

**STREAMLINING THE NATION'S
BUILDING REGULATORY PROCESS
2000 BUSINESS PLAN**

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

April 3, 2000

**STREAMLINING THE NATION’S BUILDING REGULATORY PROCESS
2000 BUSINESS PLAN
TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Executive Summary.....	ii - iv
I. Description of the Project.....	1-6
II. Uniqueness Statement.....	7
III. Operating Procedures.....	8 - 11
A. Model Review and Implementation Process.....	8
B. Funding Strategy.....	8 - 11
1. Grant funding from project partners.....	8 - 9
2. Foundation grants.....	9
3. Related contract services.....	9 - 10
4. Corporate sponsorship/partnering.....	10
5. In-kind services.....	10 - 11
IV. Outreach Plan.....	11 - 12
A. Project Website.....	11
B. Barrier-removal and Consensus-building Conferences.....	11 - 12
C. Project Marketing.....	12
V. Key NCSBCS Personnel.....	12 - 13
VI. Financial Data.....	13
VII. Cost Proposals for Individual Tasks.....	13 - 17
A. Barrier-removal and Consensus-building Conferences.....	13 - 14
B. Model Review Process.....	15 - 16
C. Website Maintenance and Upgrades.....	16
D. Project Marketing.....	16 - 17
Appendices	
A. Background Report on Oregon Conferences	
B. Resumes of Key NCSBCS Personnel	
C. List of Project Partners	
D. Copies of Internal Revenue Service Documentation for NCSBCS and SIBTS	
E. Project Grant History	

STREAMLINING THE NATION'S BUILDING REGULATORY PROCESS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Need:

Streamlining the nation's building regulatory processes at all levels of government can save as much as 60% of the current cost to regulate construction, expediting the process of delivering homes and other buildings without compromising safety or quality of life. Builders, contractors, designers, owners, and consumers desire these changes and have expressed a willingness to work together to solve these regulatory problems. Government agencies have requested models which they can utilize in gauging their own performance and identifying areas where they can improve.

Problem:

A recent Washington Post article¹ quoted a 1993 Maryland-National Capital Building Industry Association report that building regulations in Prince George's County, Maryland add 30% to the cost of a new home. In 1993, the average sale price of a home in the county was \$139,000, of which \$34,000 was the regulatory cost— plan reviews, inspections, and building permits.

Regulatory streamlining can have a positive impact on:

- ▶ The quantity and quality of safe, affordable homes;
- ▶ Reducing or eliminating governmental redundancy and overlapping regulations;
- ▶ Regulators' ability to develop communities in a sustainable, environmentally-sound manner;
- ▶ Effectiveness of disaster mitigation elements implemented in communities; and
- ▶ A community's ability to accommodate ever-changing demographics.

By reducing the added expense of regulation beyond the basic permitting fees, builders and contractors will be able to pass along savings directly to their customers.

Approach:

This project involves the identification, development, and promotion of administrative rules, regulations, and procedures in use by jurisdictions at all levels of government which eliminate areas of existing regulatory overlap and duplication. These streamlined "models" are then promoted on a nationwide platform to encourage their use by other jurisdictions needing streamlining. Where requested, the Streamlining project offers proactive assistance in the form of barrier-removal conferences and outreach tools to help jurisdictions adopt models.

¹ Evans, Sandra. "Thirty Inspections and Counting for Prince George's Builders." Washington Post. Washington Business Section. December 6, 1999.

Accomplishments to Date:

- ▶ Received over 150 case studies currently in use by jurisdictions in 40 states. Selected 54 of these case studies for nationwide implementation as streamlined models;
- ▶ Completed *Cindy Wants to Build a House*, a comprehensive map of the regulatory process for residential construction;
- ▶ Witnessed **actual adoption and implementation of streamlined models** in other jurisdictions. For example, San Diego, California's *Process 2000* model has been replicated and implemented by the cities of Savannah, Georgia, and Portland, Oregon. Savannah's *Site Plan Review System* was also selected to serve as a streamlined model based on its successful small-scale replication of *Process 2000*;
- ▶ Conducted a *National Symposium on Streamlining the Nation's Building Regulatory Process* in Dana Point, California, on November 5, 1998. Conducted a *Second National Symposium on Streamlining the Nation's Building Regulatory Process* in Herndon, Virginia, on April 22, 1999; and
- ▶ Successfully tested a prototype implementation and outreach delivery system in the form of Streamlining Conferences in the State of Oregon, and gained substantial interest in the Conferences from other jurisdictions across the country.

Next Steps:

With a broad array of model programs collected, the Streamlining project now focuses its resources on gaining the adoption and use of models. Model implementation can be accomplished through the following outreach initiatives, :

- ▶ State and local level conferences among government, industry, and consumers to build consensus and remove regulatory barriers;
- ▶ Research into benchmarking processing times for various regulatory phases;
- ▶ Research to determine the effectiveness of streamlined models currently in use, including measurement of actual cost savings enjoyed by all involved stakeholders;
- ▶ Consumer-oriented initiatives to get current and future homeowners involved in regulatory streamlining; and
- ▶ Promotional initiatives to ensure that as many stakeholders as possible know of the Streamlining project and its efforts that can help them.

Opportunity to Invest:

The Streamlining project has received numerous requests from stakeholders in states and localities nationwide for consensus-building and barrier-removal conferences. The greatest impediment to delivery has been the availability of funding for labor, facilities, and materials. The average cost per three-day conference is estimated to be \$50,950 and constituent support is estimated to be approximately 28.5% of the total cost. It is anticipated that 7 conferences per year will be required over the next 3 years in order to meet the demand, generating a total financial shortfall of \$765,450 (\$255,150 per year). In addition, there is a need of \$37,900 per year for funding to continue the collection and processing of an estimated 30 model programs per year for different subject areas and different size jurisdictions. With resources to conduct these and other project activities, the Streamlining project will be equipped to proactively assist jurisdictions to use model programs and reduce regulatory barriers.

To date, funding for the Streamlining project has been provided through grants from several Federal agencies. In order to become self-sufficient and less reliant on Federal funds, the Streamlining project will charge modest conference registration fees and seek contracting opportunities from state and local governments, organizations, and other stakeholders for proactive streamlining assistance projects. The balance of the funds, estimated to be \$150,000 per year, will be generated from grantmaking foundations and corporate sponsorships of project activities.

I. Description of the Project

The ideal building regulatory process, graphically speaking, is a wide open highway with a series of conveniently placed exits and rest stops from beginning to end. Traffic flows smoothly because the highway is designed for high speed travel with adequate grading, lane markings, shoulders, and guard rails to avoid safety hazards. Few if any impediments exist to cause backups and delays.

The current regulatory process is more of a winding dirt road with rest stops scattered randomly and in hard-to-find places. The road can be littered with roadblocks, potholes, and construction zones. Travelers encounter detours that lead to dead ends or that carry them in circles or back to their starting point. Without a map, there is little hope of finding the end. Some would even argue that the road may never end.

The *Streamlining the Nation's Building Regulatory Process* project is an effort to change that winding dirt road into something more like a well constructed, safe high-speed highway. Like building a highway, regulatory streamlining involves connecting points of contact using the safest, shortest, and smoothest procedures possible. Customers should be able to travel seamlessly through the planning and zoning process to the site review, environmental review, plan review, and permitting processes without confusion or surprises. Customers should also be able to comply with Federal, state, and local regulation of the construction process without suffering through overlapping and conflicting requirements that reflect little or no intergovernmental coordination and serve no public purpose.

