

**MUNICIPALITY OF ANCHORAGE  
BOARD OF BUILDING REGULATION EXAMINERS AND APPEALS**

**Meeting Minutes  
February 21, 2012**

---

1. **CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL:** The meeting was called to order at 6:02 pm. by Chairman Paul Michelsohn.

**Board Present**

Scott Bohne  
Skipp Bringmann  
Rob Merchant  
Craig Fredeen  
Paul Michelsohn  
Jonathan Steele  
Bari Gray  
Troy Feller  
Sterling Strait

**Board Absent**

Serena O'Donnell  
Tom Looney

**Staff Present**

Ross Noffsinger  
Sharen Walsh  
Jerry Weaver  
Gary Hile

**Public Participation**

Chuck Homan  
Dave Doolen  
Cody Lee  
Bill Taylor  
Stacey Dean  
Adam Trombley  
Trevor Edmondson  
D. Steffen

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Minutes of May 13, 2011 were approved with the correction of spelling of Mr. Steele's last name
3. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA:** Mr. Steele moved to approve with the modification of the minutes going first. Mr. Bohne SECONDED. Agenda was APPROVED.
4. **SPECIAL ORDERS OF BUSINESS:**  
**a. AO 2012-19 Building Board Ordinance, amending Title 23 to revise composition, scope and authority of the Building Board of Examiners and Appeals.**

Chairman Michelsohn asked Staff to clarify the purpose of the meeting.

Ms. Walsh presented staff's report and recommendations on AO 2012-19. (See attached ordinance and staff memorandum). This ordinance amends Title 23 to revise composition, scope and authority of the Building Board of Examiners and Appeals. Staff noted that the last appeal to the board was in February 2007. Staff has several concerns with the proposed ordinance:

- There is no demonstrated need for the proposed changes. Last appeal to the building board was February, 2007.
- The proposed ordinance allows the BB to grant variances from the code, which undermines the primary intent and purpose of the code.
- The Municipality's Insurance Services Organization (ISO) rating and our working relationships with enforcement agencies of the State of Alaska are in large part based on the extent to which the MOA adheres to the code and how consistently it enforces the code. If this ordinance is enacted staff is certain it would have detrimental effect on the ISO rating and the property insurance rates paid by Anchorage citizens.
- Proposed variance standards are subjective and allow financial hardship as a reason to waive code.

- Current code already provides the ability to recognize impractical situations, without diminishing the integrity of the code. Note the attached excerpts from Title 23 (Modifications and Alternate Means and Methods).
- The ordinance lowers the appeal fee and allows the appeal fee to be returned in total as long as the appellant appears for the hearing. Staff time, printing, and other administrative costs associated with appeals and hearings will thus be unrecoverable, placing additional strain on the already depleted 181 fund.
- The time required for staff to service the appeals spawned by the ordinance will reduce the amount of time available for plan review, issuing of permits, and inspection for other customers.
- The proposed ordinance affects the core operations of the Building Board, but was presented to the Assembly without affording the board an opportunity to review and provide input.

Staff recommends that Title 23 Part 23.10.103.4 be affirmed as effective and viable as currently adopted:

Chair Michelson asked questions about appeal filing fees being waived and asked if an appeal filing fee has ever been waived; he asked if the lack of recent appeals could be due to the time it takes to publicize a building board meeting since it may cost more for the builder to be delayed. He further noted the Insurance Services Organization (ISO) rating has been challenged clear up to the Mayor but it's never been clearly shown that if the rating drops property owner insurance rates will go up.

Ms. Walsh stated since she's held the office of Building Official, there has not been an appeal and she couldn't testify to the time or additional cost to an appellant. She noted the department just went through a lengthy ISO rating interview process. The results of that process indicated a possible downgrade of the current ISO rating and staff is developing a work plan to address the concerns of the rating agency. As part of that effort, staff has talked with local insurance companies and confirmed that some (Allstate for one) do use the ISO rating in determining premium costs. . When a local agent inputs the location of the property being evaluated into their computer, the program returns a cost based in part on the ISO rating .

Mr. Steele noted that the ordinance was silent as to the ability to appeal the building board's decisions. He asked if there is an appeal from the Municipality or if an appellant doesn't like the decision of the board can it be taken it to the superior court for adjudication.

Mr. Weaver responded it would always go to court. Mr. Steele questioned if appeals could be taken to the Assembly or another board. Mr. Weaver replied no.

