL
- SFFD
- DPW - BSM
- DPH
- SFRA
- SFPUC
- MOD

May be rejected if not code compliant
- If changes required, correction sheet provided to customer, applicant returns with corrections to any staff covering the discipline.
- If OTC not complete, may re-register next day without IPR

May be rejected if not code compliant
- If changes required, correction sheet provided to customer, applicant returns with corrections to any staff covering the discipline.
- If OTC not complete, may re-register next day without IPR

May be rejected if not code compliant
- If changes required, correction sheet provided to customer, applicant returns with corrections to any staff covering the discipline.
- If OTC not complete, may re-register next day without IPR

May be rejected if not code compliant
- If changes required, correction sheet provided to customer, applicant returns with corrections to any staff covering the discipline.
- If OTC not complete, may re-register next day without IPR
E. RESIDENTIAL ALTERATIONS/ADDITIONS – SITE PERMIT

“As-Is” Mapping Issues:

- No tracking of customer; wait times vary. Bottlenecks occur and some fees are lost.
- Double checking of documents.
- Limited screening of application materials.
- Limited tracking of drawings.
- No guaranteed turnaround times.
- Limited hours for some staff reviews.
- Limited coordination of public notification between DBI and other agencies.
- Too many forms.

“To-Be” Mapping Narrative:

1. Registration or self-help kiosk, directed to Initial Permit Review (IPR). **No more than 60 seconds.**

2. Help desk is available for general questions and procedures for all categories listed below.
   a. Obtaining records.
   b. Registration or self help kiosk (**no more than 60 seconds**), routed to records station.
   c. Triage and recheck appointments, non-DBI submittals, records, applications (example: Planning conditional use or variance applications).
   d. Registration or self help kiosk (**no more than 60 seconds**), routed to station.

3. Pre-application (**voluntary**) coordination conference with DBI, Planning Department, DPW-BSM, SFPUC, SFFD, SFRA, etc. (for a fee), to address specific questions regarding code interpretations, prior to submitting the application. Written determinations are to be provided by all participating agencies.

4. IPR Permit Technician determines fee valuation and sends customer to cashier for filing and plan review fee payment, **prior to any work being performed.**

5. Cursory plan check at IPR is to be increased to capture more code issues during initial plan review.
   a. To ensure early tracking of SFPUC wastewater/water capacity charges, drawings must include information such as square footage, fixture count, etc. for all permit applications.
   b. If project falls within SFFD jurisdiction, preliminary review is required by the SFFD.

6. **Planning Department staff** (or SFRA, if in its jurisdiction) is to make initial determination on actual approvals during initial plan review, to determine if project may even proceed.
a. Planning Department staff or IPR Permit Technician to determine if eviction is part of this work, resulting in project being put on hold, pending outcome.

7. Customer returns with receipt from cashier to **continue processing**.

8. IPR Permit Technician performs all other tasks listed in this Report Section III, B“Department of Building Inspection: Permit Center, Station 2.”

9. Use **Radio Frequency Identification** (RFID) codes (the San Francisco Library just did this). Use RFID codes to automate the tracking of plans.

10. Application and drawings are **routed to Planning Department** for discretionary review process.

11. Planning Department “**log-in**” of workload and assignment to reviewer. Use PTS to automate. Email sent to customer to identify Planner and sent to DBI to estimate turnaround time.

   a. After discretionary review process is completed, Planning Department approved plans sent to DBI within **one business day**.
   b. Application has limited review by DBI and SFFD for site permit issues only. If application requires changes prior to site permit approval, notification is made to IPR Permit Technician. Customer is notified by IPR Permit Technician via email and mail. Customer retrieves plans, makes necessary changes or provides additional information. Recheck appointment is scheduled with DBI or SFFD for site permit issues sign-off.
   c. If DBI and SFFD approve for site permit issues, application proceeds to Processing Station. Customer notified via email and mail, maybe full set of plans or site permit approval only, customer is responsible for next action.

12. **Options for customer for site permit** and full submittal approvals:

   a. Site permit approval OTC (Customer requests after discretionary process at Planning Department or SFRA). Starts the clock for **15 calendar days appeal process**. Customer picks up drawings and application at Processing Station and proceeds with approval process.
   b. Site permit submittal allows for initial review by Planning Department or SFRA, without expending fees for the structural addendum.
   c. Site permit plus addenda/full permit review over-the-counter (after discretionary review process at Planning Department or SFRA, for smaller horizontal additions where full seismic upgrade may not be required). Customer notified by email, depending upon DBI capacity to perform these tasks over-the-counter.
   d. Full permit review submittal allows for either split submittal for site permit or for full submittal of site permit and structural addendum.

13. **If customer is submitting full sets of submittal drawings**, IPR Permit Technician determines routing to other disciplines. (Can call upon inspector/plans examiner of other stations to review if simple sign-off required). If customer is submitting site permit set, Planning Department staff reviews submittal at IPR station for completeness.
BPR - Plan Review and Permit Issuance Subcommittee As-Is Mapping: Residential Addition – Site Permit

**Voluntary Pre Application Phase**

- **Planning Department 1650 Mission St. 4th Floor**
  - 8:00 AM – 5:00 PM
  - Submit application form with $710 fee
  - Intake by clerk, given to quadrants
  - 2 week wait for appointment for an advisory meeting
  - Nothing is written, but they can request for a written letter of determination from the Zoning Administrator
  - If not satisfied, have the Zoning Administrator to write a letter and the letter can be appealed through Board of Appeals

**Mandatory Planning Department Pre Application – Neighborhood Notification Meeting (Policy, not Code)**

- **Central Permit Bureau 1650 Mission St., 1st Floor**
  - 8:00 AM – 4:30 PM
  - Take a number and wait
  - Customer pays plan check fees
  - Letter of Determination drafted within 2 weeks
  - Letter may be appealed through the chain of command to Director

**Pre Application Phase**

- **Planning Department Information Counter (IPC) (1st Floor Station 1)**
  - 8:00 AM – 5:00 PM
  - Take a number (5 – 60 min. wait)
  - Check entitlements
  - Check property info on Planning Department database
  - Develops Routing on Computer

**Planning Code Violation Abatement**

- **SFFD**
  - 8:00 AM – 5:00 PM
  - Customer signs in
  - Sr. Plan Examiner checks for completeness
  - May consult with SFFD, greater degree of review if not a site permit
  - Develops Routing on Computer

**Site Permit Issued**

- **DBI Plan Review Services 1650 Mission St. 2nd Floor**
  - 8:00 AM – 5:00 PM
  - Clerk delivers to DBI

**Applicant may choose to wait for Addendum to be approved before issuing the Site Permit**

**Site Permit Issued with no Addendum Schedule**

- **DBI Central Permit Bureau (1st Floor)**
  - 8:00 AM – 4:30 PM
  - Take a number and wait
  - Customer pays plan check fees
  - Puts in bin for Planning Department pick up

**DBI Intake Counter 1650 Mission St. 4th Floor**

- 8:00 AM – 5:00 PM
- Submit application form with $710 fee
- Intake by clerk, given to quadrants
- 2 week wait for appointment for an advisory meeting
- Nothing is written, but they can request for a written letter of determination from the Zoning Administrator
- If not satisfied, have the Zoning Administrator to write a letter and the letter can be appealed through Board of Appeals

**Planning Department Intake Counter (IPC) (1st Floor Station 1)**

- 8:00 AM – 5:00 PM
- Take a number (5 – 60 min. wait)
- Check entitlements
- Verify property info on Planning Department database
- If historical, customer must talk to a historical preservationist – historical preservationists are only at the counter 2.5 hours per day
- Check IBN, Planning violation, % fee, etc.
- Identify Planner for routing
- If ok, initial ACCEPT on routing slip

**Planning Department 1650 Mission St. 4th Floor**

- 8:00 AM – 5:00 PM
- Submit application form with $710 fee
- Intake by clerk, given to quadrants
- 2 week wait for appointment for an advisory meeting
- Nothing is written, but they can request for a written letter of determination from the Zoning Administrator
- If not satisfied, have the Zoning Administrator to write a letter and the letter can be appealed through Board of Appeals

**DBI Central Permit Bureau (1st Floor)**

- 8:00 AM – 4:30 PM
- Take a number and wait
- Customer pays plan check fees
- Puts in bin for Planning Department pick up
F. RESIDENTIAL ALTERATIONS/ADDITIONS – ADDENDUM

“As-Is” Mapping Issues:

- Order of review by different agencies is uncertain.
- Rechecking of documents between agencies; limited coordination between agencies.
- Limited coordination of recheck appointments and collating drawings for final review.
- Limited tracking of drawings.
- No guaranteed turnaround times.

“To-Be” Mapping Narrative:

1. **Full submittal sets**, parallel plan review: customer is notified number of sets required, based on routing. Customer brings copy of approved site permit.
   
   a. IPR Permit Technician is responsible for checking for completeness of addendum submittal and that it matches approved site permit.
   b. Turnaround times for first set of plan review comments after initial plan review to be within **10 business days** for small projects, **20 business days** for medium projects (See Performance Measures Subcommittee Report for specific project descriptions).
   c. Recheck appointments to be scheduled with original plans examiner within **three business days** from day of request.
   d. Customer to control rechecks with original plans examiner when ready for all disciplines.

2. **Help Desk** is available for general questions and procedures for all categories listed below.
   
   a. Obtaining records.
   b. Registration or self help kiosk (**no more than 60 seconds**), routed to records station.
   c. Triage and recheck appointments, non-DBI submittals, records, applications (example: Planning conditional use or variance applications).
   d. Registration or self help kiosk (**no more than 60 seconds**), routed to station.

3. Customer responsible for **obtaining sign-offs** from each station and collating drawings to make two approved sets.

4. Permit Technician at **Permit Issuance Station** verifies that all stations have approved the drawings.

5. Permit Technician at Permit Issuance Station determines **final plan review valuation** and sends customer to cashier for final fee payment and to obtain permit and job card. While applicant pays fee, Permit Technician stamps drawings. Customer returns with permit, job card and receipt from cashier and collects drawings.
G. RESIDENTIAL DEMOLITION/NEW CONSTRUCTION – SITE PERMIT

“As-Is” Mapping Issues:

- No tracking of customer; wait times vary. Bottlenecks occur and some fees for service are lost.
- Limited screening of application materials.
- Limited coordination among DBI and other agencies.
- Order of review by different agencies is uncertain.
- Rechecking of documents among agencies; limited coordination between agencies.
- Limited coordination of public notification among DBI and other agencies.
- Too many forms.

“To-Be” Mapping Narrative:

1. Registration or self-help kiosk, directed to Initial Permit Review (IPR). No more than 60 seconds.

2. Help Desk is available for general questions and procedures for all categories listed below.
   a. Obtaining records.
   b. Registration or self help kiosk (no more than 60 seconds), routed to records station.
   c. Triage and recheck appointments, non-DBI submittals, records, applications (example: Planning conditional use or variance applications).
   d. Registration or self help kiosk (no more than 60 seconds), routed to station.

3. Pre-application (voluntary, but highly recommended) coordination conference with DBI, Planning Department, DPW-BSM, SFPUC, SFFD, SFRA, etc. (for a fee), to address specific questions regarding code interpretations, prior to submitting the application. Written determinations are to be provided by all participating agencies.

4. IPR Permit Technician determines fee valuation and sends customer to cashier for filing and plan review fee payment, prior to any work being performed.
   a. Issue one permit for both demolition and replacement. Add box to PTS to check off.

5. Cursory plan review at IPR is to be increased to capture more code issues during initial plan review.
   a. To ensure early tracking of SFPUC wastewater/water capacity charges, drawings must include information such as square footage, fixture count, etc.) for all permit applications.
   b. If project falls within SFFD jurisdiction, preliminary review is required by the SFFD.
6. Planning Department staff (or SFRA, if in its jurisdiction) is to make initial determination on actual approvals during initial plan review, to determine if project may even proceed.

   a. Planning Department staff or IPR Permit Technician to determine if eviction is part of this work, resulting in project being put on hold, pending outcome.
   b. IPR completeness check needs to indicate if the project is subject to a conditional use application. For example, all residential demolitions require a conditional use authorization. This affects both the notice and the appeals process and must be coordinated among DBI and Planning Department.

7. Customer returns with receipt from cashier to continue processing.

8. IPR Permit Technician performs all other tasks listed in this Report Section III B, “Department of Building Inspection: Permit Center, Station 2.”

9. Use Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) codes to automate tracking of plans (the San Francisco Library just did this).

10. Application and drawings are routed to Planning Department for discretionary review process.

11. Planning Department “log-in” of workload and assignment to reviewer. Use PTS to automate. Email sent to customer resulting in more clarity to identify Planner, sent to DBI to estimate turnaround time.

   a. After discretionary process is completed, Planning Department approved plans sent to DBI within one business day.
   b. Application has limited review by DBI and SFFD for site permit issues only. If application requires changes prior to site permit approval, notification is made to IPR Permit Technician. Customer is notified by IPR Permit Technician via email and mail. Customer retrieves plans, makes necessary changes or provides additional information. Recheck appointment is scheduled with DBI or SFFD for site permit issues sign-off.
   c. If SFDBI and SFFD approve for site permit issues, application proceeds to Processing Station. Customer notified via email and mail - maybe full set of plans or site permit approval only – customer is responsible for next action. Customer is notified of number of sets required for addenda submittal(s). Limited number of addenda is allowed for Residential Demolition/New Construction.
   d. When customer is notified of approval of site permit (automatic by system), customer decides whether to opt for “Express on Premium Plan”, pay fee and be routed there.

12. IPR Permit Technician determines routing to other stations for addendum.

13. Options for customer for site permit and full submittal approvals:

   a. Site permit approval (Customer requests after discretionary process at Planning Department or SFRA) - Starts the clock for 15 calendar days appeal process. Customer picks up drawings and application at Processing Station and proceeds with approval process.
b. Site permit submittal – allows for initial review by Planning Department or SFRA, without expending fees for the structural addendum.
c. Full permit review submittal – allows for either split submittal for site permit or for full submittal of site permit and structural addendum.
H. RESIDENTIAL DEMOLITION/NEW CONSTRUCTION – ADDENDUM

“As-Is” Mapping Issues:

- Order of review by different agencies is uncertain.
- Rechecking of documents among agencies; limited coordination among agencies.
- Limited coordination of recheck appointments and collating drawings for final review.
- Limited tracking of drawings.
- No guaranteed turnaround times.

“To-Be” Mapping Narrative:

1. **Full submittal sets, parallel plan review:** customer is notified number of sets required, based on routing. Customer brings copy of approved site permit.
   
a. IPR Permit Technician is responsible for checking for completeness of addendum submittal and that it matches approved site permit.
   
b. Turnaround times for first set of plan review comments after initial plan review to be within **10 business days** for small projects, **20 business days** for medium projects (See Performance Measures Subcommittee Report for specific project descriptions).
   
c. **Recheck** appointments to be scheduled with original plan examiner within **three business days** from day of request.
   
d. Customer to control rechecks with original plan examiner when ready for all disciplines.

2. **Help Desk** is available for general questions and procedures for all categories listed below.
   
a. Obtaining records.
   
b. Registration or self help kiosk (**no more than 60 seconds**), routed to records station.
   
c. Triage and recheck appointments, non-DBI submittals, records, applications (example: Planning conditional use or variance applications).
   
d. Registration or self help kiosk (**no more than 60 seconds**), routed to station.

3. Customer responsible for **obtaining sign-offs from each station**, collating drawings to make two approved sets.

4. Permit Technician at Permit Issuance Station **verifies that all stations** have approved the drawings.

5. Permit Technician at Permit Issuance Station determines final plan review valuation and sends customer to cashier for final permit fee payment and to obtain permit and job card. While applicant pays fee, Permit Technician stamps drawings. **Customer returns with permit, job card and receipt from cashier and collects drawings.**
**BPR - Plan Review and Permit Issuance Subcommittee As-Is Mapping: Residential Demolition/New Construction - Addendum**

*For each addendum submitting*

1. **Site Permit Issued**
   - Applicant returns with minimum 2 sets of plans with Clearly marked cover sheet saying what they are submitting for.