Five types of building regulatory streamlining exist based on the geographical areas upon which the streamlining impacts.

A. Local streamlining (city or county).

Streamlining at the local government level involves solving problems within a single local jurisdiction—a city or a county. The local building department, planning department, public works, and others involved in building regulation all can benefit from both substantive and procedural streamlining to reduce unnecessary costs and wasted time. Local streamlining often has the greatest effect on reducing added costs, as an inefficient local process can add as much as 40% to the cost of new construction.

Case in point. A recent article in the Washington Post² quoted a 1993 Maryland-National Capital Building Industry Association estimate that regulations in Prince George's County, Maryland add 30% to the cost of housing. The average sale price of a home in Prince George's County in 1993 was \$139,000, of which \$34,000 was the regulatory cost. The article describes the specific types of regulatory inefficiencies:

² Evans, Sandra. "Thirty Inspections and Counting for Prince George's Builders." Washington Post. Washington Business Section. December 6, 1999.

The county requires detailed site plans for much of its new housing, including multifamily dwellings, town houses, and single-family homes in subdivisions where developers are allowed more units in exchange for more open space. These plans are reviewed for architectural design, landscaping, topography, storm water management, and parking.

The plans can be challenged by neighbors and taken to a public hearing, which can add months to the time it takes to get permits and thus push up the price of housing, according to builders...

A common complaint from builders is the sheer number of government agencies that get involved: the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, the Prince George's County Planning Board, the county departments of Environmental Resources and Public Works and Transportation, the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, the state soil conservation agency, and the Prince George's County Council itself.

"You are constantly going back and forth among government agencies," said developer and builder Michael T. Rose of building in the Washington suburbs. "The time it takes to process is extremely expensive."

"On a typical house, there might be 30 different inspections," [Caruso Homes president Jeffrey] Caruso said. "I have people who just run permits, period, because it is such a complicated process."

Rather than remove regulations and risk compromising life safety or the environment, the most effective streamlining initiatives focus on "lining up" all regulatory agencies in a predictable linear process that focuses on helping rather than hindering the customer. The one-stop permit center model is an innovation that is growing in popularity among local regulatory agencies. All agencies involved in the process are physically located in a single facility, often connected by a shared computer system. Teams composed of members from multiple departments are formed under the supervision of a project manager, designated to assist customers with complex projects and to constantly improve the permitting process for all customers. Some jurisdictions even place rigid deadlines on their own teams to complete their reviews, saving hours of unnecessary delay to the customer.

Here is a listing of jurisdictions using model one-stop permit centers and the actual cost savings they have experienced:

- **San Diego, California:** Permit processing time reduced from 25 days to 12 days. Savings to government of \$10 million over 4 years. Savings to customers of \$3.5 million over 4 years.
- **Kansas City, Missouri:** Time savings of 30-60 days over the old process for both government and customers.
- **Irvine, California:** Savings to government of 7,300 hours and \$225,000 per year. Savings to customers of 30% of their time.

- **Fairfax County, Virginia:** Permit processing time reduced from 4 hours to 47 minutes. \$1.5 million total savings to the county over the old process.
- **Savannah, Georgia:** Savings to government per project of \$600 and 19 days. Savings to customers per project of \$1000 and 19 days.

Automation models from the basic to the complex have also been implemented to produce savings for stakeholders:

- **Washington County, Oregon:** An interactive voice response system (IVR) was installed to provide permit processing and inspection requests and results updates to anyone with a telephone. The model saved the county government \$30,000-\$60,000 and 100-200 hours of time, and saved industry between \$50,000 and \$75,000.
- **Campbell, California:** A very simple bar coding system was installed to expedite and improve the efficiency of building inspections. The city saved \$70,000 in its first year alone after implementing the system.
- **Irvine and San Diego, California:** In conjunction with their one-stop permit centers, Irvine and San Diego implemented complete automation systems including a shared network, IVR, geographic information systems (GIS) and other enhancements which contributed to their overall cost savings.

Other proven examples of local government streamlining include annual permits for small projects or large projects with a common footprint, expedited processes for customers that meet special requirements, cross-training of inspectors, concurrent plan reviews, and customer service initiatives.

B. Metropolitan area streamlining.

Metro streamlining removes or reduces regulatory barriers for a group of local jurisdictions within a tight geographical area, such as a city and suburbs in surrounding counties. The target beneficiaries in metro streamlining are the builders and contractors that work in the area across county and city borders. With coordination and cooperation among regulatory departments in the metro area, customers can have the same or similar set of procedures to follow in building throughout the area. A lesser beneficiary of metro streamlining are new homeowners, who reap the benefits of the builders' savings.

Streamlining among multiple metropolitan jurisdictions is still in its trial stages. The City of Los Angeles and Los Angeles County recently initiated a campaign to reduce the number of local code amendments made by the over 80 jurisdictions that make up that metropolitan area. Multiple cities in the Silicon Valley region of California have developed a regional permitting program using the internet, and are testing online permitting and plan review in eight pilot cities. Other jurisdictions are testing master builder permit programs which allow certified builders and contractors to obtain permits under an expedited process regardless of which jurisdiction they deal with.

C. Statewide streamlining.

Depending upon the size of the state and the degree of home rule, statewide streamlining can take numerous forms and affect all stakeholders. Examples include statewide building code systems, coordinated environmental regulation, and state-mandated regulatory programs. There is always the concern of infringing upon the local jurisdictions' right to govern themselves, but several examples exist of statewide streamlining that succeeded in striking a proper balance:

- **State of Maryland.** Maryland developed a statewide building code system that requires localities to adopt the same model code, but also permits them to amend the code. To keep track of the code changes from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, a computerized database of code changes was developed and made available for public reference. The effort ensures that builders and contractors working in multiple jurisdictions can construct to a common base code anywhere in the state, and that they can easily reference local amendments through the online database.
- **State of Texas.** Texas is a state that lacks a statewide building code. To bring uniformity to the often complex subject of accessibility regulation for the disabled, a statewide accessibility code was implemented. Having a uniform set of regulations saves time and money to all parties involved by producing a written guideline that ensures compliance on the customer's first submission.
- **State of New Jersey.** New Jersey is a state that has a very strong element of home rule, granting a broad array of regulatory power to local jurisdictions. In an effort to ease the strain of different municipal regulations for streets, parking, water supply, sanitary sewers, and stormwater management improvements in connection with residential development, the State of New Jersey established statewide regulations in these areas. The result is that new and existing homeowners save an average of \$2,000 per dwelling unit. New Jersey has also implemented a statewide prescriptive Rehabilitation Subcode to encourage rehabilitation of existing buildings, as well as to bring uniformity among the many local jurisdictions in the state. State officials report that cost savings in construction requirements vary from 4% to 40% depending upon the scope and type of work.
- **Commonwealth of Virginia and State of Utah.** To reduce the cost of providing technical training to inspectors and code enforcement personnel across the state, Virginia and Utah both established statewide instructional programs. These programs are aimed at pooling resources and eliminating duplicate efforts to conduct the most efficient training possible.

D. Regional streamlining (within a large state or encompassing multiple states).

Regional streamlining employs the same concepts as metropolitan streamlining, but impacts fewer aspects of the regulatory system since it often covers much larger sections of the country and transcends state lines.