Chair Michelsohn noted all boards are set up with the caveat that appeals can go to court. Mr. Weaver reported it depends on the particular board but building board decisions are appealed to superior court. Mr. Steele asked if the board would assume any liability by allowing variances from code, as proposed by the ordinance. Mr. Weaver replied staff could check with Legal but generally, when acting officially on a board as an agent of the municipality, board members are protected.

Mr. Strait asked for clarification on what constitutes a variance versus an allowable modification. Ms. Walsh stated Title 23.10. 103.3.1 defines the scope of the building official's authority. It authorizes the building official to render interpretations of the code and to adopt policies and procedures in order to clarify the application of its provisions, but prohibits policies and procedures that have the effect of waiving requirements specifically provided for in the code. She gave an example of a situation where a very small encroachment (less than 0.12 of a square foot) of an obstruction into a code-required clear space could be approved under the allowable modifications clause but an encroachment of 2 square feet would not be.



Mr. Strait asked how staff would feel if the ordinance granted the board the ability to make modifications and not variances. Ms. Walsh replied the option for modifications is already in place under current code.

Mr. Feller asked is there is something staff likes in the ordinance. Ms. Walsh replied one thing staff felt was helpful was bringing the full definition of the board's jurisdiction forward from AMCR, noting however that there were some redundancies in the current regulation that should be cleaned up. In particular, the AMCR states that one duty of the board is to interpret building code, which is more properly done initially by staff. The board then has the jurisdiction to hear appeals to the way that staff has interpreted an issue. It would be very inefficient if all requests for interpretation went to the board before going to staff.

Chair Michelsohn commented since staff gave an example of a variance versus a modification he would give another: code requires a kitchen outlet within 24" of the sink but if the buyer wants a larger window in front of the sink, the outlet cannot be placed further away to accommodate the window because of the code. He noted this would be something one would bring before the board for a logical waiver of code.

Ms. Walsh commented most of the regulations have a reason behind them. In the case proposed by Mr. Michelsohn, electrical plan review and/or inspection personnel would research the issue and determine why the regulation existed, then decide if a modification could be allowed. If the code commentary was firm on why such a distance was required, the request would not be granted.

Mr. Fredeen asked what are the current requirements for timeliness of calling a meeting when someone asks for an appeal.

Chair Michelsohn replied 30 days notice. Ms. Walsh responded staff will check with regulations. Mr. Weaver replied 14-30 days notice but we'll check into it.

Chair Michelsohn opened the floor to public testimony.

Assembly member Adam Trombley, for East Anchorage, testified on why he proposed the ordinance change. He said it was in direct response to a cry from industry for more flexibility in the building permitting and construction process. He noted the 3-member hearing panel idea was modeled after a similar program used by Property Appraisal and that program was working very well. He also noted the determination of who would sit on the 3 member panels would be up to the board.

Board member Steele asked about the structure and intent of the ordinance, noting it allowed for up to 15 members but a quorum was based on 6. Assembly member Trombley responded that a change could be made to correct that.

Mr. Steele asked if the 3-member panel who heard a case initially would have to be recused from a board wide discussion of an appeal to their decision. Assembly member Trombley replied that was not his intent and would make the change to correct the language.

Mr. Steele noted the board consisted of members of both the design and construction communities. He asked Mr. Trombley who he talked with from industry. Assembly member Trombley responded he talked with contractors, builders and developers.

Chair Michelsohn clarified the quorum language should say half plus one. Mr. Steele noted the language would need to state 50% plus one.

Chair Michelsohn asked for a show of hands from those members of the audience who supported the ordinance, 6 people raised a hand.



Mr. Cody Lee, current President of the Anchorage Home Builders Association (AHBA) and a builder, testified the AHBA continues to hear complaints about the difficulties of dealing with Building Safety. He stated the builders are looking for way to appeal Building Safety's decisions. He further spoke about on-going problems since he's been around and said the builders need a way to count on Building Safety. He noted everyone talks about the ISO rating but Girdwood has no plans review or inspections and Eagle River has no plans code or inspection. He asked how this plays into the ISO rating and said no one can explain the ISO rating. He noted builders are not looking to waive the code; they just want another way to interpret the code. He noted Building Safety talks about cost of approval and the perceived costs to the department if the ordinance passes, but there is also a cost to the builders and Building Safety doesn't take that into account.

Board member Bohne asked what is in the ordinance that makes it easier to file an appeal rather than to appeal to the full board as is now provided for in current code. Mr. Lee noted the \$100 fee vs. \$500 fee, and the ordinance gives the board the ability to interpret code, distinguishing between the letter of the code and the intent of the code.