2. **Over the Counter (See-Over-The-Counter with Plan Menu)**
   - 8:00 AM – 4:45 PM
   - Arrives in back vault
   - Work load Manage determines number of hours for review
   - Determines next available Plan Examiner with least backlog
   - Verifies routing

3. **DBI Plan Review Services 1660 Mission St. 2nd Floor**
   - Applicant returns with additional sets
   - If additional sets are needed, call applicant to submit per routing

4. **DBI Intake Counter 1660 Mission St. 4th Floor**
   - 8:00 AM – 3:45 PM
   - Customer signs in
   - Sr. Plan Examiner checks for completeness based on what your submission needs – necessary documents, reference drawings, etc.

5. **DBI Plan Review Services 1660 Mission St. 2nd Floor**
   - outcry (Pre-application covers water flow calculations, preliminary smoke control)

6. **DPW-BSM 1660 Mission St. 1st Floor**
   - Reviews for street/sidewalk general issues
   - Reviews for mechanical code
   - Reviews for code alarm
   - Reviews for historical preservation
   - Reviews for fire department
   - Reviews for compliances

7. **SPRA 1390 Market St**
   - Reviews for fire department
   - Reviews for historical preservation
   - Reviews for smoke control
   - Reviews for smoke control

8. **SFFD 1660 Mission St. 2nd Floor**
   - Reviews for smoke control
   - Reviews for smoke control
   - Reviews for smoke control
   - Reviews for smoke control

9. **DPH 1330 Market St**
   - Reviews for health department
   - Reviews for health department
   - Reviews for health department
   - Reviews for health department

10. **DPW-BSM 1660 Mission St. 2nd Floor**
    - Reviews for public works
    - Reviews for public works
    - Reviews for public works
    - Reviews for public works

11. **SPRA 1390 Market St**
    - Reviews for smoke control
    - Reviews for smoke control
    - Reviews for smoke control
    - Reviews for smoke control

12. **Mayor’s Office On Disability 401 Van Ness, Rm 300**
    - Reviews for family code compliance
    - Reviews for family code compliance
    - Reviews for family code compliance
    - Reviews for family code compliance

13. **DBI Structural Plan Review 1660 Mission St. 2nd Floor**
    - Reviews for structural code
    - Reviews for structural code
    - Reviews for structural code
    - Reviews for structural code

14. **DBI Plan Review Services 1660 Mission St. 2nd Floor**
    - Reviews for structural code
    - Reviews for structural code
    - Reviews for structural code
    - Reviews for structural code

15. **DBI Plan Review Services 1660 Mission St. 2nd Floor**
    - Reviews for structural code
    - Reviews for structural code
    - Reviews for structural code
    - Reviews for structural code

16. **DBI Plan Review Services 1660 Mission St. 2nd Floor**
    - Reviews for structural code
    - Reviews for structural code
    - Reviews for structural code
    - Reviews for structural code

17. **DBI Plan Review Services 1660 Mission St. 2nd Floor**
    - Reviews for structural code
    - Reviews for structural code
    - Reviews for structural code
    - Reviews for structural code

18. **DBI Plan Review Services 1660 Mission St. 2nd Floor**
    - Reviews for structural code
    - Reviews for structural code
    - Reviews for structural code
    - Reviews for structural code

19. **DBI Central Permit Bureau 1660 Mission St. 1st Floor**
    - Reviews for structural code
    - Reviews for structural code
    - Reviews for structural code
    - Reviews for structural code

**Types of Addendums:**
- Foundation
- Superstructure
- Architectural
- Mechanical/Electrical/Plumbing
- (includes smoke Control)
- Exterior Wall
- Sprinkler/SFFD Alarm

---

*August 8, 2007*
I. NEW HIGH RISE – SITE PERMIT

“As-Is” Mapping Issues:

- No tracking of customer; wait times vary. Bottlenecks occur and some fees for service are lost.
- Limited coordination of application materials by all agencies.
- Order of review by different agencies is uncertain.
- Rechecking of documents among agencies; limited coordination among agencies.
- Limited coordination of public notification among DBI and other agencies.
- Too many forms.

“To-Be” Mapping Narrative:

1. Registration or self-help kiosk, directed to IPR (Initial Permit Review). No more than 60 seconds.

2. Help Desk is available for general questions and procedures for all categories listed below.
   a. Obtaining records.
   b. Registration or self help kiosk (no more than 60 seconds), routed to records station.
   c. Triage and recheck appointments, non-DBI submittals, records, applications (example: Planning conditional use or variance applications).
   d. Registration or self help kiosk (no more than 60 seconds), routed to station.

3. Mandatory pre-application coordination conference with DBI, Planning Department, DPW-BSM, SFPUC, SFFD, SFRA, etc. (for a fee), to address specific questions regarding code interpretations, prior to submitting the application. Written determinations are to be provided by all participating agencies.

4. IPR Permit Technician determines fee valuation and sends customer to cashier for filing and plan review fee payment, prior to any work being performed.
   a. Issue one permit for both demolition and replacement. Add box to PTS to check off.

5. Cursory plan review at IPR is to be increased to capture more code issues during initial plan review.
   a. To ensure early tracking of SFPUC wastewater/water capacity charges, drawings must include information such as square footage, fixture count, etc. for all permit applications.
   b. If project falls within SFFD jurisdiction, preliminary review is required by the SFFD.
6. **Planning Department** staff (or **SFRA**, if in its jurisdiction) is to make initial determination on actual approvals during initial plan review, to determine if project may even proceed.

   a. Planning Department staff or IPR Permit Technician to determine if eviction is part of this work, resulting in project being put on hold, pending outcome.

   b. IPR completeness check needs to indicate if the project is subject to a conditional use application. For example, all residential demolitions require a conditional use authorization. This affects both the notice and the appeals process and must be coordinated between DBI and Planning Department.

7. Customer returns with receipt from cashier to continue processing.

8. IPR Permit Technician performs all other tasks listed in this **Report Section III B, “Department of Building Inspection: Permit Center, Station 2.”**

9. Use Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) codes to automate tracking of plans (the San Francisco Library just did this).

10. Application and drawings are routed to Planning Department for discretionary review process.

11. Planning Department “log-in” of workload/assignment to reviewer. Use PTS to automate. Email sent to customer resulting in **more clarity to identify Planner**, send to DBI to estimate turnaround time.

   a. After discretionary process is completed, Planning Department approved plans sent to DBI within **one business day**.

   b. Application has limited review by DBI and SFFD for site permit issues only. If application requires changes prior to site permit approval, notification is made to IPR Permit Technician. Customer is notified by IPR Permit Technician via email and mail. Customer retrieves plans, makes necessary changes or provides additional information. **Recheck appointment** is scheduled with DBI or SFFD for site permit issues sign-off.

   c. If DBI and SFFD approve for site permit issues, application proceeds to Processing Station. Customer notified via email and mail – maybe full set of plans or site permit approval only – customer is responsible for next action. Customer is notified of number of sets required for addenda submittal(s). Limited number of addenda is allowed for Residential Demolition/New Construction.

   d. When customer is notified of approval of site permit (automatic by system), customer decides whether to opt for **“Express on Premium Plan”**, pay fee and be routed there.

12. **Customer supplies addendum** schedule for IPR Permit Technician review and approval. IPR Permit Technician determines routing to other stations for addendum.

13. Options for customer for **site permit approvals:**

   a. Site permit approval (customer requests after discretionary process at Planning Department or SFRA) - Starts the clock for 15 calendar days appeal process.
Customer picks up drawings and application at Processing Station and proceeds with approval process.

b. Site permit submittal – allows for initial review by Planning Department or SFRA, without expending fees for the structural addendum.
J. NEW HIGH RISE – ADDENDUM

“As-Is” Mapping Issues:

- Order of review by different agencies is uncertain.
- Rechecking of documents among agencies; limited coordination among agencies.
- Limited coordination of recheck appointments and collating drawings for final review.
- Limited tracking of drawings.
- No guaranteed turnaround times.
- Unclear addendum process for soon to be approved permits.

“To-Be” Mapping Narrative:

1. Full submittal sets: parallel plan review: customer is notified number of sets required, based on routing. Customer brings copy of approved site permit.
   a. IPR Permit Technician is responsible for checking for completeness of addendum submittal and that it matches approved site permit.
   b. Turnaround times for first set of plan review comments after initial plan review to be within established turnaround times on a case-by-case basis (See Performance Measures Subcommittee Report for specific project descriptions).
   c. Recheck appointments to be scheduled with original plan reviewer within three business days from day of request.
   d. Customer to control rechecks with original plan reviewer when ready for all disciplines.

2. Help Desk is available for general questions and procedures for all categories listed below.
   a. Obtaining records.
   b. Registration or self help kiosk (no more than 60 seconds), routed to records station.
   c. Triage and recheck appointments, non-DBI submittals, records, applications (example: Planning conditional use or variance applications).
   d. Registration or self help kiosk (no more than 60 seconds), routed to station.

3. Customer responsible for obtaining sign-offs from each station, collating drawings to make two approved sets.

4. IPR Permit Technician at Permit Issuance Station verifies that all stations have approved the drawings.

5. Permit Technician at Permit Issuance Station determines final plan review valuation and sends customer to cashier for final permit fee payment and to obtain permit and job card. While applicant pays fee, Permit Technician stamps drawings. Customer returns with permit, job card and receipt from cashier and collects drawings.
The Inspections Subcommittee examined current practices of securing inspections, how the responsibilities are coordinated among city agency, and where changes to the process should be made to increase efficiencies and improve customer service without sacrificing safety. These goals were accomplished with “As-Is” and “To-Be” maps, accompanied by both findings and over 55 recommendations.

I. SWOT ANALYSIS

Strengths

- Customer service.
- Sensitive to issues.
- Uniform enforcement.
- Gives good communication.
- Uniform code enforcement.
- Public notification at website and online.
- Responsive to complaints, provides follow-up and closure.
- Provides in-house and outreach training/presentation.
- Keep up with changing technology that is very informative and is available to the public.
- Keeps list of code articles and gives as handouts at the counter and in the field.
- Staff is helpful and knowledgeable on code and policies.
- Live response when contacted over the phone.
- Excellent and dedicated support staff.
- Easy application process and instant issuance of electrical and plumbing, online. This process is approximately 10 minutes.
- Electrical off-hours inspection scheduling available online (but not for regular inspection scheduling).
- Clients are asked if they wish to be contacted to attend training while filing application at CPB.
- Emergency response. DPW and DBI work closely in emergency response. Staff members are contacted based on availability. Respond within 20 minutes, coordinating with SFFD, calling senior staff, utility companies, among others.
- After-hours overtime inspections available.
- Good inter-relations and cooperation with other agencies.
- Ability to contact inspector directly for any issues related to permit.
- There is smooth changeover when someone comes in with a complaint as there is actual person to deal with and not automated.
- Records available to the public.
- Be able to talk to senior staff and management for second opinion.
• **Able to speak to inspector** and having a point of contact.
• Easy access for public to file complaints. Approximately **33% of complaints** are filed online.
• Highly efficient.
• Back-up staff.

**Weaknesses**

• Maintenance of city vehicles. Although this is outside of DBI’s control it impacts schedule and production. The challenge is to improve vehicle availability to improve service.
• **Multiple inspections** for scope of work.
• Unclear final inspection, Certificate of Final Completion and Occupancy, Temporary Certificate of Occupancy policies.
• **Scheduling and rescheduling** inspections adversely impact other appointments.
• Customer encounters problems when calling at designated time of 7:30 AM to 8:30 AM. Line is always busy.
• Ratio of **inspectors vs. inspection requests**, not enough staff to cover all inspection requests.
• Complaint investigations not only made to the department, but at the Mayor’s Office and/or Board of Supervisors.
• Unable to update inspector when customers would call to cancel or reschedule appointments.
• More **training** made available to all city staff.
• Need more **parking** spaces.
• Insufficient parking available in the field. Inspectors run into issues (e.g. time, parking ticket).
• **Access to inspection site** are not considered when scheduling inspections and in the time frame.
• **Inability to schedule** regular and overtime building inspections online.
• Cannot apply for two applications at the same time, with online permitting must logout and login.
• **Quality of DBI staff** is overlooked.
• Inconsistent interpretations in the field.
• **Coordination among departments.** Received public complaints regarding the need for electrical and plumbing, street-space (public right-of-way) excavation coordination. The contractor ends up with NOV. It is a common problem as not everyone is familiar with DPW rules, especially with complex projects.
• Coordination sequence of inspections among various disciplines is unclear.
• Permit issuance scheduling.
• Not meeting **two business days** turnaround times for inspections.
• Method of scheduling inspection varies across city agencies. Scheduling of inspection **need better consistency** (guideline on how to make the call, who to call/clerical staff).
• Inability to use technology in the field so you do not have to come back to the office to update status of permit and input other information.
• **Redundant** inspections.
• Customer preparedness for inspection at job site – time loss; incomplete file/missing documents resulting in delay by inspector and inability to close job. Customer should keep track of all records/documents and have them ready at time of inspection.
• Lack of **accurate existent** “conditions” on job site, this depends on customers’ information.
• Multi-agencies coordination – for large projects, different agencies (SFPUC, DPW, others), either public or private, may have jurisdictions over the site.
• Site conditions **do not meet plans and delays work.** Public right-of-way often neglected or forgotten.
• Forms and handouts not updated consistently.
• **Inconsistencies among inspectors** illustrate the need for written guidelines. On question of revisions, sometimes inspectors would settle for just a letter from the engineer, other times inspector would require a permit. Requirements are inconsistent depending on field conditions and changes.
• **Multiple permit numbers** for changing scopes of work.
• Renewal permit numbers clogs the system. Documentation should reflect what design approval is, not what it was initially applied/filed.
• Plumbing and electrical permits, **90 calendar day expiration limit.**
• Lack of notification of **expiring permits.**
• When calling for code questions and/or complaints, DBI inspection telephone lines timeframe for requesting inspections is **too limited.**
• **Premature calls for inspection wastes time.** This is a tactic used by general contractors to put pressure on sub-contractors and results in uncoordinated efforts, job is not ready yet.
• **Lack of communication** between client and inspector, if and when there is a change in field conditions. Sometimes, if inspector is sick or on vacation and there are no staff back-ups.
• Process of obtaining duplicate copy of permits is not widely known by public.
• SFFD delay in responses due to various reasons including contact person not available, access issue, contractor not available, no approved drawings.
• **Permits on hold due to other issues** - inconsistency on another permit. Building owner compliance issues/multiple unrelated violations, but affect a contractor who may not be involved in work with violation. Alert contractor early of existing conditions that owner has not addressed or not compliant, inspector cannot just sign-off/approve work.

• **Job site may be more complex than scope of work approved.** Scope of work may be incorrect.

• Customer may have obtained the wrong type of permit due to process being too complex or did not know what permit to get.

• The permit and inspection processes do not distinguish between frequent and infrequent customers.

• **Correction Notice** issued because of inconsistencies.

• Communication and outreach can be enhanced.

• Customer held responsible for coordination of inspection sequences.

• **Time management** should be better.

• After work has been inspected, other parties disrupt previously approved work thereby requiring multiple inspections.

• **Lack of inspection coordination** when job site has multiple work/inspections, especially when scope of work is revised.

• **Lack of communication** between office and in the field in the scheduling process, such as running late, etc.

**Opportunities**

• **Automate** current inspection and related processes.

• Public and neighborhood-specific **outreach** such as workshops, summits, brown bags, open-house, or town hall meeting.

• Training.

• **Frequently update** informational handouts on procedures, checklists, and other publications.

• Update **policies and procedures** regularly.

**Threats**

• Budget, economy, staffing levels.

• Political input.

