



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

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, July 20, 2022 at 10:00 a.m.

Remote Hearing via video and teleconferencing

Watch SF Cable Channel 78/Watch www.sfgovtv.org

WATCH: <https://bit.ly/3OefBcl>

PUBLIC COMMENT CALL-IN: 1-415-655-0001 / Access Code: 2487 822 2830

ADOPTED AUGUST 17, 2022

MINUTES

- 1. The regular meeting of the Building Inspection Commission was called to order at 10:06 a.m.
Call to Order and Roll Call.**

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

Raquel Bito, **President**

Alysabeth Alexander-Tut, **Commissioner**

J.R. Eppler, **Commissioner**

Bianca Neumann, **Commissioner**

Jason Tam, **Vice-President**

Angie Sommer, **Commissioner**

Sonya Harris, **Secretary**

Monique Mustapha, **Assistant Secretary**

D.B.I. REPRESENTATIVES:

Patrick O’Riordan, **Director**

Christine Gasparac, **Assistant Director**

Joseph Duffy, **Deputy Director, Inspection Services, Excused**

Neville Pereira, **Deputy Director, Plan Review Services**

Ray Law, **Legislative and Public Affairs Manager**

CITY ATTORNEY REPRESENTATIVE

Robb Kapla, **Deputy City Attorney**

Ramaytush Ohlone Land Acknowledgement:

The Building Inspection Commission acknowledges that we are on the unceded ancestral homeland of the Ramaytush Ohlone, who are the original inhabitants of the San Francisco Peninsula. As the indigenous stewards of this land and in accordance with their traditions, the Ramaytush Ohlone have never ceded, lost, nor forgotten their responsibilities as the caretakers of this place, as well as for all peoples who reside in their traditional territory. As guests, we recognize that we benefit from living and working on their

traditional homeland. We wish to pay our respects by acknowledging the Ancestors, Elders, and Relatives of the Ramaytush Ohlone community and by affirming their sovereign rights as First Peoples.

2. FINDINGS TO ALLOW TELECONFERENCED MEETINGS UNDER CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54953(e). (*Discussion and Possible Action*)

The Commission will discuss and possibly adopt a resolution setting forth findings required under Assembly Bill 361 that would allow the BIC to hold meetings remotely according to the modified Brown Act teleconferencing set forth in AB 361.

Commissioner Neumann made a motion, seconded by President Bito, to continue to meet remotely for the next 30 days.

The motion carried unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. BIC 050-22

3. President’s Opening Remarks.

President Bito made the following remarks:

I am encouraged by the progress the Commission has made in conjunction with the leadership at the Department of Building Inspection (DBI), and the Pre-Plan Check process was a step in the right direction. As President, I am keen on seeing the continued progress of streamlining the permit process as well as continued learning of the operational processes of DBI.

There was no public comment.

4. Director’s Report.

a. Director’s Update [Director O’Riordan]

Assistant Director Christine Gasparac gave the following update:

Ms. Gasparac said she was filling in for Director O’Riordan and wanted to begin by recognizing Deputy Director Neville Pereira for the launch of the Pre-Plan Check earlier that month. The new process would help DBI manage their workload better and it was one of a series of operational improvements that would be rolled out in upcoming months.

Ms. Gasparac said these operational improvements were meaningful to DBI’s customers and especially those who would have small and medium, in-house review projects because those projects would move quicker through the system in a more streamlined way. It’s also better for DBI’s staff to have more manageable workloads and would help to ensure accountability.

Ms. Gasparac thanked Mr. Pereira for his work on the Pre-Plan Check and said DBI looked forward to rolling out additional operational improvements in the next few months.

Ms. Gasparac said DBI was working on building a great team and introduced a new member of DBI’s Finance team Junko Laxamana as the Finance Manager and would be managing accounting and revenue group as well as the facilities and fleet management, she came to DBI from the Board of Supervisors (BOS) where she previously was Deputy Director for Finance Administration and she would report to

the new Deputy Director of Finance and Administration and DBI was still in the hiring phase for that position and hoped to onboard someone in the next few months.