Board member Fredeen asked if the building industry is not getting access to the board, is it because they are being told they can't make an appeal?

Mr. Lee stated the industry isn't being told they can't appeal to the building board. They are being told issues are subject to a strict interpretation of the code and the building board doesn't have the ability to interpret the code.

Mr. Fredeen noted if industry was often asking for the same items to be modified they must be spending a lot of time at the counter. He asked about the financial costs impact associated with typical items for which modifications were being requested. Mr. Lee stated it would have to be more than \$500 to warrant asking for a modification.

Mr. Steele asked if Mr. Lee could envision a timeline if the new process were to be put into place, i.e., how long did he think it would take to process an appeal under the new rules. Mr. Lee responded he didn't know at this point, but in any case it would have to be a pretty substantial cost to make it worthwhile to take an appeal forward.

Mr. Steele noted then it would still have to be substantial issue, even if the new lower fee made it a bit easier to move forward. Mr. Lee replied that industry has to make those kinds of decisions day in and day out. Mr. Steele asked if there is then a benefit to the new format. He noted the building board is on a monthly schedule, they haven't had meetings because there hasn't been a need. He felt the lack of appeals on the schedule spoke to issues being resolved with staff. He again asked based on cost impact, what is the advantage of this new process to industry.

Mr. Lee replied they would have relief from strict interpretation of the code. Mr. Steele asked if Mr. Lee had used the alternatives means method in the past to resolve issues. Mr. Lee noted he had.

Mr. Bill Taylor introduced himself as a residential builder with over 30 years experience. He stated, "This ordinance gives the industry a chance. This gives the board a chance of interpreting the code. This boils down to technical issues we've been trying to get past the plan reviewers. We need some common sense to apply. We see substantial compliance with the code. They are looking for 110% of the code. We can't get past that. This provides a gateway for the board to look at our interpretation of the code and apply to come up with a something reasonable." He mentioned the pendulum had swung too far to the right and they were looking for a way to do value engineering.



Mr. Bohne asked if Mr. Taylor could put a timeframe to when the pendulum started to swing. Mr. Taylor replied: "It started with James Gray and Andy Stemberg. Andy was the lead plan review about 15 years ago. Over time it has gotten stricter and stricter. What we are looking for is something a little more balanced."

Mr. Steele noted that Mr. Taylor mentioned value engineering. He asked if that was a reference to the financial hardship variance standard in the ordinance. Mr. Taylor responded no, that was his interpretation.

Mr. Steele asked Mr. Taylor about the "strictness" and asked if this was what he viewed as a cost impact. Mr. Steele noted the more often a builder builds and works with the city the more they should understand what is expected. He asked if Mr. Taylor rolled past knowledge successfully into the next project. Mr. Taylor replied he wouldn't call it a success. He said his company does try to anticipate what the city is going to require, but it never seems to stop and it seems there is this over-interpretation of the code.

Mr. Steele commented that Mr. Taylor indicated he has been practicing in Anchorage a long time, and asked if he had experience with other jurisdiction about their plan review process. Mr. Taylor replied yes, he was one of the people who brought forward the white paper from Washington State, which talks of the friction between the industries.

Mr. Steele asked why the codes are written the way they are. Mr. Taylor responded, "It's difficult, you can write it up on paper but in the field you have to make it work. The code in its best effort does that in the alternative means and methods but it falls short."

Board member Strait noted that right now there is a provision of Municipal code that allows a builder to request a modification and if that is denied the builder can appeal that to the board. He asked what is wrong with the current process? Mr. Taylor commented his experience is it does not work. He said, "What you look for is another pathway and the ordinance provides that. The ordinance is another set of eyes and different experience."

Mr. Strait commented it seems Mr. Taylor was in effect trying to short circuit the system. Mr. Taylor responded no, he didn't interpret it that way. He said the builders see it as a different way to alternate means and methods.

Chair Michelsohn asked Mr. Taylor if he had been able to learn what the plan review wants or expects from him. He said he has heard tale from the industry about situations that actually arise in the field due to possible customer changes. Mr. Taylor responded, "A lot of times you get something unexpected that happens and you need to regroup on the fly so we need a mechanism to get a quick decision."