• **Lack of succession planning.** Institutional knowledge lost due to inspectors retiring.

• Automation (computers/telecommunication) crash during emergency.

• New legislation.

• Workload and new demands. Current staffing vs. anticipated staffing levels to accommodate changes.
• Code adoptions/cycles; learning curve for new code.
II. ANALYSIS OF BENCHMARKING SURVEY AND STAKEHOLDER SURVEY

Benchmarking Survey from Other Cities

Of the 31 jurisdictions that were contacted, representatives from six responded, and only one was within California.

The respondents were from:
- Montreal, Quebec, Canada
- St. Paul, Minnesota
- Honolulu, Hawaii
- Portland, Oregon
- Miami, Florida
- Los Angeles, California

Findings:

1. Majority of responding cities (nearly 80%) had a one business day turnaround time for inspections. Remainder met two business days turnaround time.

2. Most responding cities utilize Integrated Voice Recognition (IVR) scheduling systems, mixed with online scheduling and personal calls.

3. All provide overtime inspections.

4. Nearly 70% of responding cities employ “combo” (building, electrical and plumbing) inspectors.

Stakeholders Survey from Customers

We received a total of 50 stakeholder surveys.

- 14 of the 50 were general contractors:
  - 11 of the 50 were permit consultants/plan runners

- Remaining 25 participants were:
  - Owner/builder
  - Architects
  - Electrical contractors
  - Plumbing contractors
  - Homeowners
  - Unknown

- General profile of stakeholders included:
  - More than 80% used DBI Inspection Services more than five times during the past year, i.e., frequent customers/users of inspection services.
o Most utilized inspection services over the previous 30 days from when the survey was taken.

**Findings:**

1. **Lack of consistency** in code interpretations among inspectors.
2. **Lack of consistency** among inspection divisions.
3. **Demand for more online** inspection services.
4. **Failure to meet** 48-hour turnaround time to do inspections.
5. Tendency for field inspectors to **ignore plan review decisions**.
III. INSPECTION SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

A. INSPECTIONS: OVERALL PROCESS

1. **Centralize and automate** inspection scheduling for all disciplines, with option to contact inspector through:
   a. Integrated Voice Recognition System (IVR)
   b. Online / website
   c. In-person

2. Create **hybrid scheduling system**, partly automated for inspection time slots with supervisors allocating assignments day of, to sustain needed flexibility (inspector calls to confirm).

3. Automated system to **screen types of inspections**; identify how many of what types are needed on any given day. (Different inspections require varying lengths of time.)

4. New system must have ability to **assign time slots/hours** for coordinated inspections among all agencies.

5. Automate permit applications, revisions, expirations numbering system (**one master permit application number**).

6. **Assign an inspector** at inspection counter from **7:30 AM to 5:00 PM** to answer technical questions, requests for information, etc. for all disciplines.

7. Inspection turnaround time. Goal is one business day to two business days, implemented in two-stage process:
   a. Immediate goal: **two business days** from time when call is received.
   b. Long-term goal: **one business day** from time when call is received.

8. **All city agencies** to adhere to response time, hours and methods of inspections.

9. **DPW-BSM** also to meet **two business days** inspection turnaround times on street improvements/street space and sidewalk issues.

10. Mayor’s Office on Disability to meet **two business days** inspection turnaround.
B. POLICY ISSUES

1. Develop and implement policy to streamline small residential remodel permits and inspections.

2. Develop and implement a policy to handle fee reduction requests, allowing customers to go through DBI established process (Director’s Hearing or In-house Committee), before going to Board of Permit Appeals (BPA).

3. Develop and implement a policy/guideline that no DBI sheetrock inspection be required for unrated wall assemblies.

4. Intake and Over-The-Counter plan review to have discretion eliminate old complaints upon review so long as these actions are discussed with other divisions involved prior to complaint elimination.

5. Expirations:
   a. Create new policy/process to alert inspector when permit expires; tied to automation with trigger mechanism to generate notice letter.
   b. Change 90 calendar days electrical and plumbing permit expiration to 180 calendar days (all stand-alone permits to expire 180 calendar days).
   c. Tie electrical and plumbing permits to associated building permit expiration date.

6. Requests for re-inspection: Fees to be paid by permit holder.

7. Rename “$1 Permit” (actually $140) as “Final Only” permit.

8. Provide letter from general contractor that certifies insulation has been installed and meet code requirements or State insulation certification.

9. Building Inspection Division is final discipline to sign-off before cover-up and final.

10. Building Inspection Division is the responsible discipline for SFFD-stopping inspection, caulking, and fire-rated assemblies at cover-up and final inspection. SFFD will also make a notation on card.

11. Plumbing and Electrical Inspection Divisions are responsible for buildings that do not require building inspections.

12. Given complexities of modern life-safety systems, keep Electrical Inspection Division and SFFD involved in fire alarm inspection to provide different expertise.
13. **Building Inspector to confirm building height.** If Building Inspector is not satisfied, contractor to provide survey.

14. Plumbing Inspectors to inspect heating ducts, flues and vents; Building Inspectors to continue to inspect all “environmental air,” such as bathroom fans, kitchen hood vents, dryer ventilation, etc.

15. **Move block and lot maps out of Central Permit Bureau** (CPB) drawers and make available online.

16. **Single point-of-payment** (cashier) for inspection-related issues. Includes other agencies.

C. **SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT**

1. Fire sprinkler/new service on pipes one-foot beyond property line to be inspected either by Plumbing Inspection Division or SFFD.

2. **Fire Sprinkler Inspections:** SFFD shall inspect the complete fire system. Plumbing Inspection Division to inspect pipe size, supports, seismic bracing, back flow protection and underground piping.

3. Fire inspector to make decision for **exit sign locations** at rough and final inspections.

4. **Only Fire inspector** signs off on fire alarm locations.

5. **Expand outreach** programs to educate/homeowners using handouts, mailings and online access. Include San Francisco Customer Service Center “311” to help respond to basic questions.

6. Provide automated **services in other languages**, such as Chinese and Spanish.

7. Ways to manage problem with inspector:
   
   a. Use “**Guaranteed Second Opinion**”.
   b. Document complaints.
   c. Reassign project to another inspector at manager’s discretion. DBI to establish timeframe when to act.

8. Board of Appeals (BPA) cases to be heard within **45 calendar days**.

9. Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA) - Department of Parking and Traffic (DPT) to issue permits within **two business days** and enforce its own policies.
10. DPW - Bureau of Urban Forestry (BUF) to relocate office for easy public access, better services and to meet two business days inspection turnaround time.

D. CITY INSPECTION VEHICLES

1. Utilize outside service garage as an option to expedite city vehicle repair and maintenance.
2. Recommend discussions with DPT to ensure cooperation concerning parking of city inspection vehicles.

E. TASK FORCES

Special task forces are required to develop and implement the following recommendations.

1. Have only two final copies of plans with approvals/sign-offs from all city reviewing agencies; client responsibility to obtain all required signatures. Establish criteria and policies.
2. Update and revise job card.
3. Review, approval, and record retention of revisions and field changes to approved plans.
4. Tower crane permits.
5. Develop specific work scope conditions requiring pre-construction meetings with DBI, DPW, and other required agencies.
6. Establish performance standard for condominium conversion map and Physical Inspection Reports between DBI and DPW-BSM.
7. Resolve street vaults’ conflicts/issues with DBI, Planning Department, Office of the City Attorney and PG&E.
8. Streamline garage door permit process (DBI and Planning Department).
9. DBI Task Force on Special Inspections has been established to ensure construction quality. Goal is to set up a separate inspection unit where special inspections are audited and special inspectors are certified.
IV. MAPPING

The following maps *illustrate the inspection process*; these maps are:

- Appeals Process
- Inspection Scheduling
- New Construction (Residential / Commercial)
- Revisions – New Structural, Envelope Changes, Architectural
- Overlapping Inspections
- Condominium Conversion DBI, Two-Unit Owner Occupied Condominium
- Conversions and Two to Six-Unit Condominium Conversions (Lottery Winners)

Each map has a separate introduction outlining each individual process.
A. APPEALS

There are four separate appeals processes in the map;

Planning Commission, Board of Supervisors, Board of Permit Appeals and Building Inspection Commission. **The general process after permit issuance is to be appealed** to the Board of Permit Appeals – in certain circumstances a permit holder may be appealed to the following commissions and boards: The Board of Supervisors, the Building Inspection Commission and the Planning Commission.
BPR – Inspections Subcommittee As-Is Mapping - Appeals

BUILDING PERMIT Application is Denied

Client files Appeal with either:

PLANNING DEPARTMENT/COMMISSION

- Planning Department Appeals Process:
  - Appellant submits appeal
  - Staff enters information
  - Planner briefs department representative on case issues
  - Hearing held to review appeal
  - If Department upheld hearing results, staff enters information or Board of Appeals database
  - If Planning overturned, staff enters information or Board of Appeals database
  - Planner implements Appeal decision and modifies NSR if required
  - Applicant records new NSR if required

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

- Board of Permit Appeals Process:
  - Appeal an action
  - Schedule hearing (within 3 months)

BOARD OF PERMIT APPEALS

- BOARD OF PERMIT APPEALS Process:
  - Appeal an action
  - Schedule hearing (within 3 months)

BUILDING INSPECTION COMMISSION

- Building Inspection Commission

ACTION:
- Type of actions - issuance, revisions, revocations - suspended, pending hearing
- Variance
- 309 – to Bureau of Architecture

DECISION UPHELD

- DECISION UPHELD

Applicant may file appeal with Board of Permit Appeals

Process:
- Permit re-instated
- Begin work

DECISION UPHELD

- DECISION UPHELD

Planner implements Appeal decision

Planner may file appeal with Board of Permit Appeals

Process:
- Permit re-instated
- Begin work

DECISION UPHELD

- DECISION UPHELD

Applicant may file appeal with Board of Permit Appeals

Process:
- Permit re-instated
- Begin work

DECISION UPHELD

- DECISION UPHELD
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B. INSPECTION SCHEDULING

Provide a centralized and automated inspection scheduling system for all disciplines:

- Integrated Voice Recognition System (IVR)
- Online / Website
- In-person
BPR – Inspections Subcommittee To-Be Mapping: Inspection Scheduling

Centralized scheduling system will electronically route inspection schedules to each discipline/agency.

**Features of Centralized/Automated Inspection Scheduling:**
- Provide an option to talk to inspector/live person, offer translation such as Chinese and Spanish.
- Hybrid system that is partly automated for inspection time slots, with supervisors allocating day-of, to provide needed flexibility (inspector calls to confirm).
- Include generated type of inspections that are known to take time, so that automated system can tell how many of what types you need to provide on any given day.
- Coordinated inspections – Allow slots/hours for coordinated inspections.
- Pre-Final – contractor makes call on need for pre-final, once all trades signed-off. Building signs off final inspection.
- Extensions/revisions are approved with specific timeframes towards completion as progress made within timeframe.
- Final Inspections – follow through by DBI for NOV. Computer to finalize all expired permits and abate any complaints & notice of violation’s.

Also includes inspection scheduling for PRE-CONSTRUCTION MEETING with:
- Building Inspection Division
- Department of Public Works
- SFFD – If requested.
- Special Inspections, Electrical Inspection Division
- Plumbing Inspection Division
- PG&E – Service entrance conduit

START
Frequent and New Customers

Centralized/Automated Inspection Scheduling

Integrated Voice Recognition (IVR)
- ONE MAIN LINE
- Bilingual Services

Online Website

Direct call to Inspector/Agency

Online/Website

Additional inspections needed

Field Inspection

Frequent and New Customers

Feature of Centralized/Automated Inspection Scheduling:
- Provide an option to talk to inspector/live person, offer translation such as Chinese and Spanish.
- Hybrid system that is partly automated for inspection time slots, with supervisors allocating day-of, to provide needed flexibility (inspector calls to confirm).
- Include generated type of inspections that are known to take time, so that automated system can tell how many of what types you need to provide on any given day.
- Coordinated inspections – Allow slots/hours for coordinated inspections.
- Pre-Final – contractor makes call on need for pre-final, once all trades signed-off. Building signs off final inspection.
- Extensions/revisions are approved with specific timeframes towards completion as progress made within timeframe.
- Final Inspections – follow through by DBI for NOV. Computer to finalize all expired permits and abate any complaints & notice of violation’s.
C. NEW CONSTRUCTION (COMMERCIAL/RESIDENTIAL)

The following maps identify the necessary inspections from pre-construction meetings to building final, certificate of final completion, and annual inspections.
START

Building Permit is Issued

Customers notified by:

1) Back of pink applications
2) Job card; form ½ (white)

(1)*

START WORK

INSPECTION

Start work inspection (verify scope of work)
Call to schedule – 8:30 AM clerical
schedulers between 7:30 – 8:30 AM & 3:30 – 4:30 PM; at PID and EID, clients able to speak to live inspector
Fax DPW
Call telephone number on job card or directly to inspector, message machine, 72 hour or less turnaround time – SFFD

BEFORE:

DPW
1. Fax permit copy: (415) 654-6161
2. Call for preconstruction/site meeting: (415) 554-7149
3. Look at conditions, service, utility shut-off, etc.
4. Set up parking, overhead, including MUNI
5. PG&E discretionary – difficult, can take up to 3 weeks
6. Water Department – discretionary

SPECIAL INSPECTIONS

1 Urban Forestry – tree removal
2. Encroachment permit (DPW)
3. Underground Service Alert (USA)

(2)*

SITE INSPECTION (Pre-construction)

...Continued

EXCAVATION/UNDERPINNING/SHORING

(3)*

COVER INSPECTIONS

(5)*

FRAMING/SUPERSTRUCTURE

(6)*

FINAL/Certificate of Final Completion

(7)*

PRE-FINAL INSPECTIONS

(8)*

FOUNDATIONS/STEEL/RETAINING WALL

(9)*

CLOSE OUT PERMITS

DPH, SFFD, BID

EID

PID

Building Inspection Division
Special Inspections
DPH
Water
Cal-OSHA
Review plans
Crane/Cal-OSHA
- Coordinated by agent/contractor
- DBI representatives
- Contractor
- Design professional/s

Plumbing/Electrical underground
PG&E underground
Special Inspections/Engineer
Building Inspection Division
SFFD service (Plumbing)
SFFD and PID

Building Inspection Division
Special Inspections
DAS/Mayor's Office on Disability
OSHA – complaints
Insulation/T24 after frame soundproofing

Building Inspection Division – OK to cover, sheetrock/stucco
SFFD
Shower Pans (PID)
Special Inspections

Pre-Temporary Certificate of Occupancy
Life safety – who gets involved? BID, SFFD, EID - after hours (coordination is an issue)

Plumbing Inspection Division
Electrical Inspection Division
DPW Bureau of Urban Forestry
Transit Impact Development Fee

Special Inspections
DPW - BSM (streets, sidewalks, curbs, driveway)
Inclusionary housing
LEED/Green
Mayor's Office on Disability (publicly-funded buildings)
DPH
OSHA/Cal-OSHA
Elevator/escalator
Temporary Certificate of Occupancy issued

ANNUAL INSPECTIONS

Fuel storage
Underwriter’s Laboratories certificate
Boiler
Housing Annual Inspections
Various SFFD Inspections
High Rise

*All inspections are independently scheduled with specific agency. For details, see Scheduling Inspection "As-Is Mapping"
BPR – Inspections Subcommittee To-Be Mapping: New Construction (Commercial/Residential)

START Permit Issued

Customers notified

1. Start work inspection (verify scope of work)
   - Schedule – 24/7
   - Call # on job card or directly to inspector, message machine, 72 hour or less turnaround time – SFFD

BEFORE:
- Pre-construction meeting with all agencies concerned, scheduled thru DBI Centralized System.
- PG&E – Task Force
- Follow Performance Standards
- Special Inspections – Task Force

*All inspection scheduling will go through DBI Centralized/Automated Scheduling System