Two regional streamlining models exist for the industrialized/modular construction industry. One is the Industrialized Buildings Commission (IBC), an interstate coordinating compact that allows multiple states to regulate industrialized buildings to a common set of standards, or to recognize and approve a product bearing a member state's label. The savings under the IBC model come from

elimination of duplicative 3rd party design reviews, out of state inspection travel costs, and multiple labeling programs.

Another model is the Reciprocal Agreement shared by the states of Idaho, Washington, and Oregon for the siting of modular structures. Manufacturers in these three states can have their products inspected in their home states, yet be sited without additional inspections in the other two states because the codes in all three states are so similar. As a result of this model, government saves \$1,800 per siting and industry saves an estimated \$500 per unit in permit fees, or \$1 million per year industry-wide.

Regional streamlining is most effective for the industrialized/modular construction industry because the products are frequently built and shipped across state lines. The same concept of coordinating multiple governments can be applied to the site built construction industry as well. The internet permitting initiative underway in Silicon Valley could be replicated to cover the entire state of California, or could be installed in the Northeast U.S. to cover numerous smaller states where large builders may do lots of interstate business. Turning the concept into reality requires coordination, communication, and common sense. And in the near future with the growth of the information technology industry, we may begin to see more and more regional streamlining initiatives.

E. National streamlining.

One of the major goals in regulatory streamlining is to have a uniform nationwide building code system. With the development of the International Code Council's family of codes, this may be a reality in the near future. Today, however, examples of national streamlining are few and far between.

One of the best examples of national streamlining involves one of the smallest jurisdictions to participate in the Streamlining project. The City of Superior, Wisconsin managed to coordinate wetlands permitting for their local jurisdiction— an often complicated process that involves city agencies, state agencies, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. The result of their efforts produced a savings of \$25,000 and 150 hours per application to government and \$9,000 and 250 hours (essentially a 1-year delay) to customers. The streamlining effort is national in scope because the Corps of Engineers and EPA regulate wetlands all over the country, allowing the model to be replicated anywhere wetlands are an issue.

Substantively, there is no reason why the concept of a regional or statewide master builder certification cannot be taken on a national platform. If a common set of standards could be agreed upon for the certification, a builder based in Virginia could easily build homes in California, Texas, Alaska, or anywhere in the country without having to worry about additional licenses and certifications. The development of the International Code Council's family of codes may make this case study a reality some day.

Procedurally, advances in information technology can produce some of the best national streamlining models. The internet can be used for plan reviews between an enforcement staffer in Los Angeles,

an engineer in Chicago, and an architect in New York without exchanging one scrap of paper or requiring any handwritten signatures.

National streamlining is limited only by opponents' lack of imagination. If proponents of national models can make opponents understand that geographic borders do not have to be obstacles to improved regulation, then any of the models presented above can be replicated for all jurisdictions to utilize.

Conclusion

Regulatory streamlining has to start somewhere, and from the examples listed above there are clearly many forward thinking jurisdictions that have chosen to start the process and have produced tangible cost savings. But as in the highway metaphor, the building regulatory process links together jurisdictions like points on a map and stops along a highway. In many cases, the effectiveness of one jurisdiction's streamlining efforts can be diminished if other jurisdictions do not follow suit. The most prominent goal of the Streamlining project, and the one objective that will help the greatest number and type of stakeholders, is to get other jurisdictions to adopt proven model programs to streamline the *entire* process from all facets of regulation.

The Streamlining project's outreach component is the strongest tool to achieve nationwide streamlining and draws from the resources of the project's 55 national partners. Summaries of model programs and implementation strategies are made available on the internet (www.ncsbcs.org) for download and use. Project staff and partners publicize the initiative and its models on diverse stakeholder platforms. Streamlining conferences are conducted across the country for jurisdictions needing assistance with building consensus and removing regulatory barriers. Through these methods of outreach, jurisdictions have begun to adopt their own customized versions of streamlining models. Savannah, Georgia adopted San Diego, California's *Process 2000* model, and Portland, Oregon, and Richmond, Virginia are also considering use of the model. New Jersey's Rehabilitation Subcode, while still a model in process, has been implemented in Wilmington, Delaware and is being considered for adoption by the States of Delaware, Maryland, and Rhode Island.

As we begin the 21st Century, the Streamlining project will strive towards building that high speed highway and to help building regulators think beyond their borders-- local to local, local to state, state to national, and so on. Innovations in automation, such as electronic plans submittal and review, internet permitting, and videoconferencing will be a tremendous assistance. But only through an old fashioned, face-to-face sharing of ideas and cooperative problem solving can the goals of streamlining be truly achieved and real savings can be enjoyed by all.

II. Uniqueness Statement

How does the *Streamlining the Nation's Building Regulatory Process* eliminate regulatory barriers, reduce unnecessary costs, and shorten construction times? Rather than utilizing research teams or “think tanks” to create conceptual models that jurisdictions must use to streamline, the project assembles packages of proven programs that are already in use in different localities across the nation. Models are reviewed by experts in the building regulatory industry, and refined so that they can be presented to jurisdictions interested in streamlining. Practical, experience-based implementation strategies are developed to aid these jurisdictions in adopting and using the models. The jurisdictions are also provided with proven ways to build consensus and improve the communication needed to make the models work.

The Streamlining project does more than simply find and publicize examples of regulatory streamlining. The project vigorously advocates model adoption through the following activities:

- ▶ Partnering with Federal, state, regional, and local governments, public and private organizations, and the construction community to assist with the model review and implementation process.
- ▶ Holding state and local-level conferences to assist contractors, regulatory and elected officials on the importance of streamlining and consensus building.
- ▶ Holding national symposiums in which attendees meet and discuss model programs with the individuals who created them.
- ▶ Tracking the adoption of model programs and publicizing how each jurisdiction successfully implemented the models.
- ▶ Creating outreach materials to promote a better understanding of the regulatory process.
- ▶ Encouraging jurisdictions and the construction community to use the project's website to view and download models, and learn effective ways to adopt a model in their state or community.

The project's strength comes from its adaptability and in-kind contributions from its partnership. A streamlined model is not promoted as a “best practice.” It simply serves as a powerful example of how the time, cost, and complexity of regulatory processes can be significantly reduced. Streamlined models are also continuously refined to incorporate stakeholder input and adaptations made by implementing jurisdictions.

NCSBCS is uniquely qualified to lead the charge to streamline the nation's building regulatory process. As an “issue-oriented” association, NCSBCS prides itself on finding solutions to the challenges facing both the building regulatory industry and the construction community. The Conference maintains a close working relationship with the model code organizations to encourage the development of a uniform state-based, national regulatory system for the 21st Century. The Conference also serves as a national forum for over 500 architects, engineers, product suppliers, manufacturers, code enforcement personnel, and elected officials that serve as key stakeholders to regulatory streamlining.