Chair Michelsohn asked, "Knowing how the building board is handled now. Can you see utilizing this board...say how many times in a season?" Mr. Taylor responded maybe a couple of times. He doesn't view this as a like a flood of appeals coming through. He felt it would be used for highly technical issues that pop up that can't be resolved easily through the plan review process.

Mr. Dave Doolen, builder, stated, "No one here is against codes. Everyone here has run into situations where something doesn't make sense or could be done better. It's basically flexibility vs. rigidity. This system is designed to eliminate the appeal process." He hasn't gone before the board before. He noted he works with SIP's (Structural Insulated Panels) and the plan review process does not understand them and the reviewers don't know how to deal with this material. He said the rigidity of the process right now makes it easier for the plan reviewers to do their job. He said "This thing gives us hope of some success."

Mr. Steele asked Mr. Doolen what his expectation would be for a timeline for a panel or board formed under the new procedure to render a decision. Mr. Doolen responded about 30 days. He felt it would depend on the issue and didn't know if there could be some flexibility on the timeline.



Mr. Steele asked Mr. Doolen if he built with SIP's or if he was a manufacturer. Mr. Doolen replied he builds with them. Mr. Steel asked him if he found the SIP industry to be supportive in terms of engineering and code analysis. Mr. Doolen responded the industry is trying.

Mr. Chuck Homan testified next, and noted he's been building in Anchorage since 1978. He noted the building board needs to have the same authority as the other boards have. He thinks the department would support this especially if there is a mistake in the code. He noted as point of correction the State of Alaska does not have jurisdiction over single family homes and there is no State Fire Marshal jurisdiction on single family homes, multiple family is different.

Mr. Steele pointed out that the representation present at tonight's meeting was mostly residential. He asked Mr. Homan, "Do you feel this ordinance is applicable to the commercial side as well as the residential side?" Mr. Homan responded, "It's applicable to everything."

Mr. Steele asked Mr. Homan if he typically hired architects to vet out code issues. Mr. Homan replied yes, he does.

Mr. Steele asked Mr. Homan if he felt the 30-day time frame is reasonable. Mr. Homan replied yes. Mr. Steele asked what the expectation would be of how many would like to use the new form of appeal. He asked, "What do you think the frequency of the meetings would have to be, 30 days, bi-weekly, etc?" Mr. Homan said he understood staff would need time to prepare so 30-days would be reasonable.

Mr. Strait asked, "When do you see this occurring, during the plan review or during construction? Mr. Homan replied that he expected most times issues would be resolved during plan review.

Chair Michelsohn also noted the state fire marshal doesn't have authority over single family buildings. Mr. Homan confirmed that review of 1-2 family residential structures are exempt per state statute.

Mr. Andre Spinelli, residential builder and past president of AHBA testified he likes the idea of the ordinance. He also said he "...likes the ability for the board to look at something and the code says this but we can allow this." He likes the idea of opening up the process, speeding it up and appeals being more available.

Board member Merchant asked Mr. Spinelli, "What is your opinion of a perfect board for structural appeal? Who needs to be on that board?" Mr. Spinelli responded, "Three structural engineers."

Chair Michelsohn asked Mr. Spinelli if he had seen the code and if he would agree that its primary purpose is to protect the life safety of the occupants. He asked if Mr. Spinelli had noticed that the code has begun to stray from life safety of the occupants and focus more on building preservation. Mr. Spinelli answered his experience doesn't go back that far.

Mr. Trevor Edmondson with the Peterson Group testified he does support Assemblyman Trombley's ordinance. He thinks a lot of issues are resolved by the Building Official before they get to the board but an improved process is always a good thing. He asks that the board strongly consider what they had heard tonight for the benefit of the industry and the community.

Chair Michelsohn asked for opposed. None. **Public testimony closed.**

#### **Mr. Steele - MOTION**

**The Building Board supports the language of AO 2012-19 and will provide written affirmation at the upcoming public hearing with the Assembly. Mr. Bohne seconded.**



Mr. Steele said he would not be supporting his motion. He did not see how changing current code would improve the situation. As a practicing architect since 1979, he has had the benefit of many years of experience of working relationships with both the building department and builders. He has not been hearing that a month cycle is an inappropriate amount of time in which to schedule a hearing. He noted when sitting on cases, the board does base their decisions on the code. He stated he was not quite certain that this ordinance is the vehicle to resolving the builders' problems. He suggested perhaps there should be more workshops with the city and the building community to work through this.