2. Site inspection (pre-construction)
   - Review plans
   - Crane/Cal-OSHA - Coordinated by agent/contractor - DBI reps
   - Contractor - Design professionals
   - DBI - DPW - BFM

3. Foundations/Steel/Retaining Wall
   - Building Inspection Division
   - Special Inspections
   - PG&E underground
   - Special Inspections Engineer
   - Building Inspection Division
   - Fire services (SFFD and PID)

4. Framing/Superstructure
   - Plumbing/Electrical underground
   - Special Inspections
   - Building Inspection Division
   - Fire services (SFFD and PID)

5. Excavation/Underpinning/Shoring
   - Building Inspection Division
   - Special Inspections
   - PG&E
   - Water
   - Cal-OSHA

6. Cover Inspections
   - Plumbing/Electrical (rough sprinkler)
   - Special Inspections
   - Building Inspection Division
   - Fire services (SFFD and PID)

7. Pre-Final Inspections
   - Plumbing Inspection Division
   - Electrical Inspection Division
   - DPW Bureau of Urban Forestry
   - Transit Impact Development Fee
   - Special Inspections
   - DPW - BFM (streets, sidewalks, curbs, driveway)
   - Inclusionary housing
   - LEED/Green
   - Mayor’s Office on Disability (publicly-funded building)
   - DPW
   - OSHA/Cal-OSHA
   - Elevator/escalator
   - Temporary Certificate of Occupancy issued

8. Final/Certificate of Final Completion
   - Final from Electrical/Plumbing Inspection Division
   - Certifications
   - Condo map
   - Exterior building maintenance
   - Cal-OSHA
   - Address open permits on Building
   - Inclusionary housing

9. Close Out Permits
   - DPH, SFFD, BID
   - Comments reviewed by senior inspector
   - Input in computer
   - No microfilm

ANNUAL INSPECTIONS
- Fuel storage
- Underwriter's Laboratories certificate
- Boiler
- Housing Annual Inspections
- Various SFFD Inspections
- High rise

Comments reviewed by senior inspector
- Paper permits sent to microfilm – Automation, including scanning of paper permits and electronic archiving.
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D. REVISIONS: NEW STRUCTURAL, ENVELOPE CHANGES, ARCHITECTURAL

The following maps demonstrate the process when changes are made during construction to the approved plans and permits.
BPR – Inspections Subcommittee As-Is Mapping – Revisions: New Structural, Envelope Changes, Architectural

---

**BUILDING PERMIT is Approved and Issued**

---

**Client Pick-Up Permit**

---

**Work underway**

---

**….oops, changes identified in field**

---

**Engineer/Architect required changes**

---

**Submittal to DBI for new or multiple changes.**

---

---

**ENVELOPE CHANGES: 6' Height variable**

---

**ARCHITECTURAL:** (Same process as foregoing)

---

**311 - Planning Department**

---

**Appeals**

---

**ZONING ADMINISTRATOR**

- 10%
- 75+ High Rise

---

**Pay fees**

---

**Schedule Inspections**

---

**Expiration timeline, field to valuation = 90 calendar days**

---

---

**Pick up Permits for Revision/s and other job card/s**

---

---

**Note: All inspections are independently scheduled with specific agency. For details, see Scheduling Inspection “As-Is” Mapping.**
BPR Inspections Subcommittee To-Be Mapping: Revisions - New Structural, Envelope Changes, Architectural

START
Permit Issued

Customer Picks-Up Permit

Work underway

...oops, changes identified in field

Engineer/Architect required changes

Field Inspector accepts changes (non-Planning code issues i.e. building envelope, work under continuous approval)

Submit revisions/changes if:
- Field Inspector did not accept changes/revisions; or,
- If District Inspector believes change is substantial.

ENVELOPE CHANGES:
6' Height variable

ARCHITECTURAL:
(Same process as foregoing)

Submit revisions/changes if:
- Field Inspector did not accept changes/revisions; or,
- If District Inspector believes change is substantial.

311 – Planning Department

Appeals

ZONING ADMINISTRATOR

Field to valuation = 90 calendar days

Pay fees

Pick up permits and job cards for revisions

Expiration timeline, field to valuation = 90 calendar days

Schedule Inspection
Centralized Automated DBI System

FIELD INSPECTION
E. OVERLAPPING INSPECTIONS

This map illustrates the different disciplines that are required to conduct inspection and eliminates unnecessary overlapping inspections.
PERMIT Issued

*All inspections are independently scheduled with specific agency. For details, see Scheduling Inspection "As-Is" Mapping.

- Engineer of record – coordinates/assigns Special Inspection
- *Plan Review Engineer: Issues
  - DBI does not know who
  - proof of approved fabricators?
  - Lost inspectors reports and list of certified
  - Difficult to keep track
  - No mechanism for reporting construction defect
- Outside agencies

**BPR – Inspections Subcommittee As-Is Mapping: Overlapping Inspections**

- CONCRETE/STEEL
  - Concrete-encased Electrode/Electrical conduit
  - Special Inspection
  - Structural Engineer
  - Building Inspection Division
  - Plumbing Inspection Division (drains/water)
  - SFFD

- SUPERSTRUCTURE
  - Building Inspection Division
  - Plumbing Inspection Division
  - SFFD
  - Electrical Inspection Division
  - Special Inspection
  - Architectural Engineer
  - Elevators
  - Restaurants
  - Pumps
  - Life Safety

- TENANT COMMON IMPROVEMENT (TCI)
  - Special Inspections
  - Mechanical Inspection Division
  - SFFD

- SPECIAL INSPECTIONS
  - State (Elevator)
  - Structural Engineer
  - Ducts (BID, PID, BID)
  - Demolition
  - Elevators
  - Restaurants
  - Pumps
  - Life Safety

- MECHANICAL
  - Demolition
  - Elevators
  - Restaurants
  - Pumps
  - Life Safety

- BUILDING FINAL
  - Demolition
  - Fire Stopping (BID, PID, EID)
  - Ducts (BID, PID, BID)
  - Special Inspection
  - State (Elevator)
  - Mechanical

- SPECIAL INSPECTIONS
  - Engineer of record – coordinates/assigns Special Inspection
  - Outside agencies
  - Plan Review Engineer: Issues
    - DBI does not know who
    - Proof of approved fabricators?
    - Lost inspectors reports and list of certified
    - Difficult to keep track
    - No mechanism for reporting construction defect
  - Outside agencies
All inspection schedules will go through DBI Centralized/Automated Scheduling System.
F. SUPERSTRUCTURES

This map illustrates the different disciplines that are required to conduct **inspections of the superstructure** including structural, architectural, electrical, plumbing, fire life safety, and elevator inspections.
G. CONDOMINIUM CONVERSION

This map guides you through the condominium conversion process from application of physical inspection to final submittal to DPW-BSM.
BPR – Inspections Subcommittee As-Is & To-Be Mappings: Condominium Conversion

Department of Building Inspection, Code Enforcement Section (CES)
8:00 AM – 5:00 PM
1650 Mission Street, Ste. 312C

Start New or Frequent Customers

Application for Physical Inspection Form

**+ DPW - DBI Code Enforcement Section**

Application Logged
- Assign Physical Inspection number (1 business day)
- Run Physical Inspection report
- Call and agree on date

STOP

ASSESSOR'S OFFICE
Is application deemed submittable?

NO

Circulate to City Agencies & Neighborhood

YES

DPW - BSM
(2 weeks Notice)
- Coordinate Physical Inspection with DBI for physical inspections (two weeks)

APPLICANT
- Received approved tentative map
- Also, Planning Department request for checkprint, tax certificate and mylars

PLANNING DEPARTMENT
- Review for Conditional Use (CU)
  - If approve, receive comments and check for technical details
  - Checker recommends tentative map approval
  - Senior approves tentative map
  - Return to applicant

DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION
- Order files from microfilm permit search (1-2 weeks)
- Electrical, Plumbing, and Building inspections coordination (2 weeks notice)
- Supervisor review (2 business days)
- Report mailed.

Board of Supervisors
Request & received Subdivision Guarantee & Tax Certificate (Certificate of Final Completion)

5 units or more
Less than 5 units

FINISH
Back to DPW - BSM to continue condo conversion process (see DPW Condo Conversion flow charts)

FINISH
When clear, Certificate of Final Completion issued

submit to Recorder’s Office for confirmation

Field Inspections

FINISH
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H. TWO-UNIT OWNER OCCUPIED CONVERSIONS / TWO TO SIX-UNIT CONVERSIONS (LOTTERY WINNERS)

The following maps guide you through the process for two-unit owner occupied conversions; and two to six-unit conversions (lottery winners) from first applications eligibility to final map.
DPW As-Is Mapping: Two Unit Owner Occupied Conversions

GO TO WWW.SFDPW.ORG AND PRINT CONDO APPLICATION
READ AND FAMILIARIZE YOURSELF WITH THE APPLICATION, MOST QUESTIONS ABOUT THE PROCESS ARE ADDRESSED IN IT

SEPARATE RECORD OWNERS EACH HOLDING AT LEAST 25% OWNERSHIP OCCUPY BOTH UNITS FOR ONE YEAR

ANY EVICTIONS IN THE BUILDING SINCE MAY 1 2005?
YES

DETERMINE ELIGIBILITY UNDER ARTICLE 9 SECTION 1396.2
YES

ELIGIBLE?
NO

RETURN WHEN ELIGIBLE

NO

1) APPLY TO DBI FOR PHYSICAL INSPECTION
2) HIRE A MAP PREPARER
3) GO TO WWW.SFDPW.ORG AND PRINT THE CURRENT CONDO APPLICATION, THESE ARE UPDATED REGULARLY
4) BEGIN COLLECTING THE DOCUMENTS REQUESTED IN THE APPLICATION

PREPARE LEGAL DOCUMENTS (CC&R'S)

BEGIN CODE COMPLIANCE WORK AS SOON AS YOU HAVE YOUR PHYSICAL INSPECTION REPORT (CFCO FROM DBI REQUIRED PRIOR TO REQUEST FOR MYLARS)

WHEN THE MYLAR REQUEST IS ISSUED PROVIDE: TAX CERTIFICATE RECORDING FEE

TO BSM FOR REVIEW

APPLICANT RECORDS CC&R'S

BSM SUBMITS MAP TO COUNTY RECORDER

AFTER MAP RECORDS

CONVERSION COMPLETE!!!

RECEIVE TENTATIVE MAP APPROVAL REQUEST FOR CHECK PRINTS & CFCO

REQUEST FINAL MYLARS

FILL OUT AND SUBMIT THE CURRENT CITY APPLICATION PAY SPECIAL ATTENTION TO THE FINALIZING YOUR APPLICATION SECTION TO AVOID FEES

READ AND FAMILIARIZE YOURSELF WITH THE APPLICATION, MOST QUESTIONS ABOUT THE PROCESS ARE ADDRESSED IN IT
DPW As-Is Mapping: Two to Six Unit Conversions (Lottery Winners)

1) APPLY TO DBI FOR PHYSICAL INSPECTION
2) HIRE A MAP PREPARER
3) GO TO WWW.SFDPW.ORG AND PRINT THE CURRENT CONDO APPLICATION, THESE ARE UPDATED REGULARLY
4) BEGIN COLLECTING THE DOCUMENTS REQUESTED IN THE APPLICATION

GO TO WWW.SFDPW.ORG AND PRINT CONDO APPLICATION
READ AND FAMILIARIZE YOURSELF WITH THE APPLICATION, MOST QUESTIONS ABOUT THE PROCESS ARE ADDRESSED IN IT

FILL OUT AND SUBMIT THE CURRENT CITY APPLICATION
PAY SPECIAL ATTENTION TO THE FINALIZING YOUR APPLICATION SECTION TO AVOID FEES

RECEIVE TENTATIVE MAP APPROVAL
REQUEST FOR CHECK PRINT & CFCO
REQUEST FINAL MYLARS
TO BSM FOR REVIEW

WHEN THE MYLAR REQUEST IS ISSUED PROVIDE:
TAX CERTIFICATE
RECORDING FEE

BEGIN CODE COMPLIANCE WORK AS SOON AS YOU HAVE YOUR PHYSICAL INSPECTION REPORT
(CFCO FROM DBI REQUIRED PRIOR TO REQUEST FOR MYLARS)

CONVERSION COMPLETE!!!
The Automation Subcommittee analyzed the permit review, permit issuance and inspection processes to determine where the application of state-of-the-art technologies should be introduced to improve the work practices of city agencies. The subcommittee’s goal was to make accurate information, covering all aspects of the development review process, more readily accessible to both city staff and the public. This will be achieved by implementing the following recommendations, which will advance city agencies to a more comprehensive and integrated system with improved web based/online services.

I. SWOT ANALYSIS

Strengths

- **Skills and abilities of staff.**
- Fast online plumbing and electrical permits.
- Ability to file a complaint online. One third of complaints are currently received online.
- Commitment to technology and financial resources.
- Record-keeping of final drawings (disks, DVDs, digital transmission).
- Keep up with changing technology that is very informative and is available to the public.
- DBI Permit Tracking System (PTS) design flexibility.
- DBI PTS enables data collection from multiple users.
- DBI online PTS easy to use by other agencies.
- DBI Management Information Systems (MIS) very impressive.
- Vast amount of information available online.
- Track/credit training advances, continuous online training.
- Public notification at website and online.
- Email announcements for in-house and outreach training/presentation.
- Off-hours schedule available online (Electrical Inspection Division).
- Planning Department website has specific contact names and telephone numbers, especially for plan review (can be used as DBI model).

Weaknesses

- **PTS is not intuitive.** PTS access rights block users from making clerical/typographical changes.
- **Lack of integration between department databases.** Multiple databases reveal inconsistencies and undermine confidence in what data are accurate. Example: Unable to access Housing Inspection Services data. Address information needs to be more accurate and coordinated with block and lot (which changes). Linkage among multiple disciplines. Lack of coordination among other city departments.
• **Lack of an integrated** document management system to track email correspondence, document list, plan review comments, etc.

• Unable to record Planning Department’s conditions in the DBI PTS.

• Inaccurate parcel/building information from the applicant at the very beginning of a project for all reviewing agencies.

• **Internal system changes**, due to poor maintenance (system dates back to 2000, staffing, funding, software, etc.)

• **System fails to alert PTS** users on activity at any specific address and does not provide linkage among multiple permits. User interface not friendly when looking up information on multiple permits on any address.

• Disabled Access Compliance Status Documentation AB-056 is not recorded on PTS.

• Inability to make quick changes to computer system to better administer and manage compliance and legislation.

• Need for constant review and appropriate **budgeting to fund** required changes.

• Inability to use technology for field staff to record updates/information to avoid delays in data entry. **No mobile device solutions for field inspectors.**

• **Inability to add** industry software and systems.

• **Website is not user-friendly** (including organization, layout). Features such as frequently asked questions (FAQs) are limited.

• Inspection and special inspection status and/or requirements **not online**.

• **Inability to schedule** regular and overtime inspections online.

• Unable to process **multiple plumbing and electrical applications** online at the same time.

• Fees assessed are not consistent with actual personnel time required or real DBI costs. **Unable to obtain preliminary fee estimates** for specific projects.

• The impact of **plan revisions** on all review agencies.

• **Microfilm and storage quality.** Document management is poor; job cards filled in by hand rather than automatically from the system.

• **No automated notification** of expiring, pending and approved permits, or required inspections (180 calendar days), cancelled projects.

• Inability to include **code and time requirements**, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements, etc. in PTS system.

• Several **shortcomings with the email system**, such as speed, functionality and storage restrictions.

• No automated “**tagging**” system to eliminate ‘lost’ plans and lack of security for plans.

• Different physical locations for revisions, DPH, SFRA, etc.

• Flag **neighborhood issues** due to construction timing (automate communications, schedule among departments).

• **Lack of document search engine** (no access to Google/security issue).