Finally, Ms. Gasparac said every three years California and the San Francisco Building Codes are updated and members of the Commission have a role in that process. Ms. Gasparac acknowledged Michelle Yu and the Technical Services team for their hard work in putting together the Code update package that would be presented at the next BIC meeting, and if approved those Code changes would be drafted into legislation and the process would wrap by the end of the year. Barry Hooper from the Department of Environment was presenting some of the new Code changes that promoted Green Building practices, and at the next BIC staff would highlight more trends in Building Code development.

b. Update on major projects.

Assistant Director Christine Gasparac gave a presentation on major projects for June 2022 as follows:

- Major projects are those with valuation of \$5 million or greater filed, issued, or completed.
 - 7 permits filed
 - \$575.4 million in valuation
 - 1,500 net units
- Major projects with permits issued.
 - 3 issued
 - \$101.3 million in valuation
 - 178 net units
- Major projects with Certificate of Occupancy
 - 6 issued
 - \$318.8 million in valuation
 - 692 net units

c. Update on DBI's finances.

Finance Manager Junko Laxamana gave a presentation on the Department's finances for June 2022 as follows:

- Total Revenues as of June 30, 2022 was \$84.3 million, \$57.3 million were operating revenues.
 - Operating revenues increased by \$3.1 million compared to fiscal year 2020-2021.
- Total Expenditures as of June 30, 2022 was \$70.3 million and projected to be \$89.5 million
 - Surplus expenditure projection was \$2.5 million

d. Update on proposed or recently enacted State or local legislation.

Mr. Ray Law, Legislative and Public Affairs Manager, presented on recently enacted or proposed local and State legislation as follows:

AB 2234 – Would require a local agency to compile a list of information needed to approve or deny a post entitlement phase permit, as defined, to post an example of a complete, approved application and an example of a complete set of post entitlement phase permits for at least 5 types of housing development projects in the jurisdiction, as specified, and to make those items available to all applicants for these

permits no later than January 1, 2024. The bill would define “local agency” for these purposes to mean a city, county, or city and county.

SB 379 – Would require every city, county, or city and county to implement an online, automated permitting platform that verifies Code compliance and issues permits in real time or allows the city, county, or city and county to issue permits in real time for a residential solar energy system, as defined, that is no larger than 38.4 kilowatts alternating current nameplate rating and a residential energy storage system, as defined, paired with a residential solar energy system that is no larger than 38.4 kilowatts alternating current nameplate rating.

Commissioner’s Questions and Comments:

Commissioner Alexander-Tut said for File No. 210514, she wanted to confirm regarding the hearing on oversight of the mandatory soft-story retrofit program that there had been no movement from the Board of Supervisors (BOS) since June 2021.

Mr. Law said it was correct that there had been no movement.

Commissioner Alexander-Tut asked if there were any updates regarding the hearing on the Building Operations component of the 2022 Climate Action Plan that was received and assigned to the Land Use and Transportation Committee.

Mr. Law said the hearing had not been scheduled, and the 2022 Climate Action Plan was still pending at the assigned committee.

President Bito asked if AB 2234 was specifically for residential housing.

Mr. Law said that was correct.

President Bito questioned if AB 2234 was turning from discretionary approval to ministerial approval, how would that affect the City of San Francisco.

Mr. Law said that was the intention of the Bill; However, it had been updated with some amendments which would allow local jurisdictions to have more time when applications would be reviewed.

President Bito said although AB 2234 prioritizes housing, all permits that affect the City’s economic development, especially coming out of a pandemic, would benefit from the Bill especially if it is not required to be a ministerial process but still would be a discretionary process. – It would be good practice to expediting those permits.

President Bito said regarding SB 379, what was meant by “real time” in the Bill.

Mr. Law said to his knowledge the intent of the State Bill was to have local jurisdiction implement online platforms that would issue permits instantly; However, he thought in practice there would be questions about that process due to projects different sizes and buildings. Also, DBI is working with the Mayor’s office to provide feedback.

President Bito asked if the automated permitting platform would require electronic submittal of plans.

Mr. Law said SB 379 would require electronic submittal of plans; However, for equity reasons to keep paper plans as well.

President Bito said that there was a service in the Permit Center where the community was able to have their plans printed.

Ms. Gasparac said the service was available and Rebecca Villareal-Mayer reported on that at the previous BIC meeting, and outreach had been done to inform the community when the service began a few months ago.