III. Operating Procedures

A. Model Review and Implementation Process

The Streamlining Project consists of three phases. In the first phase, staff members, national partners, and task groups of experts from diverse areas of the building regulatory industry work together to identify and facilitate the submission of the most efficient and most promising streamlined processes currently in use nationwide. Submitted programs are reviewed thoroughly by task group experts to determine if their distinct qualities can contribute to the streamlining effort. In some cases, submitted programs are combined into a single model program, or individual models are modified to emphasize their most innovative, efficient qualities. Once the submitted programs are selected to serve as models, expert review committees and project team members work to compile implementation plans to be used by jurisdictions in adopting the model programs. These models and their implementation plans are then provided to the National Streamline Implementation Committee which assists in getting the models adopted nationwide. The National Streamline Implementation Committee offers comments and recommendations as to how to make the models most useful to both the public and private sectors and the citizens whose health, welfare, and life safety these regulations are designed to protect.

In the second phase, review group experts determine in what categories of regulatory processes streamlined models were missing and could be developed. In this phase, model programs are assembled both from portions of submitted programs and from the concepts and visions of review group members and regulatory industry representatives. Many of these programs focus on innovative approaches that may not be time-tested, but will achieve the goals of streamlining. In 1998, representatives from the regulatory task groups began preliminary work on this phase of the project by classifying the existing models into categories representing a wide array of topic areas in the building regulatory process.

The third and final phase of the project completes the models and gains nationwide adoption to create a regulatory process in which overlap and duplication is minimized. To accomplish this final goal, staff and experts rely heavily on the input of regulatory officials and industry participants to comprehend the nuances of creating a strong and practical regulatory network. During the second year of the project, task group representatives and staff developed a map of the regulatory process. This map is a generic and comprehensive rendering of the steps involved in construction from zoning and land use to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy. In subsequent years, the project will rely heavily upon this map to link the model programs into an efficient streamlined regulatory process.

B. Funding Strategy

Streamlining project operating funds come from a combination of sources including grants and contract services. Additional project tasks are accomplished through in-kind services.

1. Grant funding from project partners

The majority of Streamlining project funding to date has been provided through grant contributions by several Federal agencies as part of the project partnership. The National Institute of Standards

and Technology (NIST) serves as grant administrator for the project. Grants have been provided both for general project operations and for specific task assignments.

In 2000, fundraising efforts will be concentrated on the project's original 55 national partners that have not contributed financially to the project in addition to non-partner agencies and organizations. Since the project is particularly valuable to state and local governments, state and local home-builders associations will be approached to gauge interest in barrier-removal and consensus-building conferences, as well as any in-kind contributions to be offered.

2. Foundation grants

Until recently, NCSBCS has been non-competitive for funding from most grantmaking foundations. NCSBCS's Internal Revenue Service tax designation is a 501(c)(6) "not-for-profit" – a designation that precludes NCSBCS from competing for these types of grants.

In January 2000, the States' Institute for Building Technology and Safety (SIBTS), a new corporate entity created by NCSBCS, the National Governors' Association, and the Council of State Governments, received a 501(c)(3) "non-profit" tax designation from the IRS. This favorable designation meets the minimum requirements of grantmaking foundations. Project staff has performed extensive research into foundations which may be interested in the Streamlining project, and will immediately begin soliciting grant funds for both specific tasks and general project operations. A short list of these foundations includes the Ford Foundation, Pew Charitable Trusts, Olin Foundation, and the Intel Foundation among others. Smaller foundations that contribute only in specified geographic areas will be called upon for funding assistance of activities within those areas.

SIBTS is being utilized as the applicant for these grants and work performed will become part of the SIBTS, rather than the NCSBCS, operating budget.

3. Related contract services

NCSBCS obtains funding for certain Streamlining project activities by competitive contract bidding. These activities consist primarily of facilitation services provided as part of the barrier-removal and consensus-building conferences. Jurisdictions that are financially capable of funding these conferences will do so under a contract service. Jurisdictions needing financial assistance, or fund through in-kind stakeholder contributions, will have their conferences funded under grants provided by foundations or project partners.

NCSBCS will also explore other contract services related to regulatory streamlining. These services include, but are not limited to:

- a. Assistance with the code development process
- b. Specialty conferences and workshops (particularly to state and local home-builders associations and government agencies)
- c. Regulatory streamlining consultations

In some cases, the contract will include a fee schedule to cover labor, operational, and incidental costs. The work product from these contract services will be publicized as part of the outreach component of the Streamlining project.

4. Corporate Sponsorship/Partnering

One subject area in regulatory streamlining that is drawing widespread interest is the convergence of permitting and internet technology. Many new companies have been founded in recent years focusing solely on providing internet services to local building departments, and many large companies have developed departments to take advantage of this unmet need.

NCSBCS, through work with its national partners in the Streamlining project, is ideally suited to work with corporations to bridge the gap between the product/service providers and the building departments. Many departments are lacking in both funds and expertise in working with state-of-the-art technology, or even technology that is several years old. Building officials worry about issues such as what to do if the automation streamlining necessitates staffing reductions, and may let these issues block the implementation of an automation system. Corporations often strive to produce systems filled with high-tech “bells and whistles,” but may not have a clear grasp of what basic functions the users of the system will need.

In 2000 and beyond, NCSBCS and its Streamlining project partners will offer partnering arrangements to several corporations working in the area of regulatory automation. Consensus-building conferences and consultations will be offered as part of these partnering arrangements to bring automation streamlining to the jurisdictions that need them. Additionally, sponsorship agreements will be sought as a means of adding revenue for general project operations. Corporate sponsorships include, but are not limited to, advertisements on the Streamlining project website; promotions under the project’s marketing initiatives; and sponsoring of project events.

5. In-kind services

The Streamlining project relies on the support of in-kind services provided by both public and private sector participants, including those from non-profit organizations. These services are provided by 13 Task Groups, the Regulatory Affairs Committee, the Streamlining Steering Committee, the National Streamline Implementation Committee, and separate state and local government initiatives.

The Task Groups are comprised of five to ten members, with at least one representative from each level of government (Federal, regional, state, local) and one representative from the private sector. The 40-member Regulatory Affairs Committee also includes representatives from each level of government and private sector organizations. The Streamlining Steering Committee and National Streamline Implementation Committee are comprised of 55 national organizations, associations, and agencies drawn from all levels of government, public and private sector associations representing various portions of the building industry, and partners of other national initiatives. The in-kind services of these participants include hourly labor for individuals to review model materials, and their travel to and participation in project meetings.

Over the past year, NCSBCS has specifically provided in-kind services for the following project initiatives:

- Publication of national news releases on project events;
- Development and delivery of two *National Symposiums on Streamlining the Nation's Regulatory Process*;
- Coordination with national partners to place articles on the Streamlining project in their national publications;
- Project presentations and exhibits to various organizations and associations;
- Development and delivery of prototype outreach and implementation conferences in the State of Oregon;
- Research into jurisdictions needing streamlining assistance, as well as preliminary meetings with representatives wanting outreach and implementation conferences; and
- Research into alternative funding sources for streamlining initiatives.

Based upon input from our partners, it is estimated that the amount of in-kind services provided by project partners during this grant period is over \$845,000.

IV. Outreach Plan

A. Project Website

Since 1997, the centerpiece of the Streamlining Project's outreach plan has been the project website, located at www.ncsbc.org. Visitors can download model executive summaries, implementation plans, press releases, and other background information on the project from this site. There are also email links for contacting key personnel, and automated forms for visitors to input their comments and questions on the project.