• No telephone system contacts and cell phone for **field personnel.**
Opportunities

- Opportunity for DBI to survey customers to determine what the best business practices are. **Adopt new procedures where feasible.**
- Opportunity to **collaborate with industry** and benefit from its advanced changes, new information, etc.
- **Review the Planning Department's** access to property documentation and explore any template use for DBI.
- **Train staff** in new technology.
- **Streamline process** to address customer needs.
- Opportunity to incorporate new code changes as they are adopted.
- Improve emergency services communication and online submissions.
- Sort public calls according to caller’s specific needs and integrate DBI’s services with the new “311 Call Center” services.

Threats

- **Financial constraints** for extensive systems change and continuous maintenance.
- Management of information and cooperation among different city departments.
- **Lack of staff and resources.**
- **Overly focused on automation** and lose sight of main purpose (review and approve permits).
- **Automation failing in emergency situations**, increasing dependency on computers.
II. ANALYSIS OF BENCHMARKING SURVEY AND STAKEHOLDER SURVEY

Benchmarking Survey from Other Cities:

Of the 31 jurisdictions that were contacted, representatives from eight responded.

The respondents were from:
- Montreal, Quebec, Canada
- St. Paul, Minnesota
- Honolulu, Hawaii
- Portland, Oregon
- Miami, Florida
- Long Beach, California
- Clark County, Nevada
- Irvine, California

Findings:

1. All customers and employees were satisfied to somewhat satisfied with their systems.

2. All employees said their system was somewhat user-friendly and required little training.

3. Most jurisdictions chose an off-the-shelf permit tracking system. Vendors included Eden Inforum Gold, POSSE/Computronix, HTE, Tidemark, PG Mensys, AMANDA, ACCEL.

4. Phased implementation was the most common approach when switching over to their new system. All had their legacy data migrated into the new system.

5. The other jurisdictions automated system also tracked the plan review and inspection functions/services of the Planning Department, Fire Department, Public Works, Redevelopment, and Assessor’s Office.

6. The following services were automated: Permit Application, Permit Issuance, Permit Tracking Status, Project Tracking (multiple permits), Property Profile Information, and Complaint Tracking.

7. The following services were available online: Permit Tracking Status, Property Profile Information, Permit Application, Geographic Information Systems (GIS).

8. Jurisdictions that utilize mobile devices by their field staff used laptop computers such as Panasonic Toughbooks, Fujitsu Lifebook, and tablets, not handheld devices. Only half were synchronized to the database.

9. Most jurisdictions had basic system administration, routine maintenance and application workflows supported by in-house staff. No jurisdiction had their systems supported solely by the vendor, consultants or manufacturer.
10. Most systems provide **automated checks and balances** for the following functions:

   a. Validation of permit application information (i.e., verification of property details provided by customer against a municipal property information database).

   b. Notifications/alerts to flag potential concerns that need attention prior to issuance of a permit (i.e., violations, code enforcement activity, etc.).

   c. Automated fee calculation and verification of payment prior to permit issuance.

11. Most systems have **standard back-up** of data stored off-site with necessary downtime for restoration.

12. Most jurisdictions spread their automated system cost among initial development, implementation, annual license fees and annual maintenance fees.

13. **Positive feedback** from staff regarding their system included: reliability, consistency, expandability, easy to track down all information about one building.

14. **Negative feedback** from staff regarding their system included: too much information required to be entered; higher performance expectations from the public; system could be more user-friendly; and lack of system flexibility.

**Stakeholder Survey from Customers:**

29 responses from stakeholders were received. Stakeholders included architects, engineers, contractors, permit applicants and one city employee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designers (architects, engineers)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractors and sub-contractors</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Applicants</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Employees</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 29

**Findings**

1. **The top five web-based services** the stakeholders would like to use include: permit application, permit tracking status, electronic plan submittal, permit issuance and inspection scheduling.

2. **Information stakeholders would like to have readily available include:** complete permit history; DBI property database (owner, floor area, site size and current assessment); code updates, interpretations and rulings; online help question with technical services, and plan review; appointments for pre-application reviews; detailed descriptions of work; complaint tracking; inspection scheduling; automatic fee calculator; payment of fees and project tracking; plot map information; planning issues such as historical ratings of existing structures; automated notifications of new DBI guidelines.

3. **Most stakeholders are willing to pay an additional fee** (automation surcharge) if they were offered enhanced web-based services.
4. **A third of the stakeholders** have used some form of web-based services in other jurisdictions including San Jose, Oakland, Sonoma County, and Santa Clara.

5. Some features stakeholders would like an **automated permit tracking system to incorporate are**: ability to access accurate building profiles and permit history; automatic email notifications to applicants; ability to view plans; photographs and plan review comments online; and to view current status of permit and/or inspections online.
III. AUTOMATION FINDINGS

During the BPR process the Automation Subcommittee recorded a list of findings from each meeting. The subcommittees of Plan Review and Permit issuance and Inspection also recorded automation related findings during their meetings. Below are the automation related general findings as well as findings from other subcommittees.

A. GENERAL FINDINGS

- System **does not prompt** for information needed to eliminate human error and inaccurate information.
- **Systems and database** from different agencies are not integrated into DBI PTS.
- Email server too slow and size of accounts too small.
- Internal system changes are time consuming due to poor maintenance (system dates back to 2000, lack of staffing, funding, software, etc.).
- **Automated notifications** to customer/owner/staff/neighbors for different stages of the permit application, including cancellation. PTS to count days, print reminder, email of permit issuance, expiration, etc.
- Unable to add industry software.
- **Planning Department** does not schedule hearings, instead uses email notification only.
- **Board of Appeals not automated.** Appeal numbers are assigned manually in chronological order. Reliance on paper back-up. BPA is an independent agency and not connected to DBI server.
- **Complete DBI** Public Information Counter information not online.
- **Hours are tracked via PTS**, but team leaders are unable to track plan review hours.
- Ideally 80% of processes computerized.
- Inability for MIS to make quick changes to computer system to better administer and manage compliance and legislation.
- **PTS does not properly** detail the potential size of the project. (i.e., 500 sprinkler heads vs. 10).

B. PLAN REVIEW AND PERMIT ISSUANCE FINDINGS

- **Complicated permit process** for staff, customers and general public.
- Unable to estimate actual permit fee.
- **Inflexible PTS** does not record revisions to approved permits and allow additional fields for more detailed information. For example, special inspections, Planning Department conditions of approval etc…
- No automated “tagging” system to eliminate ‘lost plans’ lack of security for plans.
- **Inability to include** code and time requirements, ADA requirements, etc. in PTS system.
• The Planning Department does not have clerks to enter permit information. Planners are entering data but have to verify that there are no double entries for a project.
• PTS does not provide tracking mechanism to link related information to a specific project.
• SFFD plan review and inspection procedures are not automated. Rescue air system, water-flow and SFFD flow requirements online payment, Water Department maps of water mains/fire hydrants in the city, water meter request/removal approval from Water Department, fire flow problems, record of all high rise buildings, smoke control buildings, scheduling of appointment with payment, SFFD violations, customer education and downloads, plan submittal guidelines are not recorded in a computer database.
• Information regarding property profile is located in different locations in Division Applications.
• No monetary charges are made by DBI despite all initial work and reviews done by permitting agencies. Client may decide to discontinue.
• No feature in PTS to automatically route plans and permit applications.
• Undocumented process for creating address, including new address, block and lot number, and all other issues relating to address.
• City agency fees are collected at different locations outside DBI.
• Unable to apply for two separate plumbing/electrical permits online-simultaneously. Contractor’s data is required to be re-entered for each permit.
• Block and lot maps from CPB are not digital.
• Multiple permit tracking systems, (i.e., DPW, SFFD, DPH, etc.) that track permit data differently and are not linked.
• Complaints on properties prevent online plumbing and electrical permits from being issued until abated (regardless of date of complaint and/or validity).
• Complaints and/or Notice of Violations are not updated on PTS even after a complaint or Notice of Violation has been abated.
• Memorandum from DBI regarding minimum criteria for review, not on DBI website. Planning Department’s requirements may differ from DBI’s.
• DBI does not have a streamlined process for registration, renewals, and extensions.

C. INSPECTION FINDINGS

• Eliminate duplications and help communication in field/industry with the benefit of mobile devices.
• Linkage among multiple disciplines (i.e., Housing, SFFD Headquarters, Planning Department, Assessor's Office, DPH, SFRA, DPW, DPW-BSM) does not exist.
• No online scheduling for special inspection.
• Inability to schedule regular and overtime inspections online.
• Electrical and Housing Inspectors enter field data after supervisor review. Support staff enters revisions.
• **Multiple inspectors** may investigate same complaint (no PTS coordination). There is a lack of policy, documentation, procedures, and automation among different divisions in DBI to update complaints.

• **Job card information unavailable online.** Insufficient space to register all notes on job card.

• Communication via email between inspectors and customers unavailable.

• Contractors and customers cannot go online to view their scheduled inspection time.

• **Unable to schedule inspections** and view inspector availability online.
IV. AUTOMATION SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

A. INTEGRATED PERMIT TRACKING SYSTEM

1. System to provide work flow tracking and ability to track status from application submission to Certificate of Final Completion and Occupancy (CFC).

2. Integrate databases from different divisions, departments and agencies (i.e., Housing Inspection Services, SFFD Headquarters, Planning Department, Assessor’s Office, DPH, SFRA, DPW, DPW-BSM, etc.)

3. System to be capable of aggregating all pertinent information for any particular property/building. (Existing complaints/NOVs (HIS, BID, EID, PID), historical status, number of units, stories, type of construction, year built etc.).

4. Consolidate legal city address database among Assessor’s Office, DBI, DPW-BSM. (Inter-departmental subcommittee to coordinate implementation of the various addressing processes like new address or change in existing addresses.) Provide real time block and lot maps online and integrate block and lot maps from other city agencies.

5. System to collect and distribute fees for other city agencies involved with the permitting process.

6. System to have a well documented user manual/guide in conjunction with the business policies and procedures manual.

7. System to provide a smart permit numbering system.

B. IMPLEMENT AUTOMATED CUSTOMER TRACKING SYSTEM

1. Ability to track customer wait-times.

2. Ability to intelligently route customer based on wait times.

3. Ability for customer to “wait” in multiple lines. True parallel or “shotgun” review.

4. Ability to store customer information and transfer data into a permit tracking system if customer files for permit.

5. Ensure customer flow to eliminate bottlenecks.

C. ONLINE SERVICES

1. Provide centralized application forms from various city agencies online and the ability to enter project information and start application process online.

2. Increase the types of permits that can be issued online.
3. **Enhanced inspection scheduling** for all disciplines. Inspection scheduling to integrate IVR or web-based system with PTS. Options to schedule inspections for other departments SFFD, DPW, DBI, etc.

4. Provide **real time inspection** history for projects.

5. Ability to view a customer's required **special inspections** for current projects.

6. Provide list of **frequently asked questions** regarding the permitting process, code interpretations, submittal requirements, guidelines and checklists online.

7. **Ability to check** expected turnaround times, project status, assigned plans examiner, number of hours reviewed, name of supervisor, and view plan review comments.

8. **3R Report requests** submittal to be made available online with acceptance of online payments and receipt issuance.

**D. AUTOMATE PLAN REVIEW SERVICES**

1. **System to automate** and notify owner/staff/neighbors of all important project timeframes i.e., expiration of plan review, expiration of permit renewals, permit renewals and extensions, TCO, NOV, turnaround times, escalation mechanisms, routing templates, all milestones in a project lifetime for all review stations (i.e., Planning Department, MOD, SFPUC etc.).

2. **System to track** staff’s comments, determinations, and conditions of approval.

3. **System to have real time access** to other agency databases State Contractors Licensing Board, Workers’ Compensation, Business Tax Registration Certificate, etc.

4. **Expand routing to show** specifically what stage of Planning Department review the project is in (notification stage or hearing dates, etc.).

5. System to provide the ability **to track plans** – subcommittee to look into various plan tracking mechanism like RFID barcode, labeling, check-in and check-out, etc.

**E. AUTOMATE INSPECTION SERVICES**

1. Provide field inspectors with cellular phones.

2. Provide field inspectors with latest devices like hand-held devices to record field inspections, update complaint status, NOV, correction notices, etc.

3. System to have built-in links to various portion of the process to place ‘holds’ for inspections or other functions.
F. DOCUMENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

1. System to provide document management capability as a built-in or an optional plug-in outside product.

2. System to provide ability to scan and store imaged documents and electronic files (e.g., CAD filings, microfilm, photographs, other binary or ASCII files) in virtual folders and associate them with any object in the system (e.g., property, person, complaint, case, etc.).

3. System to encompass electronic plan submittal, review, and approval mechanisms with version tracking and auditing capabilities and digital rights management capabilities.

CONCLUSION TO RECOMMENDATIONS

The implementation of automation subcommittee’s recommendations should come after the BPR implementation to minimize iterations and maximize efficiency.
V. MAPPING

The following “As-Is” maps developed by other subcommittees illustrate the lack of automation in the current plan review, permit issuance, and inspection processes.

“AS-IS” MAPPING ISSUES

1. Customer does not have a dedicated initial point of contact.

2. Customer pulls multiple numbers at each review station and has to wait in each station serial fashion. No intelligent routing based on wait times.

3. DBI is unable to track applicant wait times.

4. DBI is unable to determine all pertinent building information. (Easements, stories, type of construction, year built etc.).

5. City agencies within the Permit Center are located on numerous floors.

6. Intake counter and plan review staff are not provided with comprehensive application completeness and plan review checklist.

7. Functions CPB are not clearly defined.

8. Not all city agencies involved in the permitting process are located within Permit Center (i.e., SFPUC, MOD, SFRA, DPH, San Francisco Unified School District {SFUSD}). Some permit applications must be routed outside the building.

9. Addresses with notice of violations are required to be routed to a Senior Inspector for that discipline.

10. Multiple permit application forms for different types of permits. All are required to be filled out by hand and later re-typed into a computer when permit is approved.

11. SFUSD, SFPUC, DPW-BSM and other fees are not collected at one centralized location (DBI).
**BPR - Automation Subcommittee As-Is Mapping: Central Permit Bureau (CPB) Simple Permit Without Plans – Over-The-Counter (OTC)**

**Simple Permit without Plans OTC**
- Sign in on Pink Clipboard
- Wait time: 20 minutes – 2 hours
  - (Manual Clipboard)

**Central Permit Bureau**
- 8:00 AM – 4:30 PM
- 558-6070

**1408 Clinical Staff reviews for completeness and accuracy (Manual Process)**
- If problem, send to original plan reviewer
- Corrected
- Returns to CPB
- Wrong information
- Block and lot, occupancy class, unit count research on AVS, maps, permit history, etc...