Ms. Gasparac said DBI had an instant permitting system service for trades permits and other no plans permits such as regrouping permits. Licensed contractors were able to sign up for an account and would be able to instantly receive permits, and SB 379 would expand the types of permits that would be instantly available. However, some would benefit from plan review because that burden would then shift to the field inspection and it would be best if concerns were addressed at the plan review stage rather than the installation stage.

Deputy City Attorney Robb Kapla said to clarify, AB 2234 would apply to nondiscretionary permits but it did not change any permits from discretionary to nondiscretionary in its most current version.

e. Update on Code Enforcement.

Deputy Director Joseph Duffy gave an update on inspections for June 2022 as follows:

- Building Inspections performed June 5,438
- Housing Inspections 715
- 92 Cases sent to Directors Hearing
- Issued 109 Orders of Abatement
- Code Enforcement Inspections 436
- Life Hazard and Heat Complaints 19

Deputy Director Joseph Duffy presented the following Building Inspection Division Performance Measures for June 1, 2022 to June 30, 2022:

- | | |
|---|-------|
| • Building Inspections Performed | 5,438 |
| • Complaints Received | 427 |
| • Complaint Response within 24-72 hours | 411 |
| • Complaints with 1st Notice of Violation sent | 55 |
| • Complaints Received & Abated without NOV | 251 |
| • Abated Complaints with Notice of Violations | 49 |
| • 2nd Notice of Violations Referred to Code Enforcement | 28 |

Deputy Director Joseph Duffy presented the following Building Inspection Division Performance Measures June 1, 2022 to June 30, 2022:

- | | |
|---|-----|
| • Housing Inspections Performed | 715 |
| • Complaints Received | 314 |
| • Complaint Response within 24-72 hours | 309 |
| • Complaints with Notice of Violations issued | 189 |
| • Abated Complaints with NOVs | 288 |
| • # of Cases Sent to Director's Hearing | 40 |
| • Routine Inspections | 97 |

Deputy Director Joseph Duffy presented the following Building Inspection Division Performance Measures for June 1, 2022 to June 30, 2022:

- | | |
|---|----|
| • # Housing of Cases Sent to Director's Hearing | 92 |
|---|----|

• # Complaints of Order of Abatements Issues	19
• # Complaint of Cases Under Advisement	0
• # Complaints of Cases Abated	109
• Code Enforcement Inspections Performed	436
• # of Cases Referred to BIC-LC	0
• # of Case Referred to City Attorney	3

Deputy Director Joseph Duffy said Code Enforcement Outreach Programs are updated on a quarterly as follows for the 3rd quarter:

• # Total people reached out to	64,968
• # Counseling cases	597
• # Community Program Participants	4656
• # Cases Resolved	492

f. Update on Housing Inspection Services

Chief Housing Inspector James Sanbonmatsu gave an update on inspections for June 2022 as follows:

- Housing Inspection Services (HIS) overall goal
- Issues addressed
- Enforcement tools and how they compare
- HIS Impact – 2021

Commissioner’s Questions and Comments:

Commissioner Alexander-Tut asked how the relationships the Department had with tenant and apartment groups and associations impacted the Housing Inspection Services division, and how those relationships were used as a tool.

Chief Sanbonmatsu said the outreach program had two main components, one was the mediation and cooperation to deal with less serious issues such as communication between parties where tenant and landlord groups work together and ultimately breaks down some of the mistrust issues. The importance of the program was to bring people together and save resources for housing inspectors because most times to help with the issues its best to have someone in attendance from that community. The second component was to identify some of the most egregious problems which mostly were cases sent to the Litigation Committee. Most times HIS would not have known about it if those programs were not there, because some of the communities may be scared to go to the government and file a complaint. If the landlord had not been responding to the Notices of Violations and that was how the division has been able to drive enforcement by utilizing the community programs.

President Bito thanked Mr. Sanbonmatsu for his presentation and said that he was instrumental in setting up the tours of the Single Room Occupancy (SRO) hotel, and she was still learning of some of the issues surrounding the SROs. Going forward, President Bito requested a monthly report from Housing Inspection Services (HIS) to understand the challenges HIS goes through in general, and to educate the Commission on some of the issues that are ongoing because housing is a hot subject for the City as well as the Bay Area.

Vice President Tam said there were 3,132 complaint cases and 1,978 went unverified and asked what

was a scenario of a complaint going unverified.