Mr. Bohne commented he would not be supporting the motion he seconded. He noted he is not convinced there is a broken system. He noted that there currently is an appeal process and for a special meeting there is a 10-day notification, which is not unreasonable from what he's heard in tonight's testimony. He did not agree the board could only rule for the literal interpretation of the code but noted the board does have the responsibility to meet the intent of the code. He did not see what would be accomplished by the ordinance. He was also concerned about some of the detrimental effects of the ordinance that were brought forth by the Building Official, especially regarding the ability to deviate away from the code.

Mr. Feller noted he would not be supporting the motion. He said he felt all the issues raised could be addressed by the systems in place. He felt the building board does meet in a timely manner to address appeals that the industry brings forward; although he agreed the \$500 fee is a bit of an obstacle. He said that the Building Official had some very important points.

Mr. Merchant commented he looks at this on the mechanical side on a daily basis, but on the mechanical side he doesn't have an issue because he can deal with what comes up. He noted there will always be grey areas. He thought there does need to be a grey on the building side. He stated he is not sold on the three member board and it would have to be explained a bit more but based on what he has heard tonight he is for it.

Mr. Fredeen stated he is not in favor of the motion. He noted that his prior dealings with the staff have always been educational. He said it sounds like this ordinance was coming from one section of the building industry, he is very sympathetic to the issue they are having but the current proposed change is very dangerous, opening doors at too great of a risk. He proposed other avenues to resolve issues, noting that the electrical engineers have bi-monthly meetings to talk about code. He suggested both sides try to open the communications path. He summed up by stating this ordinance is too dangerous to the public in his opinion.

Chair Michelsohn commented he has been a builder since 1976 and he has a personal relationship with the city also through the Anchorage Home Builders Association. He noted the AHBA already meets with the building official once a month and many of the issues the industry brings before the building official are not resolved to the point that he feels it is a fruitless effort. He asserted that nothing seems to get accomplished and the codes have gone from preservation of life to preservation of buildings. He said fee costs are excessive. He said the industry has tried to find the grey and are told they can't. He noted that he likes the ordinance; he doesn't see the board being overly burdened with appeals. He said he would vote in favor and it's a good ordinance.

Mr. Gray noted that looking at 103.4.1, section a, in order to hear appeals; the member should be qualified and experienced in matters pertaining to that field. Section 1 allows for up to 5 hearing panels each year to hear appeals. He asked where the board would get these 15 people. Assemblyman Trombley replied the 15 members are appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Assembly, at which point the Chair and Secretary of the Board would designate who would sit on each three-member panel.

Mr. Feller asked for confirmation that the intent was the panels would be made up of members from the building board. Assemblyman Trombley responded that is correct.



Mr. Gray asked Assemblyman Trombley who he would want to sit on the panel for a plumbing issue. Assemblyman Trombley commented it would be up to the chair of the board. He said that he himself was not a plumber, so he doesn't know and that's why it would be up to the chair.

Chair Michelsohn noted there are three mechanical on the list; one plumbing engineer so maybe that would make up the three.

Mr. Bringmann noted he doesn't agree with adding an extra layer to the appeal process. He said he agrees there needs to be more access to the building board and he definitely thought that increasing the board would be a good idea but noted the board has not had an appeal since 2007. He felt if a major appeal had existed the board would have seen it. He felt the way the ordinance is written doesn't give the desired effect. He said there is a positive outlook now. He noted he doesn't see the issue that industry is seeing but knows his is not the best way to solve the problem. He said he would be in support of increasing the board composition and perhaps add more members from the residential side.

Chair Michelsohn noted a yes vote would send a recommendation of support to the Assembly and a nay vote would send a denial to the Assembly. There was discussion regarding intent of the vote and what it would be sending to the Assembly.

Chair Michelsohn called for a vote: **7 nays and 2 yeas. Motion failed.**

#### **Mr. Fredeen - MOTION**

The building board affirms administrative code 23.10 of Title 23 also known as Anchorage Administrative Code, and particularly 23.10.103.4 as effective and viable as currently adopted. **Mr. Steele seconded. BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Chair called for vote. Motion passed with 8 yeas and one abstained. Case is closed.**

Chair Michelsohn called for a 10 minutes recess at 8:25 p.m. Chair Michelsohn reconvened meeting at 8:34 p.m.

#### **b. PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE CODE 23.10.105 TO CLARIFY LICENSE REQUIREMENTS**

Mr. Noffsinger presented the explanation for the AO licensed in that trade. He stated this would fix a hole found in the Administrative Code and would create a \$1000 handyman exemption, noting there really is no dollar limit exemption presently. The revisions also clarify the licensing requirements in the Anchorage Administrative code by actually listing all of the general, electrical, plumbing contractors, and specialty contractor trades, matching the State of Alaska's requirements.