**Verify signatures and proper routing on form (Manual Process)**
- Plan Examiner corrects

**Verify general information such as block and lot/address, occupancy class/use**
- (Manual Process)

**First Time Contractor applying**
- No proof of documentation or Expired license/Insurance
- Must renew and return with proof

**Check State Contractors’ License, SF Business Tax Registration, and Workers’ Compensation (if needed) in Contractor Information Database**
- Check for above in PTS. State/BT systems not directly linked
- Storage Room to be Microfilmed
- Picked up by Public Services Division Staff

**Permit with Contractor Undeclared**
- Payment by cash, check, Visa or MasterCard. Enter data into PTS. Process on POS.
- Permit (in PTS)
- Fill out Job Card with application number and expiration date. Attach other information such as ‘General information about Construction in San Francisco’ and SF Environment brochure on Construction/Demolition Waste procedures (Manual process)
- If paying by Company Credit Card, Must have Company’s Authorization Letter

**Check data entered by Station 2 OTC counter or 4th Floor is correct (Manual Process)**
- Issues permit, in PTS
- Job card, and gives to customer

**CPB Duties:**
- Answer miscellaneous questions
- Address assignments
- Provide plans under 15-day hold to view
- 300’ Mail of principal portion (DBI policy)
- Expired permit renewals
- Extension of permits still under filing
- Notice of Permit Cancellation / Letter of Disapproval
- Permit Withdrawal
- Maintain list of notifications
- Bilingual translation
- Change owner/contractor
- Refunds
- Meetings, trainings
BPR – Automation Subcommittee As-Is Mapping: Central Permit Bureau (CPB) Filing New Construction with Demolition

**Central Permit Bureau**

**8:00 AM – 4:30 PM**

**558-6070**

**Start Reading for Filing**

- Take a number
- Waittime: 30 minutes ~ 2 hours

**Central Permit Bureau**

**8:00 AM – 4:30 PM**

1408 Clerical Staff reviews for completeness and accuracy

- Verify signatures and proper routing on form. Look at plans for correct/ completeness & accuracy
- If problem, send to original Plan Examiner
- Corrections made returns to CPB
- Wrong information
- Block and lot, occupancy class
- Returns to CPB
- No supporting documents.
- More research must be done to resolve issue

**Plan Examiner**

- Verifies signatures and proper routing on form.
- Look at plans for completeness and accuracy
- Returns to CPB
- No supporting documents.
- More research must be done to resolve issue

**State Contractor’s License Board**

- Not linked with DBI’s system

**Tax Collector’s Office**

- 8:00 AM – 5:00 PM
- Not linked with DBI’s system

**Other CPB Duties**

- Answer miscellaneous questions
- Address assignments
- Provide plans under 15-day hold to view
- 300’ Mail of principal portion (DBI policy)
- Expired permit renewals
- Extension of permits still under filing
- Notice of Permit Cancellation / Letter of Disapproval
- Permit withdrawal
- Maintain list of notifications
- Bilingual translation
- Change owner/contractor
- Refunds
- Meetings, trainings

**Legend:** Automation Commentary are in Blue Italic
BPR – Automation Subcommittee As-Is Mapping: Central Permit Bureau (CPB) Permit Issuance

Other CPB Duties:
- Answer miscellaneous questions
- Address assignments
- Provide plans under 15 day hold to view
- 300' Mail of principal portion (DBI policy)
- Expired permit renewals
- Extension of permits still under filing
- Notice of Permit Cancellation / Letter of Disapproval
- Permit Withdrawal
- Maintain list of notifications
- Bilingual translation
- Change owner/contractor
- Refunds
- Meetings, trainings

Legend: AUTOMATION COMMENTARY are in Blue Italic
BPR – Automation Subcommittee As-Is Mapping: Central Permit Bureau (CPB) Bounced Check

September 3, 2007

Central Permit Bureau
1660 Mission Street
1st Floor

Permit Issued
by check payment
No electronic check verification
Called to Start Work

WORK UNDERWAY

Check bounces!

City Hall Tax Collector’s Office

Notifies CPB about bounced check

Central Permit Bureau
1660 Mission Street
1st Floor

ISSUED

For Non Issued Permits: Pay issuance fee
Applicant returns with permit fee and additional $50 penalty fee
Payment by money order, cashier check or cash ONLY

Issue resolved. Updated on Division Applications. OK for inspections

STOP

No Response. No Inspections. Permit Expires

STOP

No Response. No Inspections. Permit Expires

STOP

No Response. No Inspections. Permit Expires

Building Inspection Division
1660 Mission Street
3rd Floor

PLUMBING INSPECTION DIVISION
1660 Mission Street
3rd Floor

Electrical Inspection Division
1660 Mission Street
3rd Floor

_paid for FILING a submittal permit and plan review

Legend: AUTOMATION COMMENTARY are in Blue Italic
PERFORMANCE MEASURES
SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT
This subcommittee focused on the identification and development of quantifiable and measurable criteria applicable to all city agencies involved in the application and plan review, permit issuance and inspection processes. Charged with setting reasonable, practical and achievable goals/performance standards city wide, and thereby setting the baseline from which ongoing changes may be measured and acted upon, the subcommittee identified the following Key Findings and Recommendations:

Key Findings:

- Lack of established turnaround time targets for plan reviews.
- Lack of established turnaround time targets for inspections.

Key Recommendations:

- Implement the following performance measures and turnaround times.
- Provide quarterly and annual reports to evaluate actual performance against established measures and objectives.

Target:

1. To complete and issue to the project sponsor the initial comprehensive plan review comments within established turnaround times as described below, for at least 90% of projects. These turnaround times will apply to all review disciplines unless otherwise noted.

a. Small Projects: 10 business days from arrival date to review discipline.

- Simple one or two-story single family and duplex on level lot.
- Minor modifications and additions to single multi-family residential, commercial and industrial buildings.
- Signs with structural calculations.
- Commercial tenant-improvements with minor structural calculations.
- Site retaining walls.
- Foundation repairs.
- Storage racks.

b. Medium Projects: 20 business days from arrival date to review discipline.

- Three-story or more single family dwelling or duplex.
- Custom, unusual single family dwelling including hillside with steel substructure and/or concrete piers or caissons.
- Two, three or four-story multi-family, commercial or office buildings.
- Simple four-story multi-family residential project over a concrete podium.
- Complex commercial and office tenant improvements with or without structural calculations.
• Parking structures (up to three stories).
• Assembly occupancies (churches, schools, restaurants with multiple dining rooms, etc.).
• Excavation and shoring.
• Indoor swimming pool.

c. Large Projects: Turnaround times to be determined on a case by case basis determined and provided to project sponsor at submittal time for all reviewing agencies (excluding Planning Department and SFRA). Note: These projects must go through completeness review by appointment only before intake.

• Complex four or more stories commercial/office buildings or multi-family project including buildings over a concrete podium.
• High rise buildings.
• Multiplex theatres/auditoriums.
• Multi-story shopping centers/malls.
• Convention centers.
• Airport.
• Wastewater and water treatment plants.
• Projects subject to peer review.

2. For building permit application, Planning Department and SFRA to complete and issue the initial comprehensive plan review comments/corrections, within 15 business days of arrival date, for 90% of projects.

3. To schedule all rechecks within three business days of request for at least 90% of projects.

4. To distribute all submitted drawings to next review station within one business day for 90% of projects.

5. To schedule pre-application meetings for all city agencies, excluding Planning Department and SFRA, within three business days of request and to be held within 10 business days for 90% of projects.

6. For Planning Department and SFRA, to schedule pre-application meetings within three business days of request to be held within 15 business days for 90% of projects.

7. For all city agencies, to perform field inspections associated with DBI permits within two business days of request for 90% of projects with a long-term goal of one business day.

8. For DBI and SFFD, to respond to life hazards/life safety/lack of heat complaints within one business day for 100% of requests.
BENCHMARKING SURVEYS
Plan Review and Permit Issuance Subcommittee Benchmarking Survey - Sample Comments

CUSTOMER SERVICE

QUESTION 2:
What is the level of technical expertise for the staff at the general information counter?

- Experienced clerical staff.
- Plan Check Techs with Plans Examiner Certification.
- Tech II – moderate.
- Certified Plans Examiner.
- Very basic minimum.

QUESTION 6:
What is the average wait time at each station?

- Customer only needs to go to one “One-Stop” counter to submit plans or pick up approved permit. 50% of customers wait less than 10 minutes, 75% of customers wait less than 20 minutes. Tracked using automated customer tracking system. Over the counter permits may require going to more than one station in the same lobby. Generally no wait at other stations (planning, plan check) after getting initial service at main counter. Priority counter service (different queue for automated customer tracking system) for homeowners and residential remodel contractors.
- One time wait max of 20 minutes.
- 3 hours.
- 15 minutes.

PERMIT REVIEW

QUESTION 2:
What type of work is exempt from permit review?

- Minor electrical, mechanical, plumbing, appliance replacements.
- Small accessory structures, retaining walls less than 4 feet in ht, most residential MEP work is sold simple permit followed by field inspection.
- Generally repairs less than $1000.00, painting, carpeting, re-roofing with the same material (residential only), walls less than 30” in height, temporary tents less than 14 days, residential television and radio antennas, storage buildings less than 120 sq. ft. See also chap. 18 of local amendments.
- All work is reviewed to insure compliance with zoning “regs” and at least a cursory construction review, but garages and other simple projects are normally reviewed at the counter and permits issued immediately.
QUESTION 13:  
Do you offer expedited plan review?

- No, we commit to and meet reasonable plan check timeframes. We accommodate special requests and needs for expediting where possible as long as standard timeframes are not impacted.
- We do not expedite reviews but we do have programs that allow for scheduling of reviews to match the development requirements of projects.
## DBI BPR Plan Review Benchmarking Survey

### 1. Contact person for this survey:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fax</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **answered question**: 11
- **skipped question**: 5

### 2. How the customer is greeted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91.7% (11)</td>
<td>8.3% (1)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **answered question**: 12
- **skipped question**: 4

### 3. What is the level of technical expertise for the staff at the general information counter?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **answered question**: 11
- **skipped question**: 5
4. Are there tutorials for the public in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permit process/procedures</td>
<td>63.6% (7)</td>
<td>36.4% (4)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code changes/customer training</td>
<td>30.0% (3)</td>
<td>70.0% (7)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 11
 skipped question 5

5. What are the minimum standards for intake drawings?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Is there an automated on-site intake/customer tracking system while in the building?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 10
 skipped question 6

7. What is the average wait time at each station?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Are Building and Planning Departments separate or combined?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. What type of work is exempt from permit review?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Do you have Over the Counter (OTC) Plan Checking Services?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, what % of plan review is OTC?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. What scope of work can be reviewed OTC?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 12. Is OTC review done on a walk-in basis?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 9

skipped question 7

### 13. Do you offer enhanced services for OTC review for an additional fee?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, what kind? 1

answered question 9

skipped question 7
### 14. Which plan check disciplines are included in OTC service?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please specify 2 answered question 9 skipped question*

### 15. Plan Checking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you use third party plan check services?</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.7% (6)</td>
<td>33.3% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review for structural design?</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.3% (1)</td>
<td>85.7% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have electrical plan checking?</td>
<td></td>
<td>62.5% (5)</td>
<td>37.5% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have plumbing plan checking?</td>
<td></td>
<td>87.5% (7)</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there parallel (concurrent) plan checking for both Building and allied Departments (ie., Planning, Fire, Public Works, Accessibility, Mechanical, etc.)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.7% (6)</td>
<td>33.3% (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*What qualifies for parallel process? 5 answered question 9 skipped question*
### 16. Do you offer enhanced plan check service for additional fee?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**If yes, what kind?**

- **answered question**: 5
- **skipped question**: 7

### 17. Is there separate review of disabled access laws for publicly funded projects in addition to standard plan checking?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**answered question**: 8

**skipped question**: 8

### 18. Do you return drawings to applicant after initial review?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**answered question**: 9

**skipped question**: 7
19. At what point does a revision/field change require a new permit?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 8
skipped question 8

20. Do you offer expedited plan review?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, for what types of projects? 4
answered question 9
skipped question 7

21. Does an individual plan reviewer review all types of projects (ie: commercial, residential, new and existing)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 9
skipped question 7
### 22. Does an individual plan checker review multiple disciplines (ie., building, mechanical, fire, zoning, etc.)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, what disciplines? 5

- answered question 9
- skipped question 7

### 23. Fee payment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One main cashier</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different locations</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- answered question 11
- skipped question 5
Inspection Subcommittee Benchmarking Survey - Sample Comments

QUESTION 5:
Are there inspection benchmarks/objectives set by management? If yes, what are they?

- All inspections completed within 24 hours.
- Check for conformance for all permit requirements pertaining to a permit (to include but not limited to: zoning, building, electrical, plumbing, energy efficiency, NPDES) minimum number of inspection dependent upon area, type and unit
- Monthly list of inspections by district

QUESTION 12:
Do you have specialty inspectors? If Yes, for what disciplines and what projects?

- Plumbing/Mechanical Electrical For commercial projects
- Roofing and elevators. Zoning and public works.
- Plumbing, electrical, building, commercial complaints, mechanical, manufactured housing, Business license, regulate 1200 special inspectors

QUESTION 21:
How do other departments such as Planning, Fire, Health, Public Works, etc. coordinate with Building Inspection staff?

- Fire, Public Works- Field coordination at inspector and supervisor level. Regular supervisor and management level meetings. Planning- Consult planning staff in office (on same floor as inspection, plan check).
- Verbal, work orders (computer, electronic)
- Through the busy system (main frame).
- By fax or by phone daily if required.
### 1. Contact person for this survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*answered question 8*  
*skipped question 1*

### 2. How do you schedule your inspections?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online service</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personally by phone</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Voice Recognition System (IVR)</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In person - with in office/counter, on the field/site</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Other (please specify) 1*

*answered question 9*  
*skipped question 0*
3. Is there a cut off time for scheduling an inspection?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 9

skipped question 0

4. What is the average number of inspection per inspector per day?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the average number of stops per inspector per day?</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 8

skipped question 1

5. Are there inspection benchmarks/objectives set by management?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, what are they? 3

answered question 8

skipped question 1
### 6. Inspections are quantified by

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site visits</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit application number(s)</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of inspection (ie., plumbing, electrical, building, framing, health, complaint, etc.)</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**answered question** 9  
**skipped question** 0

### 7. When you schedule an inspection, what timeframe is offered?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hour by hour</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM, PM</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Please specify** 4

**answered question** 9  
**skipped question** 0
8. What are the turn around time for inspections/inspections response?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24 Hours</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Hours</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same Day</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As Requested</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Do you have combo-inspectors (Building + Electrical + Plumbing)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, for what kind of projects? 3

answered question 9

skipped question 0
### 10. How many inspectors do you have?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Response Average</th>
<th>Response Total</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combo inspections</td>
<td>25.40</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special inspections</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability access</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40.75</strong></td>
<td><strong>163</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*answered question* 8  
*skipped question* 1
### 11. How many supervisory inspectors do you have?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Response Average</th>
<th>Response Total</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combo inspections</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special inspections</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability access</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **answered question**: 9
- **skipped question**: 0

### 12. Do you have specialty inspectors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If Yes, for what disciplines and what projects?

- **answered question**: 3

- **skipped question**: 0
### 13. How are inspections requests distributed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District (geographical boundaries)</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District (geographical boundaries)</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*answered question* 9  
*skipped question* 0

### 14. Do you provide the following inspections? If yes, are they inspected by specialty inspectors or combo inspectors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inspection Type</th>
<th>Does not apply</th>
<th>Specialty Inspector</th>
<th>Combination Inspector</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>75.0% (3)</td>
<td>25.0% (1)</td>
<td>25.0% (1)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm water</td>
<td>75.0% (3)</td>
<td>25.0% (1)</td>
<td>25.0% (1)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmentally sensitive lands</td>
<td>100.0% (4)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public improvements</td>
<td>60.0% (3)</td>
<td>20.0% (1)</td>
<td>20.0% (1)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>50.0% (2)</td>
<td>25.0% (1)</td>
<td>25.0% (1)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic safety</td>
<td>60.0% (3)</td>
<td>40.0% (2)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>66.7% (2)</td>
<td>33.3% (1)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*answered question* 5  
*skipped question* 4
15. How are your inspector’s results entered/recorded?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centralized database at office</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manually (pen and paper)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handheld device (real time)</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please specify</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question: 9
skipped question: 0

16. Which of the following disciplines are entered into a centralized system?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question: 9
skipped question: 0
17. How are the inspectors' time allocated weekly? (Please indicate number of hours)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Average</th>
<th>Response Total</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office hours</td>
<td>12.89</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field hours</td>
<td>23.13</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training hours</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question: 9
skipped question: 0

18. Do you require certification for inspectors through ICC, IAPMO, NEC, NFPA, etc?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question: 9
skipped question: 0

19. Do you use a third party to provide inspection services?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question: 9
skipped question: 0
### 20. Do you offer enhanced inspections services at an additional fee?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, what are the fees? 5

**answered question** 9  
**skipped question** 0

### 21. How do other departments such as Planning, Fire, Health, Public Works, etc. coordinate with Building Inspection staff?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**answered question** 8  
**skipped question** 1
Automation Subcommittee Benchmarking Survey - Sample Comments

QUESTION 6:
What type of permit tracking system do you have?