During 2000, substantial modifications are planned for the project website. Steps are already underway to give the website its own domain name-- www.streamlining.org is the likely choice. Existing model packages will be updated with cost-benefit reports (where provided by the model submitter) and downloadable documentation used by the jurisdiction (such as brochures and annual reports). Additional features will be developed to educate citizens about the regulatory process, as well as how to build consensus for removing regulatory barriers. Other planned enhancements include a virtual library of resource materials, videos of model programs and conferences, discussion areas, interactive teaching materials, and other enhancements to make visiting the website an educational experience. NCSBCS has a full-time webmaster on staff to maintain and update the project website. A detailed cost proposal for this activity is located in Section VI.

B. Barrier-removal and Consensus-building Conferences

At the request of state and local stakeholders, the Streamlining Project conducts barrier-removal conferences to proactively assist communities in removing barriers to regulatory streamlining and building consensus for streamlining initiatives. Project staff, national partners, and streamlining model

submitters serve as instructors to assist agencies at all levels of government and public/private organizations for a wide variety of purposes including, but not limited to:

- Identifying areas of a jurisdiction's building regulatory process that could be streamlined;
- Implementing new regulatory processes such as a "one-stop shop" or privatization;
- Evaluating a jurisdiction on behalf of funding agencies/organizations to determine whether regulatory barriers exist to the successful administration of construction or housing-related funds.

In the event that initial meetings and consultations are unsuccessful in bringing barrier-removal conferences to a jurisdiction, consensus-building conferences may be conducted to bring all parties to the negotiating table to implement streamlining initiatives. These conferences will be modeled after those recently held by NCSBCS in the State of Oregon (**see Appendix for summary**).

A detailed cost proposal for this activity is located in Section VI.

C. Project Marketing

Since 1996, NCSBCS has promoted the Streamlining project on a nationwide platform to a number of organizations and associations. These promotional efforts have been in the form of group presentations, production of news releases and technical reports on the project, and displays at stakeholder conferences and trade shows. NCSBCS also conducted two National Symposiums on Streamlining the Nation's Building Regulatory Process-- one in Dana Point, California and the other in Herndon, Virginia. These National Symposiums highlighted several of the project's model programs by having presentations by the individuals who submitted them. Attendees were able to interact with the model submitters and ask questions to learn how the models were successfully implemented and/or replicated.

Marketing of the project has become a vital tool in making jurisdictions aware of the benefits of regulatory streamlining, obtaining diverse types of streamlined models, and gaining feedback on the effectiveness of the project. NCSBCS will continue to provide a portion of the project marketing through in-kind services. Financial contributions from stakeholder groups and project partners will be critical in ensuring that the Streamlining project continues to be promoted on a truly nationwide scope.

A detailed cost proposal for this activity is located in Section VI.

V. Key NCSBCS Personnel

Resumes for all personnel listed below may be found in the Appendix.

A. Bob Kelly (Technical Services Director)

Mr. Kelly serves as the project manager for the Streamlining project. Mr. Kelly was one of the original streamlining model program submitters in his previous employment as building official for

Washington County, Oregon. He contributes real-life expertise in creating and implementing streamlining initiatives, and this expertise is contributed to the project in his role as facilitator and presenter for barrier-removal and consensus-building conferences.

B. Brandon Stidham (Regulatory Affairs Specialist)

Mr. Stidham is one of the primary project contacts, and is the staff person in charge of receiving submitted case studies and preparing them for the review committees. He is also responsible for assembling implementation plans for approved model programs, drafting of promotional articles and news releases, and assisting the NCSBCS webmaster in the maintenance of the project website. Mr. Stidham also serves as grant and proposal writer for the project.

C. Sherman McDaniel (Building Code Consultant)

Ms. McDaniel is a consultant for NCSBCS's International Academy for Professional Code Administration (IAPCA), and utilizes her expertise as a facilitator for the project's barrier-removal and consensus-building conferences.

D. Carolyn Fitch (Project Coordinator)

Ms. Fitch is one of the primary project contacts, and is the staff person in charge of coordinating meetings and teleconferences. Ms. Fitch is also a code analyst for NCSBCS and contributes over 20 years of building code and regulatory expertise to the project.

E. Robert Wible (Executive Director, NCSBCS)

Mr. Wible is one of the founders of the Streamlining project, and currently assists staff and project partners with outreach and promotional initiatives. Mr. Wible also assists with the delivery of barrier-removal and consensus-building conferences.

VI. Financial Data

A copy of the project grant history is located at Appendix E.

VII. Cost Proposals for Individual Tasks

This section is a report on the individual tasks which make up the general operations of the Streamlining project. With the exception of website maintenance and upgrades, total costs for the calendar year vary based on the degree of interest and participation in a given task. As a result, the individual tasks are costed based upon units of production rather than total projected cost.

A. Barrier-removal and Consensus-building Conferences

The following task report outlines a basic 3-day conference including preparation and follow-up work. Depending upon the jurisdiction size and degree/type of streamlining sought, the conferences can vary in length and require greater or fewer pre- and post-conference meetings. Twenty-two jurisdictions expressed an interest in having conferences during the 1999 calendar year, with many

offering in-kind services in the form of staff time and facilities. Obtaining matching funds has been the greatest obstacle to successful delivery of conferences in these jurisdictions.

1. Project Tasks

- Pre-conference meeting/preparation
- 3-day conference
- Follow-up meetings

2. Budget Detail

•	Pre-Conference Meeting/Preparation	
	Staff labor (2 people @ \$1000/ea)	2000
	Travel (2 people @ \$1450/ea)	2900
	Facilities	500*
	Conference Calls	500*
	Printing/Duplicating Workbooks	9500
	TOTAL	\$15,400
•	3-Day Conference	
	Staff labor (3 people @ \$1500/ea)	4500
	Trainer/Speaker labor (3 people @ \$1000/ea)	3000*
	Travel (6 people @ \$1450/ea)	8700
	Facilities	10,000*
	Printing/Duplicating	500
	Shipping	500
	TOTAL	\$27,200
•	Two Follow-Up Meetings	
	Staff labor (2 people @ \$1000/ea)	2000
	Visiting trainer labor (1 trainer @ \$1000/ea)	1000
	Travel (3 people @ \$1450/ea)	4350
	Facilities	500*
	Conference Calls	500
	TOTAL	\$8350
•	TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	\$50,950

* Costs followed by an asterisk can be provided by sponsoring agencies and/or organizations in the form of in-kind contributions to reduce overall costs. The total amount of potential in-kind contributions is \$14,500.

B. Model Review Process (cost to process one case study)

The following task report reflects costs for processing a single case study under the model review process. The important thing to note is that case studies are not typically sent through the review process one at a time, but in groups to reduce the number of meetings and teleconferences needed. Multiple case studies can be processed simultaneously under steps 2-5 for the same or slightly higher cost as reflected in this report.

1. Project Tasks

- Receipt of case study (staff review, gather additional information/materials, write executive summary, assign to task group(s))
- Task group review (duplicate and mail, schedule and conduct conference call, record and distribute results)
- Regulatory Affairs Committee review (update executive summary with task group evaluation, duplicate and mail with ballot to RAC members, record ballot and distribute results)
- National Streamline Implementation Committee review (write implementation plan, duplicate and mail with comment form to NSIC members, compile results)
- Publicize availability of new model (update website, issue press release)

2. Budget Detail

•	Receipt of Case Study	
	Staff labor:	150
•	Task Group Review	
	Staff labor:	125
	Expenses (conference call, mailing):	150
•	Regulatory Affairs Committee Review	
	Staff labor:	225
	Expenses (mailing):	50
•	National Streamline Implementation Committee Review	
	Staff labor:	300
	Expenses (mailing):	50
•	Publicize Availability of New Model	
	Staff labor:	50
•	Total Labor (burdened)	850.00
	Expenses	250.00
	TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	\$1,100.00

Costs are reduced for this task through the use of in-kind contributions by the project's partners or by sponsoring agencies. The actual cost per model review is \$1250.00. The total projected cost for researching and processing an average of 30 models per year is \$37,900.