Chief Sanbonmatsu said people call in for a lot of different reasons and mostly they did not have anything to do with the Housing Code, and some calls were made anonymously so not enough information was given to follow-up. For example, there are some neighbor to neighbor calls or illegal units that would be unable to verify, or a caller thinks something was a violation but it was not and that would be the purpose of an inspection yet it turned out not be a housing violation.

Public Comment:

- Mr. Jerry Dratler said there was a \$27 million dollar transfer from the project fund and asked what was the project fund, why the transfer and what was the balance of the fund before and after the transfer. He said that was about twenty-five percent of the annual operating budget and it was listed in the Revenues comments on page 2.

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

- Mr. Henry Karnilowicz said he was a frequent flyer of the Department since 1975 when it was located at 450 McAllister and under the Department of Public Works, then moved to 1660 Mission Street and then 49 South Van Ness where all of the stations were on the second floor and that was a great way to go and get all things done including for Small Businesses.
- Mr. Karnilowicz said what he liked about DBI was the Permit Tracking System (PTS) because you can see the comments from the different stations as it goes through plan checker review, and if you had any questions you could find answers in the PTS.
- Mr. Karnilowicz said he also liked that when appointments were made the inspectors call ahead and give one-hour notice and recently he had an inspector show up right on time. He said DBI was doing a great job and to keep up the good work and DBI was one of the best departments he had ever worked in.
- Mr. Dratler discussed DBI’s failure to enforce building code Sec. 327 at 25 17th Avenue. Mr. Dratler reviewed specific portions of the whistleblower complaint he filed and presented photos of the Building Code violations.
- Mr. Dratler mentioned that on June 17,2022 DBI Inspector Birmingham visited 25 17th Avenue and made the following entry into the complaint he filed. “Contractor needs to comply with SFEBC 327, case will be referred to SFDPH”. Mr. Dratler mentioned at this point in the code enforcement process a Notice of Violation should have been issued and was not issued.
- Mr. Dratler said he found DBI’s failure to enforce building code Sec. 327 disturbing but was more disturbed by DBI’s cover up of the code violations.
- Mr. Dratler said only one of the six inspectors who worked on his complaint did their job properly and the other DBI Inspectors covered up the building code violations.

6. Review and possible action to make recommendations to the Building Inspection Commission regarding current membership and reappointments to the Code Advisory Committee (CAC). In addition, to a brief update from the Nominations Subcommittee. (Current CAC Members seeking reappointment: Stephen Harris, Small Projects Civil Engineer; J. Edgar Fennie Jr.,

Major Projects Architect; Tony Sanchez-Corea, III, General Business Community; Arnie Lerner, Disability Access Advocate; Henry Karnilowicz, Commercial Property Owner/Manager; Rene Vignos, Project Structural Engineer; Marc Cunningham, Member-At-Large; Jonathan Rodriguez, Member-At-Large; Gina Centoni, Remodel Contractor; Ira Dorter, Residential Projects Contractor; Zachary Nathan, Small Projects Architect, Brian Salyers, Fire Protection Engineer; Don Libbey, Major Projects Contractor; and Jim Reed, Electrical Engineer/Contractor.) Terms to expire August 10, 2025.

Vice President Tam made a motion, which was seconded by Commissioner Sommer, to reappoint the members of the Code Advisory Committee.

Secretary Harris Called for a Roll Call Vote:

President Bito	Yes
Vice President Tam	Yes
Commissioner Alexander-Tut	Yes
Commissioner Eppler	Yes
Commissioner Neumann	Yes
Commissioner Sommer	Yes

The motion carried unanimously.

Secretary Harris read the Oath of Office and swore in the reappointed members.

b. Update from the Nominations Subcommittee.

Commissioner Sommer said the meeting consisted of discussion about the upcoming vacancies on the Code Advisory Committee (CAC) and the Board of Examiners (BOE) and recap of what those groups do and an overview of the process to fill those positions and the intention to increase the diversity of people included in those committees and explore other ways of recruitment. Also the CAC was a seventeen-member group and two members, Nancy Goldenberg and Robert Wong elected to retire at the time of the reappointment and the CAC expressed their gratitude for their service. Commissioner Sommer said she had been attending the CAC meetings and requested a presentation regarding their work at a future BIC meeting.