- Eden Inforum Gold.
- POSSE/Computronix.
- Tidemark.
- PGMensys.
- AMANDA (CSDC) A general purpose address based database.

QUESTION 21:
What do you like most about your system?

- The documentation and interface with information pertaining to all permit related activities.
- Expandable.
- Easy to track down all information about one building.
- User friendly.
- It is basically a big object oriented database and a workflow engine so it is very flexible.
- Customized to our needs.

QUESTION 22:
What do you like the least about your system?

- Difficult to customize. Difficult to develop new applications with vendor.
- Too much information and the higher performance expectations on the part of the public
- Vendor support is unreliable and the degree of flexibility makes administration and maintenance complicated.
- Not intuitive.
## 1. Contact person for this survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 11  
skipped question 1

## 2. Do you have an automated permit tracking system?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 12  
skipped question 0

## 3. If you have an automated system, how satisfied is your staff with this system?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly satisfied</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 11  
skipped question 1
4. If you have an automated system, how satisfied are your customers with this system?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly satisfied</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 10
skipped question 2

5. How would you rate your system?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very user friendly - Required little training</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat user friendly</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all user friendly</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 11
skipped question 1
### 6. What type of permit tracking system do you have?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-house developed system</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-the-shelf system (Please indicate software/vendor below)</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customized off-the-shelf system (Please indicate software/vendor below)</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name of Software/Vendor: 8 answered question 11 skipped question

### 7. How many months did it take to develop and fully implement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8. What was your approach to implementation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phased</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel deployment</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big bang</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (please specify): 1 answered question 8 skipped question
9. Does your automated system track the plan review and inspection functions/services for the following agencies? (Select all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Department</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Department</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Districts</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business License</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Utilities</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our system is not integrated with other agencies</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 11

skipped question 1

10. Was any legacy data migrated into the current system?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 11

skipped question 1
11. Which of the following services does your system provide? AND which of these services are available online? (Select all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Automated Service Provided</th>
<th>Automated Service Available Online</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permit Application</td>
<td>100.0% (10)</td>
<td>50.0% (5)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Issuance</td>
<td>100.0% (10)</td>
<td>30.0% (3)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Tracking Status</td>
<td>90.9% (10)</td>
<td>72.7% (8)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Tracking (multiple permits)</td>
<td>100.0% (10)</td>
<td>60.0% (6)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Plan Submittal</td>
<td>100.0% (2)</td>
<td>50.0% (1)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection Scheduling</td>
<td>100.0% (7)</td>
<td>57.1% (4)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection Result Entries</td>
<td>100.0% (8)</td>
<td>62.5% (5)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee Estimation</td>
<td>83.3% (5)</td>
<td>50.0% (3)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment of Fees</td>
<td>90.0% (9)</td>
<td>30.0% (3)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint Tracking</td>
<td>100.0% (9)</td>
<td>33.3% (3)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Profile Information</td>
<td>100.0% (11)</td>
<td>63.6% (7)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automated Workflow</td>
<td>100.0% (7)</td>
<td>42.9% (3)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Management Systems</td>
<td>100.0% (7)</td>
<td>42.9% (3)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Information Systems</td>
<td>100.0% (8)</td>
<td>62.5% (5)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handheld Devices</td>
<td>100.0% (6)</td>
<td>16.7% (1)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groupware/Collaboration (email, calendar, contacts, etc.)</td>
<td>100.0% (5)</td>
<td>40.0% (2)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Review Comments and Response</td>
<td>100.0% (6)</td>
<td>50.0% (3)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filing a Complaint</td>
<td>100.0% (5)</td>
<td>40.0% (2)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Management</td>
<td>100.0% (6)</td>
<td>33.3% (2)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdivision Tracking</td>
<td>100.0% (6)</td>
<td>33.3% (2)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn-around Time for Plan Review</td>
<td>100.0% (4)</td>
<td>100.0% (4)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 11

skipped question 1
12. If handheld devices are used by inspectors in the field, what type/brand are used?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Filled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 7

skipped question 5

13. Do the handhelds have the ability to print corrections?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 10

skipped question 2

14. How are the handhelds linked to the central system?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Real time link</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sync at office</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 10

skipped question 2
15. Which of the following best describes how your system is supported? (Please check all that apply):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Routine support/maintenance and updates do not require vendor assistance.</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System includes published APIs and/or original source code.</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancements/custom changes to application workflow can be accomplished</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic system administration is supported by in-house staff/programmers</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System support is only provided by vendor, consultants, manufacturer,</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 11
skipped question 1

16. What kind of reporting system does your system provide? (Please check all that apply):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canned Reports</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad-hoc Reports</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customizable Reports</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 11
skipped question 1
17. In regards to system security, does your system provide the following? (Please check all that apply):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audit records on transactions</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over user profiles and access rights</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 skipped question

18. Does your system provide automated checks and balances for the following functions? (Please check all that apply):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan Review is scheduled and governed based on Service Level Agreements</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notifications/alerts to flag potential concerns that need attention prior to issuance of a permit</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation of permit application information</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automated verification of construction valuation</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality control for plan review</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automated fee calculation and verification of payment collection</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
prior to permit issuance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>19. How would you describe the reliability of your system?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bullet-proof with 99.999% uptime and availability.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manual failover to an off-site or standby system with limited downtime.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard backup of data sorted off-site with necessary downtime for restoration.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. What was the approximate cost associated with the system?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial development and implementation (hardware, software, and staffing)</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual license fees</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual maintenance fees</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual training costs</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual customization costs (Reports, Interface, Integration)</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster recovery equipment/media</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 10
skipped question 2

answered question 10
skipped question 2

answered question 4
skipped question 8
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. What do you like most about your system?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. What do you like the least about your system?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STAKEHOLDER SURVEYS
Plan Review and Permit Issuance Subcommittee Stakeholder Survey - Sample Comments

QUESTION 43: What two things are you most satisfied with about the permitting process and why?

- The new process is much better than before. Sitting down with a plans examiner and then moving to other stations helps identify any potential issues that might inhibit the release of a permit.
- Some individual DBI plan checkers have been great to work with. For the most part, really enjoyed working with Planning, although design review process still seems a little unformed and unpredictable, the outcome is generally good.
- For most of the cities that I go to, San Francisco is the most consistent and organized as far as records and general information go. I also appreciate that I can see plan checkers for review almost all of the time instead of making appointments, scheduling my time into limited windows, or just submitting.
- That when you submit plans to planning that you can have them back once approved and complete project over the counter. That you have opened the fourth floor for easier over the counter plan-check.
- The new OTC permitting. Being able to go back to the same plan checker or, at least, have the next checker stay within the previous checker's comments. This is VERY big.
- Appointment of a director who actually wants to do something and follows up with action, sidelining of useless staff, etc. Individual staff are excellent, the process is ungodly complex and inscrutable, and variable despite over thirty years of experience working with the Department.

QUESTION 44: What two things are you least satisfied with about the permitting process and why?

- Turnaround time; the plan checker took months to respond to my plan revisions that were in response to his comments. As a result the project will not be able to start this year due to the start of the rainy season. Pre-application neighborhood meetings; the Planning Department is just passing the buck.
- Lack of consistent answers.
- Lack of coordination between stations and the process never seems crystal clear.
- There is no understandably written set of steps needed to get a permit, especially one involving a Site Permit and its various Addenda. There should also be a companion list and set of steps required for the many auxiliary permits without which the Site Permit and its Addenda are almost worthless - such as Health, Elevator, Encroachments, water, sewer, Sidewalks, etc. Directions should reveal WHERE to apply for them and WHEN it is most appropriate. It should remind the applicant about the cost of each of those permits and perhaps an approximation of that cost. There should be reminders of permits or permissions needed from non governmental agencies such as PG&E without which a project, otherwise approved is dead in the water.
- The returning of plans to departments who have already signed-off when the change did not affect the first department. Reviewers should be given some discretion on what needs to be rechecked.
• Duplicate submittals to both DBI and the individual departments. The long delays between a permit being routed to a department and that department assigning a plan checker.

• Not enough personnel at CPB is the biggest problem.

• Long review times for minor remodels of existing tenant improvements. Unpredictability of the level of detail required on our plans and details.

• Planning has become, more recently, more capricious. We have had at least two experiences in recent years in which the staff Planner assigned to our project has virtually killed it, then another owner, at the same property, and with another Planner, got permission to do exactly what was denied by "our" Planner. 2. Inconsistency (as above). As an owner remodeling my own house, I was required by DPW to make the driveway in front of my house handicapped-accessible on an extremely steep hill—it would have been impossible, so we remodeled everything and left the driveway in its original state. Later we went back and rebuilt the driveway under a separate permit and the cost was almost three times what it would have cost had it been done as part of the original project. There was no benefit for the city, the public, or my household from such a rigid and unrealistic demand.

**QUESTION 46:**

*What two things from other jurisdictions would you recommend implementing into the City & County of San Francisco permit process?*

• Clear communication to the customer. The plan checker at the intake counter should be able to locate a precise code answer when asked by the customer.

• As in Seattle, have an all-hands meeting for major projects, with Planning, DPW, DBI etc. all the same room, especially for city-funded projects.

• Eliminate duplicate permit application submittals. All applications should be submitted to one office, triaged at the counter, and then routed to ONLY the departments listed on the triage report. Trade permits (without plans) should be approved at the triage counter whenever possible. This same office should collect the fees for all of the departments who will participate in the review process. Teach MEA that they do not have to perform an environmental review in order to determine if a project qualifies for an exemption from environmental review under CEQA.

• Put more precise information online. Also enable the option to get permit online or via fax.

• The new system does it for me. The only exception is to get faster turn time on plans that have to "come in." Two to four weeks should be enough. Someone needs to expedite that. Some plans can take a short time but if that plan has to wait in line while something else is there that is long well that will plug the system

• A much better online program, the more that can happen online the better! Whatever building can do to make planning more accountable!

• Make available the checklists your people use to check plans. We could speed up the process by checking that we have documented each of the code items before we submit

• A single, coordinated review process by ALL required departments. One where the departments come together around a project, rather than a project having to "chase" the code officials around the building to obtain a permit.
DBI BPR Plan Review Stakeholder Survey

1. Contact person for this survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Information</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone</strong></td>
<td>96.9%</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fax</strong></td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email</strong></td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- answered question: 64
- skipped question: 5

2. When was your last visit to DBI?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Visit</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-30 days</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 months</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6 months</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 6 months</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- answered question: 69
- skipped question: 0
3. Which Department or Station do you spend most of your time, when you are applying for a building permit? Please mark from 1-7, 1 being most of your time, 7 being the least.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/Station</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRE</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If Other, please specify

- Answered question: 66
- Skipped question: 3
4. When you come through the front door, what was your experience with the DBI Public Information Counter? (Not Planning Department-Planning Information Counter) Check all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generally knowledgable about the process</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technically knowledgeable</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courteous</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to Understand</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please specify 11

answered question 63

5. Is it easy to find your way around the various stations and departments at 1660 Mission Street?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very easy</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat easy</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not easy</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 66

skipped question 3
6. Is there duplication of review stations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is this appropriate? Comment 15

answered question 56

skipped question 13

7. Is it easy to find your way to other agency locations (Planning Department at 1650 Mission Street, Public Works/BSM at Stevenson Street, Fire Department, School District, SFRA/Mayor's Office of Housing?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very easy</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat easy</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not easy</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 65

skipped question 4

8. Have you used the Planning, Building, Public Works, Fire Departments for general information or customer service?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 66

skipped question 3
9. If yes, have these experiences been satisfactory?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have not used Planning, Building, Public Works, Fire Department for general information or customer service</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please specify 16 answered question 57 skipped question 12

10. How would you rate the coordination between the Building Department and other approval agencies such as Planning, Public Works, Fire ...?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 65 skipped question 4

11. Is there a consistency in information, where you get the same answers to the same question you ask others?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 64 skipped question 5
12. Is it easy for you to fulfill the requirements for obtaining a certain construction permit? (ie, licenses required for certain permits, such as plumbing, electrical, building; business tax registration, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very easy</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat easy</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not easy</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. When obtaining a permit, do you hire a permit consultant or do you obtain the permit yourself?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hire a permit consultant</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtain the permit yourself</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At Office</td>
<td>80.0% (52)</td>
<td>20.0% (13)</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On their website</td>
<td>45.0% (18)</td>
<td>55.0% (22)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 15. Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At Office</td>
<td>28.3% (17)</td>
<td>71.7% (43)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On their website</td>
<td>72.2% (26)</td>
<td>27.8% (10)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 16. Public Works/BSM/Urban Forestry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At Office</td>
<td>40.0% (18)</td>
<td>60.0% (27)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On their website</td>
<td>74.1% (20)</td>
<td>25.9% (7)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 17. Redevelopment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At Office</td>
<td>44.8% (13)</td>
<td>55.2% (16)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On their website</td>
<td>68.4% (13)</td>
<td>31.6% (6)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 18. Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>35.3% (12) At Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>72.2% (13) On their website</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **answered question**: 35
- **skipped question**: 34

### 19. Mayor’s Office on Disability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>45.2% (14) At Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>63.2% (12) On their website</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **answered question**: 34
- **skipped question**: 35

### 20. Do you think the permit/complaint tracking and other services on DBI’s website is satisfactory?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **answered question**: 53
- **skipped question**: 16
21. How often do you apply for permit applications?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 1 per month</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 1 per 6 months</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 1 per year</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 65

skipped question 4

22. Planning (after mandatory notification and hearing processes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same day</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One day</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One week</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One month</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six months</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One year</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 60

skipped question 9
23. Large Commercial Building/Remodel (not tenant improvements)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same day</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One day</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One week</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One month</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six months</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>answered question</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>skipped question</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. Small Commercial Building/Remodel (not tenant improvements)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same day</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One day</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One week</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One month</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six months</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>answered question</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>skipped question</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 25. Large Residential Building/Remodel (4+ units)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same day</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One day</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One week</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One month</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six months</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**answered question**: 52  
**skipped question**: 17

### 26. Small Residential Building/Remodel (Less than 4 units)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same day</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One day</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One week</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One month</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six months</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**answered question**: 55  
**skipped question**: 14

### 27. Over the Counter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One hour or less</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four hours or less</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**answered question**: 62  
**skipped question**: 7
28. Public Works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same day</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One day</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One week</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One month</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six months</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- answered question 51
- skipped question 18

29. Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- answered question 6
- skipped question 63
### 30. How accessible is your plan reviewer?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not accessible</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>29.8% (17)</td>
<td>57.9% (33)</td>
<td>12.3% (7)</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>28.3% (15)</td>
<td>62.3% (33)</td>
<td>9.4% (5)</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>36.8% (14)</td>
<td>52.6% (20)</td>
<td>10.5% (4)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td><strong>54.8% (23)</strong></td>
<td>35.7% (15)</td>
<td>9.5% (4)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment</td>
<td>25.9% (7)</td>
<td><strong>59.3% (16)</strong></td>
<td>14.8% (4)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor's Office on Disability</td>
<td>29.6% (8)</td>
<td><strong>59.3% (16)</strong></td>
<td>11.1% (3)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **answered question**: 59
- **skipped question**: 10

### 31. What is the quality level of your plan review?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td><strong>59.7%</strong></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **answered question**: 62
- **skipped question**: 7
32. If you received plan check comments, were they ... (Please check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understandable</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legible</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please specify</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 59

skipped question 10

33. Generally, how accessible is your plan reviewers' supervisor?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accessibility</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not accessible</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please specify</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 51

skipped question 18

34. Are you concerned about retribution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please specify</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 58

skipped question 11
### 35. Are the code interpretations you receive consistent and satisfactory?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **answered question**: 63
- **skipped question**: 6

### 36. Is there adequate coordination between the plan reviewer and the field inspectors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **answered question**: 60
- **skipped question**: 9

### 37. How do you wish to be notified that your permit has been approved and ready for issuance?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notification Method</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By mail (postcard)</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By email</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By checking online</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Comment**
- **answered question**: 59
- **skipped question**: 10
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38. Are you satisfied with the payment process of your permit?</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Building</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Planning</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 41. Do you participate in any permit agency trainings and do you find them helpful?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: 10

- answered question: 55
- skipped question: 14

### 42. What adjustments have you made to your work product to be successful in San Francisco versus other jurisdictions?