C. Website Maintenance and Upgrades

The following task report reflects costs to maintain the Streamlining project website, as well as to implement new proposed features in the coming year. NCSBCS maintains a full-time webmaster and technical staff to perform the listed tasks. Expenses listed below include costs for new hardware and software, leasing of server space, domain name registry, and other incidental costs.

1. Project Tasks

- Posting and formatting updated materials
- Upgrading site features, hardware, and software applications

2. Budget Detail

•	Posting and formatting updated materials	
	Labor:	11,375
•	Upgrading site pages and features	
	Labor:	6,125
	Expenses:	4,500
•	Total labor:	700 hours
	Labor cost, burdened:	17,500
	Expenses:	4,500
	TOTAL PROJECT COSTS:	\$22,000

D. Project Marketing

The following task report reflects projected costs to NCSBCS for promotion of the Streamlining project at the meetings, conferences, and exhibitions of other agencies and organizations in the current year. Projected costs consist of labor, travel expenses, materials production, shipping, mailing, and incidental expenditures. The budget detail in this report reflects total costs, rather than per task costs, for project marketing. Since unexpected marketing opportunities arise throughout the year, NCSBCS may request additional funding for these projects at the discretion of funding partners.

1. Project Tasks

- Delivery of group presentations
- Production of news releases and technical reports
- Publicizing the project at conferences and trade shows

2. Budget Detail

•	Total Labor, burdened	48,420
•	Expenses	
	Travel (20 trips @ \$1450/trip)	29,000
	Materials production	12,000
	Shipping	2000
	Mailing	2000
	Incidental costs	500
	Total Expenses	\$45,500
	TOTAL PROJECT COSTS:	\$93,920

APPENDIX A
Background Report on Oregon Conferences

A. Background Report on Oregon Conferences

In 1998, NCSBCS, in conjunction with the State of Oregon, developed and delivered a series of Streamlining project conferences to proactively assist the State and its local jurisdictions to reduce the cost and complexity of building regulation. These conferences were developed and provided through in-kind services on behalf of the International Academy for Professional Code Administration (IAPCA) and State of Oregon sponsors to serve as a prototype program that can be offered to jurisdictions across the country that seek to streamline certain aspects of their building regulatory process.

The first conferences were held in Oregon on November 9, 11, and 13, 1998 in the cities of Bend, Eugene, and Portland. The program was designed as a “hands-on” session whereby attendees representing a broad group of stakeholders could view and discuss streamlined models selected by NCSBCS staff and an Oregon stakeholder advisory committee. The program also included instruction on how to identify areas of regulatory overlap and inefficiency, as well as how to build consensus to gain the adoption and use of streamlined administrative processes and procedures.

Some of the “lessons learned” from these first conferences were evident in the attendees’ comments:

- ▶ Need to ensure that more stakeholders participate in future conferences;
- ▶ More models relevant to the involved jurisdictions need to be offered for discussion;
- ▶ Conference sessions should be longer in duration to encourage group interaction and discussion; and
- ▶ Special two-day conferences on consensus-building and problem-solving should be offered.

One immediate result of the meeting in Eugene was that the jurisdictions of Springfield, Lane County, and Eugene agreed to meet on a regular basis to coordinate their work, including the adoption and implementation of model programs. The attendees also requested that NCSBCS work with the State of Oregon’s Building Codes Division to facilitate these future meetings.

Since the November 1998 conferences, several follow-up sessions have been held throughout Oregon to work out the details of adopting and implementing model programs. Some models being considered or implemented include one-stop permit centers (based upon the City of San Diego’s *Process 2000* model), expedited permit processing procedures, minor labeling program, and master builder program. Industry stakeholders, such as the Oregon Remodelers Association, have been active participants in the process. In May 1999, NCSBCS held follow-up sessions in Bend and Eugene. Further follow-up sessions are scheduled for Bend and metropolitan Portland in May 2000.

Preliminary meetings to replicate the Oregon streamlining conferences have been held in Seattle and Tacoma, Washington; Poughkeepsie, New York; and Los Angeles, California. Agencies and organizations in several other state and local jurisdictions have also expressed a strong interest in streamlining conferences. Preliminary meetings in these jurisdictions will be scheduled once funding sources have been identified and secured.

APPENDIX B
Resumes of Key NCSBCS Personnel

ROBERT W. KELLY, DIRECTOR OF TECHNICAL SERVICES

PROFILE

Mr. Robert “Bob” Kelly is a former building code official with more than 22 years experience in the application, interpretation, and enforcement of construction codes. He has worked for several building departments as a plan reviewer, inspector, and manager of inspection services. Bob has been active in the code development process for ICBO and ICC and has served on numerous technical committees-past member of the Model Energy Code Committee, past member of NAHB/ICC Task Force, and past member of the Oregon State Electrical Elevator Advisory Board. He was also past president of the Oregon Building Officials. Mr. Kelly is currently the Director of Technical Services for the National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards, Inc. (NCSBCS).

SUMMARY OF PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF STATES ON BUILDING CODES AND STANDARDS, HERNDON VA *Director for Technical Services, 1998-Present*

Mr. Kelly provides technical direction to support activities in state and local building codes. Activities include training and code development efforts at the local, state, federal and international level. Mr. Kelly presently oversees “Streamlining the Nations Building Regulatory Process” Project.

WASHINGTON COUNTY LAND USE & TRANSPORTATION, LAND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION BUILDING SERVICES

Building Official, 1990-1998

Mr. Kelly supervised inspection and a support staff of 50. He was responsible for a 6 million-dollar budget and over 750 million valuation in new construction each year. He created a Team Management concept, worked with builders and elected officials and represented the County in the code development process. Mr. Kelly conducted performance reviews of senior staff and assisted in reviews of front line staff. He made presentations to the boards and established and implemented policies and procedures.

FIRE MARSHALL, TRI-CITY RURAL FIRE DISTRICT

Volunteer, 1993-1998

CITY OF MANTECA, PUBLIC WORKS-BUILDING DEPARTMENT

Chief Building Inspector, 1983-1990

Mr. Kelly supervised six inspectors, managed a budget of \$750,000; new construction of approximately 3 million dollars per year. Installed automated permit system, central filing system.

CITY OF RIVERBANK PUBLIC WORKS, BUILDING-PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Building Official-Planning Director, 1976-1983

Mr. Kelly supervised a staff of one. Managed \$250,000 budget, new construction approximately three quarters of a million dollars.

R. W. KELLY AND ASSOCIATES

1985-present

Mr. Kelly designed and constructed custom dwellings, and was an energy consultant.

DOM-LEE DEVELOPMENT

Superintendent, Bookkeeper, 1970-1976

Mr. Kelly supervised new construction, schedules, designs and build cost accounting.