7. Update regarding Information Sheet EG-02 – Emergency Escape and Rescue Openings to Yard for Existing or New Building of R-3 Occupancies.

Deputy Director of Permit Services Neville Pereira presented an update on EG-02 Emergency Escape and Rescue Openings as follows:

- Background
- EG-02 Update
- Next Steps

Public Comment:

- Mr. Jerry Dratler asked was the proposed solutions in the EG-02 presentation addressing Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) and with densification a fire protection and escape was critical

and he had not heard any mention in past presentations and if the City would become more densified it had to be deliberate and thoughtful not to create any life safety issues.

- Ms. Georgia Schuttish said she appreciated Mr. Dratler’s comment about the ADUs because they went along with the egress for bedrooms as well when located within the excavation of the typical 25x114 lot, whether below the garage or behind it which was often the case in remodels and could be true for ADUs where the first floor was above the garage that was the living space becomes just a living space with kitchen and living room and all the bedrooms are behind the garage
- Mr. John Kantor said he agreed with Mr. Dratler’s and Ms. Schuttish’s comments on life safety, but his comment was for general public comment and because he was unable to be unmuted would like to say his general public comment at that time.
- Mr. Kantor said the BIC’s time was being wasted by one individual’s personal vendetta against local small businesses. Individuals and small businesses are struggling as the pandemic was ending. Mr. Dratler would have the BIC believe he was concerned about DBI’s enforcement of Building Codes but was only interested in process. Neighbors who were friends of Mr. Dratler on the same block as Mr. Kantor repeatedly performed work without a permit, beyond the scope of a permit, and work not permitted in the San Francisco Building Code. Mr. Dratler’s complaints famously stated he had photos, yet the Commission does not hear of those complaints and no complaint was filed with DBI. Why are those projects not also on Mr. Dratler’s radar? Mr. Kantor said Mr. Dratler was only interested in enforcement with those he disagreed with. Over the years Mr. Kantor’s neighbor had filed 20 complaints and the majority had been closed without merit. The week before Mr. Dratler’s complaints wasted countless hours of at least eight city employees.
- Mr. Kantor said it was unfortunate that hard working individuals, property owners, and businesses were subject to an abuse of process and recommended the BIC create a vehicle where individual complaints would be independently closed and noted in a complaint tracking system and DBI should be aware of serial abuses and maintain a file for further scrutiny.

Commissioner’s Questions & Comments:

President Bito questioned if the Planning Department was proposing to change the Zoning Code to accommodate the four alternative prescriptive measures.

Deputy Director Pereira said it was recommended to change the Zoning Code, but it had not been done to date.

President Bito said would Mr. Pereira go into detail regarding four alternatives that were in the presentation.

Mr. Pereira went in to detail explaining each alternative listed in the presentation update of EG-02.

Deputy City Attorney Robb Kapla said there were different processes for departments to initiate a change and if the Planning Department agreed to the potential changes would seek sponsorship similar to looking at changes to the Building Code. The Planning Commission would hear it, make findings that it was necessary to make those changes, and then normal legislative process of introduction, 30-days, committee hearing, and once the Board passes it requires the Mayors signature, at minimum would be a two to three-month process.

Deputy City Attorney Robb Kapla said some of the alternatives a property may seek may be in conflict with the Planning Code and in those instances the owner could seek a variance with the Zoning Administrator on a case by case basis, and that would be a time consuming process and the current process was to choose one of the alternatives until there was a Code change, to seek a case by case variance from the Zoning Administrator if the option chosen conflicts and that was not something the Building Inspection could waive or have a policy over. Practically that would mean most applicants in the interim until there was a codification if not seeking a variance would exhaust the other options that would not conflict with the Planning Code.

8. Discussion regarding the Green Building Code with the Department of Environment along with a DBI focused presentation.

Mr. Barry Hooper of the Department of Environment presented as follows:

- Agenda
- Construction and operation of buildings impact
- Stakeholder recommendations
- Timeline
- San Francisco Green Building Code
- Led by DBI with support from SF Environment
- Green Building Regulations
- Progress
- Carbon emissions from San Francisco buildings
- Noteworthy changes in California 2022 Green Codes
- Electric vehicles – key terms
- Changes in CalGreen 2022 – Electric vehicles
- Better roofs
- Summary
- Key areas of leadership by DBI

There was no public comment.