- Response Count: 33

- answered question: 33
- skipped question: 36

### 43. What two things are you most satisfied with about the permitting process and why?

- Response Count: 36

- answered question: 36
- skipped question: 33

### 44. What two things are you least satisfied with about the permitting process and why?

- Response Count: 41

- answered question: 41
- skipped question: 28
45. Is the City and County of San Francisco permit process overly bureaucratic? Please explain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 35

skipped question 34

46. What two things from other jurisdictions would you recommend implementing into the City & County of San Francisco permit process?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 30

skipped question 39

47. If available, would you pay for an express/premium process?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 43

skipped question 26
Inspection Subcommittee Stakeholder Survey - Sample Comments

Question 16:
What additional services would you like to see offered?

- Please check the/your complain database before issue a duplicate notice of violation. For ex. I received one complaint from HIS and the same complaint from PID. It wasted a lot of my time. It seems to me that your divisions (PID, HIS, etc...) are not communicating.
- A narrower window of time period of inspection; i.e., 1 or 2 hours in stead of 4 hours (AM/PM.) Waiting time is too long.
- Handheld real time communication between inspectors and inspection division.
- Booking inspections online.
- Access to updated records such as when the inspector was out, rough inspection notes, temporary occupancy notes, etc. These would make it easier to research why permits are still open down the line.

Question 22:
Technology - What type of technological improvement would you like to see?

- Complaint need to be updated more timely, say within 5 working days of the inspection.
- Specific code and requirements should be posted online. With a homeowner’s permit and the horrible inconsistency of the inspectors, a user should be able to go online, see what exactly is required for their project, and therefore, have a reference point for disputes.
- Online scheduling of inspections and automated inspections request system - 24/7.
- Computer monitoring - with "alarms" or other notices - that certain deadlines for work are coming up. Stale permits that sit around LONG after theoretical expiration date (or for start of work under permit) are a BIG problem for neighbors/the public. There are way too many instances of a final inspection not happening FOR YEARS AND YEARS. This cheats the city out of re-assessment funds and makes it extremely difficult to track project status. There should be a "tickler" file that reports overdue status to both the individual inspector and "up the chain of command." It is really hard for an "outsider" to know what is going on. Stale information on status of work is a problem for the community and some owners. There should be the equivalent of computer tracking "alarm bells" built in. This could also benefit owners doing their own work who may not know they are responsible for getting their own work signed off.
- Central Permit should have a more advanced database that holds regular customers information, so that we and they have less manual input for each transaction.

Question 26:
What changes would you recommend to improve the inspection process?

- Web accessible inspection time request similar to airline reservation on web.
- Special Inspections.
- Would love to see an easier paperwork process or less paper work required to have a re-file on final inspections when the permit has expired. Having to go through the entire process again is slowing us down and costing us time.
# DBI BPR Inspection Stakeholder Survey

## 1. What is your role when interacting with CCSF Department of Building Inspection - Inspection Services?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Description</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **answered question**: 50
- **skipped question**: 2

## 2. How many times have you used our inspection services within the past year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One time</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two to five times</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than five</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **answered question**: 49
- **skipped question**: 3

## 3. When was the last time you used our inspection services?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30 days</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 90 days</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90+ days</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **answered question**: 50
- **skipped question**: 2
4. What inspection disciplines have you used within the last year? Check all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disciplines</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please specify 8

answered question 49

skipped question 3

5. How satisfied are you with the inspection scheduling process?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfied</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please specify 18

answered question 49

skipped question 3
### 6. How satisfied are you with the telephone contact with inspection staff?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfied</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please specify 12 answered question

| skipped question | 3 |

### 7. How satisfied are you with the quality and thoroughness of inspections?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfied</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please specify 6 answered question

| skipped question | 1 |
8. How satisfied are you with the consistency among inspectors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfied</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please specify 14

answered question 51

skipped question 1

---

9. How satisfied are you with the consistency between plan checkers and inspectors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfied</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please specify 13

answered question 50

skipped question 2
10. How satisfied are you with staff accommodating your requested inspection time?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfied</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please specify 13

answered question 48

skipped question 4

11. How satisfied are you with the coordination of other required inspections (ie., Fire, Health, DPW, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfied</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please specify 10

answered question 47

skipped question 5
### 12. How satisfied are you with the coordination with other DBI divisions (ie., Electrical, Plumbing, Housing, Building, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfied</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please specify 10

**answered question** 49

**skipped question** 3

### 13. How satisfied are you with the professionalism of the field inspector?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfied</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please specify 10

**answered question** 47

**skipped question** 5
14. How satisfied are you with the professionalism of office staff?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfied</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 49
skipped question 3

15. Did you feel you had easy access to supervisory level staff for a second opinion or interpretations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 40
skipped question 12

16. What additional services would you like to see offered?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 24
skipped question 28
### 17. Would you pay additional premium fee for enhanced services such as after/hour weekend inspections?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*answered question 45*  
*skipped question 7*

### 18. Are field inspection corrections adequately documented? Check all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accurate</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legible</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to understand</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*answered question 37*  
*skipped question 15*

### 19. Are you given adequate inspection timeslot for the scope of the inspection?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*answered question 42*  
*skipped question 10*
20. Do you work with other jurisdictions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. If you answered "YES" to the question above, how does DBI Inspection Services compare with other jurisdictions you are familiar with?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favorably</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat favorably</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavorably</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Technology: What type of technological improvement would you like to see?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 46
skipped question 6

answered question 35
skipped question 17

answered question 23
skipped question 29
23. Are you aware that you can apply for plumbing and electrical permits online?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 48
skipped question 4

24. Would you be willing to pay a premium fee for a guaranteed one hour window for your inspection?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 45
skipped question 7

25. Special Inspections Process How satisfied are you with the following areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to special inspection requirements</td>
<td>51.1% (23)</td>
<td>11.1% (5)</td>
<td>37.8% (17)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to status of special inspections</td>
<td>34.9% (15)</td>
<td>25.6% (11)</td>
<td>39.5% (17)</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign off of special inspection items</td>
<td>42.2% (19)</td>
<td>22.2% (10)</td>
<td>35.6% (16)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 46
skipped question 6
26. What changes would you recommend to improve the inspection process?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Automation Subcommittee Stakeholder Survey - Sample Comments

QUESTION 3:
What other information do you need to be able to retrieve from the online system?

- I would like to be able to see a listing of who the contractor is performing the work on a project. Too often I would check a permit that has been pulled and very very frequently the permit would list that the contractor has not been selected by the home owner or developer. Why is this important to me? I would want to know if contractor is about to perform work on a project that he has a current license, and the license will be current in 12 months, I could also check the CSLB web site to make sure he has workers’ comp because if he does not have workers’ comp and has many workers on a project what other short cuts is s/he likely to take, if the building department does not have the information before the first permit is pulled at least try and up date your records after the first inspection. Thanks.
- Photographs of work in progress or at completion. Building Plans online.
- Be able to tap into DBI property database. Apply for and track and obtain permits. Code updates, interpretations, rulings. Online help/question answering with technical services, residential plan check. Appointments for pre-application reviews online.
- Plot map information, planning issues such as historical ratings of existing structures, etc.
- Guidelines for new programs that DBI is rolling out, so that we can keep abreast of new changes.
- I need to be able to make changes to address and such. From time to time you get a general contractor who provides you with the wrong address and it needs to be changed on the permit and as it stands you must come to the office for that. It is a loss of valuable time.

QUESTION 6:
What features would you like an automated system to incorporate?

- Automatic email notification to applicants.
- History, status and inspection record on any given permit.
- Electronic filing of plans.
- Detailed plan check comments for permit application processing and plan checker contact info, with plan review stop tracking, complete permit history and planning zoning information combined in one place.
- E-mail between contractors and inspectors, to save time for tracking down answers to code requirements.
- Online applications, fee calculator, records and archives.
### 1. Contact person for this survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Type</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **answered question**: 41
- **skipped question**: 4

### 2. What types of web-based services would you use? (Check top five)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permit application</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit tracking status</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project tracking (multiple permits)</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic plan submittal</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit issuance</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection scheduling</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection result entries</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special inspections</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee estimation</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment of fees</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint tracking</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property profile information</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automated workflow</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document management systems</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Information Systems</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. What other information do you need to be able to retrieve from the online system?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Answered Question</th>
<th>Skipped Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. If you were offered enhanced web-based services, are you willing to pay an additional fee (automation surcharge)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Answered Question</th>
<th>Skipped Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Have you utilized web-based services in other jurisdictions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Answered Question</th>
<th>Skipped Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, where did you use it, and what did you like about it?

*Answered Question: 42*  
*Skipped Question: 3*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. What features would you like an automated system to incorporate?</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>answered question</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>skipped question</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PARKING LOT ISSUES
PLAN REVIEW AND PERMIT ISSUANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

All Plan Review and Permit Issuance Subcommittee parking lot issues were incorporated in the recommendations.

INSPECTION SUBCOMMITTEE

- San Francisco Fire Department complaint system is different from DBI.
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Gilbert Ginn, Department of Building Inspection
Dick Glumac, Dick Glumac Consulting Engineer
David Green, Department of Building Inspection
Matthew Greene, Department of Building Inspection
Tony Grieco, Department of Building Inspection
Chris Hall, Weather Shield Manufacturing, Inc.
Jeremy Hallisey, Department of Building Inspection
Joshua Hanna, Anka Property Group
Jim Harris, Pacific Gas & Electric Company
Pamela Harris, Pamela Flander Harris Sole Property
Neil Hart, Planning Department
Tim Hart, DASSE Design, Inc.
Janice Hayes, San Francisco Fire Department
Jack Healey, Peacock Construction
Mike Hennessy, Department of Building Inspection
Patty Herrera, Department of Building Inspection
Sue Hestor
Henry Hinds, Department of Building Inspection
Gary Ho, Department of Building Inspection
Karen Hurst, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Carla Johnson, Department of Building Inspection
Henry Karnilowicz, Occidental Express
Priscilla Kartawidjaya, Department of Building Inspection
Joe Katz, Innovative Windows
John Kerley, Contractor
Louise Kimbell, Department of Building Inspection
Yvonne Ko, Planning Department
Laurence Kornfield, Department of Building Inspection
Alex Kwan, Department of Building Inspection
Sam Kwong, Department of Telecommunications and Information Services
Edmund Lai, Lai's E & H Electric
Jim Lazarus, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Anita Lee, Department of Building Inspection
Susan Leong, Department of Building Inspection
Melissa Lerma, San Francisco Fire Department
Mary Lew, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Emily Lin, Department of Building Inspection
Wilson Lo, Department of Building Inspection
Daniel Lowrey, Department of Building Inspection
Ray Lui, Department of Building Inspection
Redmond Lyons, R Group, Inc.
Jeffrey Ma, Department of Building Inspection
Ben Man, Department of Building Inspection
Dushyant Manmohan, AME. Inc.
Sofia Mathews, San Francisco Fire Department
Jim McCormick, Planning Department
John McDowell, San Francisco Permits
Brian McGee, McGee & McGee
Dan McKenna, Department of Public Works
K. McLelland, Cahill Contractors, Inc.
Chris McMahon, McMahon Architects & Builders
Rose McNulty, American Institute of Architects/Asian Neighborhood Design
Sean McNulty, Department of Building Inspection
Jesus Mora, San Francisco Fire Department
Cheryl Muñoz, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Danny Murtagh, Boston Properties
Ephrem Naizghi, Department of Public Works/ Bureau of Street Use & Mapping
Arleen Navarret, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Jim Naylor, Citi Apartments
Hema Nekkanti, Department of Building Inspection
Kelvin Nguyen, Department of Building Inspection
Bob Nibbi, Nibbi Brothers
Robert Noelke, Professional Property Managers Association
Eric Omokaro, Department of Building Inspection
Paul Ortiz, Department of Building Inspection
Patrick Otellini, A.R. Sanchez-Corea & Associates, Inc.
Chuck Palley, Cahill Contractors Inc.
Steve Panelli, Department of Building Inspection
Paul Pedtke, Cahill Contractors, Inc.
Bernie Poggetti, Capitol Electric
John Pollard, San Francisco Garage Company
Lou Pons, Pacific Gas & Electric Company
Robert Power, Department of Building Inspection
Lou Ravano, General
James Reed, Department of Building Inspection
Joseph Ruiz, Rhapsody Painting & Environment
Paul Sacamono, Department of Public Works/Bureau of Urban Forestry
Scott Sanchez, Planning Department
Peter Sapida, Department of Telecommunications and Information Services
Amy Schmitt, Department of Building Inspection
Andy Schreck, Webcor Builders
Kevin Simons, Robert Poyas Landscaping
Garland Simpson, Department of Building Inspection
Brian Smith, Planning Department
Skip Soskin, Huntsman Architectural Group
Bill Spitzig, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Tod Stephenson, San Francisco Fire Department
Peg Stevenson, Controller’s Office
Bill Strawn, Department of Building Inspection
Andrew Stringer, Anka Property Group
Tuti Suardana, Department of Building Inspection
D.J. Sullivan, Department of Building Inspection
Ed Sweeney, Department of Building Inspection
Monica Szu-Whitney, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Simon Tam, Department of Building Inspection
Jeff Taner, Structural Engineers Association of Northern California
Sylvia Thai, Department of Building Inspection
Pat Tobin, Department of Parking and Traffic—Safety Patrol
Alan Tokugawa, Department of Building Inspection
Hanson Tom, Department of Building Inspection
David Valle-Schwenk, Department of Parking and Traffic—Special Project/Street Use
Tom Venizelos, Department of Building Inspection
Marge Vizcarra, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Peter Wade, Public Utilities Commission
Christina Wang, Department of Building Inspection
Kevin Westlye, Golden Gate Restaurant Association
Alan Whiteside, Department of Building Inspection
Alan Wilburn, Department of Public Works
Richard Wilkins, Department of Building Inspection
Daryl Williams, Department of Building Inspection
Clifton Wong, Department of Public Works
Kenny Wong, Department of Public Health-Environmental Health Section
Robert Wong, Department of Building Inspection
Willy Yau, Department of Building Inspection
Lauren Yim, Department of Building Inspection
Janet Yip, Department of Building Inspection
Brett Young, Cahill Contractors, Inc.
Lisa Yu Pan, Department of Building Inspection
Gerald Zari, San Francisco Fire Department
Howard Zee, Department of Building Inspection
AGENCIES/COMMUNITY GROUPS/LABOR

- American Institute of Architects (AIA)
- Asian Neighborhood Design
- Builders Owners and Managers Association (BOMA)
- Committee on Jobs
- Coalition of San Francisco Neighborhoods
- Golden Gate Restaurant Association
- Local 21
- National Association of Remodeling Institute
- Professional Property Managers Association
- Residential Builders Association (RBA)
- Small Business Commission
- San Francisco Planning & Urban Research (SPUR)
- Structural Engineers of Northern California (SEONC)

CITY AGENCIES

- Mayor’s Office of Economic Development
- Controller’s Office
- Planning Department
- San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD)
- Department of Public Works (DPW)
- Department of Public Health (DPH)
- Mayor’s Office on Disability (MOD)
- San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (SFRA)
- San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC)
- Water Department
- Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA)
- Department of Telecommunications and Information Services (DTIS)
- Board of Appeals (BPA)
- Department of Parking and Traffic (DPT)
- San Francisco Environment (SFE)
PHOTOGRAPHS