EDUCATION

MODESTO JUNIOR COLLEGE
Engineering

PORTLAND STATE
Management

WASHINGTON STATE
Total Quality Management

LEWIS & CLARK
Administrative Law

CERTIFICATIONS

Building Official, Plumbing Inspector, Mechanical Inspector, Building Inspector, and Housing Inspector,
Registered Construction Inspector, Licensed General Contractor
Management Trainer: Zenger-Miller-Front Line Leadership
Radon Reduction by EPA
Trainer, Applied Technology Center-Disaster Inspections

PROFESSIONAL

Chair, Oregon Building Officials One and Two Family Code Committee
Past President, International Conference of Building Officials (ICBO) Yosemite Chapter
California Building Official Committee Member (past)
Oregon Building Official Committee Member (past)
Energy Consultant
Trainer-Team Building, Conflict Resolution, Sexual Harassment
Member National Fire Protection Association, Residential Technical Advisory Committee
Member Oregon Electrical Elevator Board-Governor Appointed
City of Beaverton-Appointed Code Appeals Board
State of Oregon-Code Review Committee Member
City of Hillsboro-Appointed Code Appeals Board
Council of American Building Officials-Model Energy Code Committee
Member ICC/NAHB IRC Task Force

BRANDON L. STIDHAM, REGULATORY AFFAIRS SPECIALIST

PROFILE

Mr. Stidham serves as Regulatory Affairs Specialist, and is responsible for promoting “*Streamlining the Nation’s Building Regulatory Process*” project at NCSBCS. Promotion goals consist of:

- Managing program submissions.
- Facilitating the submission of new programs.
- Writing executive summaries and implementation plans.
- Developing model processes and components.
- Researching and writing reports on issues pertinent to the project.
- Producing outreach articles and other materials.
- Participating in outreach efforts, such as making presentations and assisting with workshops.
- Making presentations to stakeholder groups and organizations.

Mr. Stidham is also involved with the development of new business for the Technical Services Team and NCSBCS. This includes contributing expertise to expand current projects and to find alternative funding sources or promotional contracts, drafting contracts and grant proposals for potential projects, and developing new core capabilities and avenues of work for the team.

Mr. Stidham also serves as the technical secretary for the NCSBCS Factory-Built Structures Committee. This involves organizing the activities of the Committee, including but not limited to regularly scheduled meeting sessions, transcribing meeting notes, drafting reports and making presentations on behalf of the Committee and NCSBCS.

SUMMARY OF PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards

Research Analyst, 1997-1999

Mr. Stidham performed research pertinent to the building regulatory industry, which included managing program submissions for “Streamlining the Nation’s Building Regulatory Process” Project, writing technical and non-technical reports and grant proposals, and developing a library of international building codes and standards. Subtasks include assisting with the construction and maintenance of the NCSBCS internet website and editing reports and compositions of team members.

Contract Attorney Work

1997

Performed attorney-level document review for short-term projects dealing with Hart-Scott-Rodino compliance, and telecommunications litigation. Gained experience reviewing documents for privileged status, as well as organizing and supervising a large-scale document review program.

EDUCATION

University of Virginia

Bachelor of Arts (B.A.), English and History, May 1994

University of Richmond

Juris Doctor (J.D.), January 1997

SHERMAN C. EDMONDSON MCDANIEL, CPCA

BUILDING CODE CONSULTANT

PROFILE

After 25 years of service at the state and local level, Ms. McDaniel wanted a greater opportunity to have a positive impact on the quality of life for others. To achieve that vision, she knew she had to move outside of a government structure and offer her unique philosophy of public service to a wider audience.

Now, as a private consultant under contract to the National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards, Inc. (NCSBCS), Ms. McDaniel has been instrumental in the development and implementation of NCSBCS's International Academy for Professional Code Administration (IAPCA). The academy offers a Core Curriculum of instruction as well as courses tailored to meet the needs of a wide range of clients around the world.

Ms. McDaniel brings a wide range of experience as consultant to NCSBCS. She has been a field inspector, a team leader, bureau chief, and department director. Her last role at the local level was Assistant Director for the Department of City Planning and Codes Administration, City of Norfolk, Virginia. This position also included responsibilities of building official. She directed the activities of a staff of 130 new construction and property maintenance inspectors, and managed a budget in excess of \$3.7 million.

Ms. McDaniel began her private consulting practice in June 1997. In addition to NCSBCS, her client list includes Sprint PCS; Cavalier Land Corporation; Cooper Commercial Real Estate; Tidewater Builders' Association; the Qualified Gas Contractors of Tidewater, VA; Paradigm Productions; and Building Officials and Code Administrators International.

CAROLYN A. FITCH, CODE ANALYST

PROFILE

Ms. Fitch is a code analyst with over twenty years of experience with construction codes and standards. Her experience includes supervision of a team of data research clerks who obtain codes, standards, reference materials, and technical and administrative data required by contract task and needed to maintain an up-to-date codes library. She also researches and writes code-related reports and monitors code changes of the model code groups, including development of the International Building Code. Most recently, Ms. Fitch serves as a project coordinator for the NCSBCS initiative to assist government in streamlining the nation's building regulatory process.

SUMMARY OF PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF STATES ON BUILDING CODES AND STANDARDS, HERNDON, VA *Code Analyst, 88-Present*

Ms. Fitch maintains contact with state and local code officials, including those responsible for residential construction, to keep current on construction code and regulatory activities. She obtains and reviews state and local code adoption and enforcement information, and codes and standards related to all phases of construction of new buildings or renovation of existing buildings, such as indoor air quality, and radon-resistant construction. When new information is obtained, Ms. Fitch summarizes it for the NCSBCS State and local government codes profile database.

Ms. Fitch conducts state and local building regulatory reviews, performs code impact analyses on different technologies and code comparisons of national, state, and local construction codes and standards.

For the Streamlining Project, Ms. Fitch oversees the activities of the task groups and committees reviewing potential model regulatory programs and assures the participants have the necessary documentation and tools with which to do their work.

Technical Services Coordinator, 84-88

Ms. Fitch coordinated technical services for a US Department of Energy grant, and several private industry contracts. These efforts included information gathering and dissemination, reporting, and maintaining close liaison with and coordination between state energy and delegate members and DOE to assist them with their energy conservation programs.

Administrative Assistant, Energy Programs Division, 77-84

Ms. Fitch was responsible for the planning and coordination of seminars, workshops, and meetings held for State energy code officials; editing and preparation of brochures, reports, and proposals; performing cost analyses for seminars and contracts; and monitoring federal and state contract work.

Secretary to Energy Programs Director, 76-77

Ms. Fitch prepared routine correspondence and answered requests for information, perusal of federal, state and local publications, periodicals and newspapers to report relevant information to the Director; arranged committee meetings and public hearings during the development and consensus process of the Model Energy Code.

Administrative Support for Several Companies, 62-76

Ms. Fitch was responsible for the general personnel administration of a 300 employee company, which included all phases of employee benefits, compensation program, and clerical interviewing. She provided data for government manpower reports and for national and local salary and benefits surveys. Ms. Fitch maintained a bookkeeping system and inventory records and files for a West Coast microwave transmission system. She performed other administrative task needed to coordinate the activities of the corporate office with those of three field sites. Ms. Fitch prepared routine correspondence and testimonies before congressional committees. She tracked bills pertaining to the insurance industry through the legislative process. Position required handling expense accounts and other financial duties, making travel arrangements and arranging meetings.