Commissioner's Questions & Comments:

Commissioner Eppler said in the presentation the pie charts representing carbon emissions noted the largest amount of reduction was from CO2 emissions from electricity and most of that was from generation and was that correct.

Mr. Hooper said the slide was summarizing several factors at once and it showed a reduction in electricity generation and the Commissioner was correct.

Commissioner Eppler said regarding electric vehicles the Code currently dealt with multi-family and there was a large number of cars that had indoor parking. He asked if there had been any thought on how the Building Code might be changed to better incentivize external installations of chargers rather than interior facing but external facing.

DCA Robb Kapla said an Electric Vehicle Charging Location Ordinance had passed the Committee to set up retail charging stations and would replace gas stations however adding electrical chargers to a

building was regulated by the state code and would be close to an administrative ministerial process and there were special codes within the Building Code not within the Green Building Code to make it an extremely fast process to add pumps existing property.

Commissioner Alexander-Tut asked Mr. Hooper to elaborate on the plan of the Green Building Code for the existing housing stock.

Mr. Hooper said The Climate Action Plan particularly the Building Operations Chapter was a product of a multi-year public engagement process particularly for residential stock centering equity and justification and reflected input from the broader community regarding what type of education and workforce development incentives were necessary and the theme of those for existing buildings was to recognize the City needed to be opportunistic and realistic and acknowledge urgency was important and upgrade expenses were significant and the opportunity where the lowest marginal cost to make upgrades. San Francisco is a city and a county, and while putting the county hat on, we participate in the Bay Area Regional Energy Network and that was one of the sources of financial incentives for supporting efficiency and electrification in existing residential buildings. San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) Empower SF program was providing about \$1,000.00 incentive directly to the contractor for heat pump water installation to make a better business proposition for them.

Commissioner Alexander-Tut said where would someone be able to find the programs Mr. Hooper mentioned.

Mr. Hooper said those programs would be found by searching BayRen or a statewide website named The Switch is on.

Commissioner Alexander-Tut said was there any contemplation around indoor air quality and open window ventilation systems and electric bikes towards adding electric bike parking and other types of security that would incentivize the use of those types of devices.

Mr. Hooper said regulations for the electric bikes were with the Planning Department and there was an existing Ordinance for building bicycle parking primarily applied to work places and did not expect the Building Code to go into more detail other than a failure to wire for electrical bikes.

Mr. Hooper said regarding air quality he expected voluntary adoption of heat pumps will continue to accelerate if the City continued to experience air quality events and with regard to Grey Water, water policies were advanced by SFPUC and was a non-potable reuse Ordinance for large buildings there was a proposal to amend to apply the Ordinance to smaller buildings.

DCA Robb Kapla said Mr. Hooper had a better sense of the topic but in terms of the gray water and purple water system recycling it was complicated even for large buildings with the California Plumbing Code and was one of the areas where there were some frustrations with the state codes and hopefully the 2022 Plumbing Code would be better with those but within the City there was Gray Water recycling provisions for certain buildings and small residential buildings had been very hard.

President Bito thanked Mr. Hooper for his presentation and recommended the Commission to review AB93 for further information regarding how a renovation was defined and asked if there were other bulletins or information sheets Mr. Hooper would recommend.

Mr. Hooper said the AB 93 was the principal bulletin.

9. Update on the Soft-Story compliance rates.

Deputy Director Joseph Duffy gave an update to the Mandatory Soft Story Retrofit Code Enforcement Efforts as follows:

- Mandatory Soft Story Retrofit Program
- Program applies to
- Compliance timeline and tiers
- Compliance by tier as of February 8, 2022
- Enforcement
- Next steps

There was no public comment.

Commissioner's Questions & Comments:

Commissioner Neumann said for Mr. Duffy to explain what the different tiers were in the presentation.

Mr. Duffy said Tier one was buildings that contained a group A, E, R21, R3, and R4 occupancy on any story and was an assembly of occupancy, educational and some residential occupancy. Tier two contained fifteen or more dwelling units, except for building assigned to Tier one or four. Tier three were buildings not falling in the definition of another tier. Tier four were buildings that contained office or retail occupancy on the first story or on the basement of an underfloor area and was any portion standing above grade and buildings that were not mapped in liquefaction zones except for buildings assigned to tier one.