Mr. Merchant asked - regarding electrical, plumbing contractors – if the changes apply to them. Mr. Noffsinger replied no, when reading the first exception; it basically says that it doesn't apply to electrical, plumbing and mechanical work, which shall be administered by contractors in accordance with state law and this code. There is also a similar provision under performing work section.

Chair Michelsohn asked if this meant that a handyman or individual - except someone working on their own residence - cannot perform any mechanical or plumbing. Mr. Noffsinger replied, "Correct".

Chair Michelsohn opened the public hearing.

Mr. Chuck Homan, contractor and past AHBA president from two years ago was the first to testify. He stated he appreciated staff working on this and putting it together. He stated this was really important for the consumers out



there as there are a lot of unlicensed individuals out there. A lot of home owners are getting burned by them. This is a real positive thing.

Chair Michelsohn noted for clarification in the past these issues were turned over to the state and the state indicated they did not have the staff to enforce the law. Mr. Homan replied the state's resources are very limited. This gives the local department more power to enforce.

Mr. Cody Lee testified, noting it was good to be on the same side as Building Safety. He said the handyman industry is not following the code. He noted currently there really is no protection for the home owner and this closes the loop hole. This gives the city a way to enforce things. He supported the changes.

Chair Michelsohn asked Mr. Lee if he was familiar with a case of an unlicensed handyman who performed over \$100,000 worth of work on one house, doing so with multiple invoices. Mr. Lee answered he has heard of several of them.

Mr. Doug Steffen with Taylored Restoration, commented staff has been a great help putting this together. He said this is a baby step but the enforcement is a big part of it.

Mr. David Doolen, Jada Construction, commented this is an issue for contractors and that handymen are not playing by the rules. He complimented staff but expressed concern regarding enforcement. He stated there needs to be serious consideration given to the enforcement of this and it could be self supporting.

**Public Testimony closed.**

Chair Michelsohn called for a motion from the board.

Mr. Steele stated he's a little confused with C reverting to B. Mr. Noffsinger responded the original paragraph was redundant so staff deleted that, which shifted the numbering.

Mr. Steele - MOTION

**The approval of AO 2012- \_\_\_\_ as written. Ordinance 23.10.105 to clarify contractor's license and to create exceptions under \$1000. Mr. Gray SECONDED.**

Chair Michelsohn declared his appreciation and thanks to staff. **Vote 9 yeas, 0 nays. APPROVED**

Ms. Walsh noted since the Board had approved the proposed ordinance it would be put into the PACE system for introduction on March 13<sup>th</sup>.

Chair Michelsohn asked when and if it's introduced at the Assembly are you going to ask immediate action. Yes, replied Ms. Walsh.

Ms. Walsh noted current code does allow us to waive the fine for a first offense regarding licensing. This means those non-licensed contractors who are cited under the newly clarified code will have a chance to learn the requirements without a penalty.

Chair Michelsohn asked does staff have the ability to enforce this part of code. Ms. Walsh noted that Development Services already has a need for more staff but budgets are tight and current staff will absorb this work at this time.

Chair Michelsohn asked would it be beneficial for the board to make a recommendation for one or more staff persons to be hired to enforce this.



Mr. Weaver commented we've worked with the administration and if we don't have sufficient staff we will ask for additional resources.


Mr. Hile noted the inspectors also have the authority to ask for licenses on projects they are inspecting. Mr. Barnhill will follow through on any violations brought up by the inspectors. Ms. Walsh noted we also respond to complaints received from the general public. **Case complete and closed.**

**5. BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS - None**

**6. NEXT MEETING:** March 29, 2012, 6:30 – 9:00 p.m., Loussac Library

Chair Michelsohn noted the meeting will be at the regular meeting location and at that time we will hold vote for Chair and Vice Chair appointments. The Chair also welcomed the new board members Mr. Gray, Mr. Strait and to the board.

**7. ADJOURNMENT:** Meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m. **Mr. Steele moved. Mr. Bohne seconded. Approved.**

	<u>8/14/12</u>	<u>Sharen Walsh</u>	<u>8/14/12</u>
Paul Michelsohn, Chairman	Date	Sharen Walsh, P.E.	Date
Board of Building Regulation Examiners and Appeals		Building Official	