EDUCATION

Washington School for Secretaries

PUBLICATIONS

Directory of Building Codes and Regulations, State Edition, National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards, Editions since 1993

Directory of Building Codes and Regulations, City Edition, National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards, Editions since 1993

Brown, Robert and Fitch, Carolyn "Introduction to Energy Codes" *Southern Building* (September/October 1994)

ROBERT C. WIBLE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

PROFILE

The Executive Director of the National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards, Inc. (NCSBCS), Robert Wible, has been with NCSBCS for 20 years. He served as the organization's Information Director from 1977 until being named Executive Director in January 1984.

As Information Director, Mr. Wible authored several studies and developed training programs on effective codes administration. He served as program director for the U.S. Architectural and Transportation Compliance Board project providing training to architects and state and local building officials on the Uniform Federal Accessibility Standard. He also initiated National Building Safety Week, which is held nationwide each April.

As Executive Director, Mr. Wible is responsible for helping the organization represent the state governors' building code and public safety interests in Washington, D.C. and provide technical information services which help the states adopt and effectively administer modern building codes and standards. NCSBCS's policy making body is comprised of a governor-appointed delegate from each state and from several territories and one representative from the other NCSBCS membership categories.

NCSBCS is headquartered in Herndon, Virginia and has a staff of 65 employees who provide membership services and support several major federal and state regulatory programs in the factory-built construction field. Staff also provide education, training, and data gathering and abstraction of state and local building codes for a variety of public and private sector clients. In 1991, Mr. Wible, working with state officials from New Jersey, Minnesota, and Rhode Island, helped launch one of the nation's newest interstate compacts, the Industrialized Buildings Commission (IBC). Mr. Wible currently serves as Secretary to the IBC.

Among his other duties as Executive Director, Mr. Wible is responsible for NCSBCS's Executive Branch Agreement with the National Governors' Association (NGA), through which NCSBCS provides three NGA standing committees with technical information, and oversees NCSBCS's Memoranda of Understanding with the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission and the National Institute of Standards and Technology and a cooperative agreement with the Council of State Governments. Mr. Wible is a member of the World Organization of Building Officials and the Conference of World Regions. He is also a member of the American/Saudi Building Code Steering Committee. Mr. Wible is the author of several reports on effective and efficient building regulations and economic development and together with State regulatory officials developed the Streamlining the Nation's Building Regulatory Process Project.

A mass communications and international relations major at American University's School of International Services, Mr. Wible came to NCSBCS following several years of work in county government and six years as a Foreign Service Officer with the U.S. Information Agency, where he served overseas in India and Nepal. Mr. Wible grew up in Cleveland, Ohio.

APPENDIX C
List of Project Partners

C. List of Project Partners

NCSBCS sought the broadest possible participation in this project by drawing from all levels of government, associations representing various portions of the building industry, partners in the National Partners in Homeownership Initiative, and participants in the National Science and Technology Council's Construction and Building Initiatives.

Agencies and organizations accepting our invitation to participate are as follows:

1. Federal Agencies:

- Consumer Product Safety Commission
- Department of Agriculture
- Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers
- Department of Commerce - National Institute of Standards & Technology
- Department of Energy
- Department of Health and Human Services - National Institutes of Health
- Department of Housing and Urban Development
- Department of Labor - Occupational Safety & Health Administration
- Department of Veterans Affairs
- Environmental Protection Agency
- Federal Emergency Management Agency
- General Services Administration
- National Science Foundation

2. Government Associations:

- Association of Major City Building Officials
- Council of State Community Development Agencies
- Council of State Governments
- Industrialized Buildings Commission
- National Association of Counties
- National Association of County Community and Economic Development
- National Association of State Facility Administrators
- National Conference of State Legislatures
- National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards
- National Council of State Housing Agencies
- National Governors' Association
- States' Institute for Building Technology and Safety
- U.S. Conference of Mayors

3. Public Sector Organizations/Associations:

- American Association of Retired Persons
- American Institute of Architects
- American Public Works Association
- Construction Industry Institute
- Habitat for Humanity International
- International Code Council

National Fire Protection Association
National Trust for Historic Preservation
National Institute of Building Sciences
The Enterprise Foundation
The International Fire Marshals Association
United Homeowners Association

4. Private Sector Organizations/Associations:

AFL-CIO Housing Investment Trust
American Health Care Association
American Planning Association
American Society of Heating, Refrigerating, and Air Conditioning Engineers
American Society of Interior Designers
American Subcontractors Association
Associated General Contractors of America
Building Owners and Managers Association International
Civil Engineering Research Foundation
Construction Specifications Institute
Fannie Mae
Institute for Business and Home Safety
Manufactured Housing Institute
National Association of Home Builders
National Association of Realtors
National Growth Management Leadership Project
U.S. Chamber of Commerce
Urban Land Institute

APPENDIX D
Internal Revenue Service Documentation
for NCSBCS and SIBTS

**** Please contact Brandon Stidham at NCSBCS to obtain copies of these documents (PH 703.437.0100, Email bstidham@ncsbcs.org)**

APPENDIX E
Project Grant History

**STREAMLINING THE NATION'S BUILDING REGULATORY PROCESS
PROJECT GRANT HISTORY**

1.	Financial Assistance Award (9/5/96 - 12/1/96):	24,495.00
	* Project start-up expenses	
2.	Financial Assistance Award (12/2/96 - 2/28/97):	95,000.00
	* Research, provide technical reports, project operations	
3.	Amendment to Award (3/1/97):	0.00
	* No-cost extension to 4/30/97	
4.	Amendment to Award (4/1/97):	137,150.00
	* Assemble and update models, NPRC Meetings; extension to 7/31/97	
5.	Amendment to Award (7/1/97):	75,000.00
	* Project development; extension to 8/31/97	
6.	Amendment to Award (10/1/97):	100,000.00
	* Project operations; extension to 11/30/97	
7.	Amendment to Award (12/1/97):	0.00
	* No-cost extension to 1/31/98	
8.	Amendment to Award (2/1/98):	72,277.00
	* Project operations; extension to 3/31/98	
9.	Amendment to Award (3/31/98):	0.00
	* No-cost extension to 4/15/98	
10.	Financial Assistance Award (7/1/98 - 8/31/98):	150,000.00
	* Project operations	
11.	Amendment to Award (7/30/98):	0.00
	* Pre-agreement costs	
12.	Amendment to Award (9/1/98):	0.00
	* No-cost extension to 10/31/98	
13.	Amendment to Award (10/1/98):	0.00
	* No-cost extension to 11/30/98	
14.	Amendment to Award (12/1/98):	176,547.00
	* Project operations, carryover of funds; extension to 3/31/99	
15.	Amendment to Award (4/1/99):	0.00
	* No-cost extension to 5/15/99	
16.	Amendment to Award (5/16/99):	70,994.00
	* Project operations; extension to 5/15/00	
17.	Financial Assistance Award (11/19/99 - 3/31/00):	22,638.00
	* Monitoring the adoption and implementation of models	
18.	Financial Assistance Award (11/19/99 - 3/31/00):	27,943.00
	* Development of Streamlining models compendium	
TOTAL GRANTS AWARDED:		\$952,044.00
VALUE OF IN-KIND SERVICES PROVIDED (see pp. 10-11):		\$845,000.00