Commissioner Eppler said with respect to the cases going to Director's Hearings how were those cases being selected and how that backlog was being worked through.

Mr. Duffy said the Director's Hearings backlog was being worked through by Tier and the dates of those deadlines.

Commissioner Eppler asked when did the Department expect to have worked through the backlog with at least ninety percent compliance across all tiers.

Mr. Duffy said regarding to get projects to Certificates of Completion would be a few years considering things were beginning to move again in the industry and there being a lot of empty buildings and when scheduling hearings there are request for continuances based on hardships. Also, referring to programs that assist to get projects completed.

Commissioner Eppler said what was the usual time between permits issuance and notice of completion.

Mr. Duffy said usually a project with a valuation under \$100 thousand the completion was expected within twelve months and that was the time allowed on a permit though there had been a small percentage of delays due to utility concerns.

Commissioner Eppler said when the Commission looks at the numbers at a later date to also include the permitting numbers to have a view of how the process was going.

10. Update on launch of Pre-Plan Check process.

Deputy Director of Permit Services Neville Pereira present an update on the Pre-Plan Check launch as follows:

- Overview of the Pre-Plan Check Process
- Pre-Plan Check launch
 - Webinar
 - Update
 - Projects received
 - Next Steps

There was no public comment.

Commissioner's Questions & Comments:

President Bito applauded Deputy Director Pereira and DBI on the progress made with the Pre Plan Check process, and the portion where the project was not a black and white solution but pursuant to applicants who were in the pipeline and said she was pleased at the holistic approach that was taken.

Commissioner Sommer said when applicants were pushed back from intake was there a checklist of missing items being provided to customers and what was the process of reapplying.

Mr. Pereira said the initial response had been to copy and paste a corrected checklist via email to be consistent in the response along with public announcements via webinar regarding any updates but the goal was to stay consistent.

Commissioner Sommer said the challenge was permits from applicants who does not get permits regularly and may not ever need to apply for a permit again and to be sure that the process was not confusing and the Pre Plan Check was not to be perceived as a Plan Check.

Mr. Pereira said applications were submitted electronically and an intake email would be generated and those would be taken in the order received and the turn-around was 48 hours to respond whether the applicant would move forward and the Department wanted to project the idea of facilitation rather than impedance.

11. Commissioner's Comments and Questions.

- a. Inquiries to Staff. At this time, Commissioners may make inquiries to staff regarding various documents, policies, practices, and procedures, which are of interest to the Commission.
- b. Future Meetings/Agendas. At this time, the Commission may discuss and take action to set the date of a Special Meeting and/or determine those items that could be placed on the agenda of the next meeting and other future meetings of the Building Inspection Commission.

Secretary Harris said the next regular meeting of the Building Inspection Commission was August 17, 2022.

President Bito asked about an update on the timeline of the fee study and once it's complete to show how it related to the different tiers of projects and other study's and their timelines so those would be tracked

as a Commission to be able to appropriately agendaize those items.

Ms. Gasparac said the fee study would be done by the Deputy Director of Finance and Administration whom had not been hired and a timeline would be provided once that person had been on boarded and it had been anticipated the Department would engage the Controller’s Office for assistance with the fee study. The Permit Center had engaged the Gartner Group to research permitting processes across the City which began in June 2022. Staff met with the Gartner Group to look at DBI portion however the Permitting Center was managing the project with the Gartner Group to find how all of the Departments would utilize technology better together.

12. Review and approval of the minutes of the Regular Meeting of June 15, 2022.

Vice President Tam made a motion to approve the Regular Meeting minutes of June 15, 2022, seconded by President Bito.

There was no public comment.

RESOLUTION NO. BIC 051-22

13. Adjournment.

Vice President Tam made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Commissioner Eppler.

The motion carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:44 p.m.

SUMMARY OF REQUESTS BY COMMISSIONERS OR FOLLOW UP ITEMS	
Commissioner Eppler requested statistics on permitting in the Soft-Story compliance updates. – Eppler	p. 12
President Bito requested timeline of studies the Department was working on such as the fee study and the Gartner Group. – Bito	p. 13

Respectfully submitted,


Monique Mustapha, Assistant BIC Secretary


Edited By: Sonya Harris, BIC Secretary