MINUTES ARE NOT VERBATIM

OKALOOSA COUNTY CONSTRUCTION COMPETENCY BOARD
MINUTES
July 27, 2016

The regular meeting of the Okaloosa County Construction Competency Board was held Wednesday, July 27, 2016, at 3:00 p.m. at the Okaloosa County Administration Complex, 1250 Eglin Parkway N., first floor Commissioner's Chambers, Shalimar, Florida. Board members in attendance were Mike Chesser, Linda Flowers, Buddy Gordon, Randy Wise, Jimmy Henderson, Skip Miller, Skip Royster, Fay Seketa and Damian Curtis. Jason Buck and Mike Dean were not present.

Growth Management staff in attendance were Elliot Kampert, Growth Management Director; Renée Lucas, License Specialist; Lisa Payton, Code Enforcement Supervisor; John Wilson, Code Enforcement Officer and Teresa Mullins, Administrative Assistant II. Assistant County Attorney Kerry Parsons was also present.

I. Call to Order

Chairman Mike Chesser called the meeting to order.

a. Roll Call:

Ms. Teresa Mullins conducted roll call.

II. Acknowledge Guests

Chairman Chesser welcomed staff and applicants to the meeting.

III. Approval of Minutes: May 25, 2016:

Motion to approve the minutes as written made by Linda Flowers; seconded by Skip Royster; there being no objections, Chairman Chesser approved by acclamation.

IV. Announcements:

None

V. Old Business:

None

VI. New Business

a. Swearing in applicants/speakers:

Ms. Mullins swore in all those wishing to address the Board.

b. Candidates for Testing Approval:

1. Jozef Kubaliak – Exterior Applications

Ms. Renée Lucas informed the Board that staff have found that Mr. Kubaliak meets all of the requirements for all of the facets of the Exterior Applications contractor's license.

Chairman Chesser asked staff if this request for an Exterior Applications license relates to the discussion the Board had at the July meeting.

Ms. Lucas stated that the issue was discussed at the July meeting, and Mr. Kubaliak was very thorough and specific in his descriptions while filling out his work history and experience affidavits. Ms. Lucas reiterated that Mr. Kubaliak meets all of the requirements for all of the facets of the Exterior Applications contractor's license. Ms. Lucas stated that Mr. Jozef Kubaliak was present to answer questions from the Board.

A brief discussion ensued.

Mr. Jozef Kubaliak addressed the Board stating that he was originally from Slovakia and came to America several years ago. Mr. Kubaliak informed the Board that, at one time, he played professional hockey. Mr. Kubaliak further stated that he worked in construction for many years in Slovakia building all sorts of structures, from houses to churches. Mr. Kubaliak stated that he first lived in Alabama when he came to the United States where he worked in all facets of construction, from building houses to installing bathrooms, kitchen cabinets, flooring, windows, siding and roofing. Mr. Kubaliak further stated that he moved to Florida after he married and has worked with other local contractors but he wants to start his own business.

Ms. Linda Flowers asked Mr. Kubaliak if he was intending to be the primary owner of this business.

Mr. Kubaliak stated that he intends to be the primary owner and he wants to start this business and get his license so that he can actually contract to do jobs, such as siding, that he is offered now, but is currently unable to do.

Chairman Chesser asked Mr. Kubaliak how long he has been in the United States.

Mr. Kubaliak stated that he came to America about 8 years ago and worked as allowed by his visa; however, he is married now and wants to start his own business.

Chairman Chesser asked Mr. Kubaliak if he has had any LLCs or corporations in the past and if he has one now.

Mr. Kubaliak stated that he started his first company "Kups" in January of last year and set it up as a LLC.

Mr. Skip Miller asked Mr. Kubaliak if he was intending to work alone or if he was going to hire employees.

Mr. Kubaliak stated he would sometimes work by himself, but would prefer to have employees for jobs like siding as those take at least 3 people to do properly.

A brief discussion ensued.

<u>Motion to approve made by Skip Miller; second by Jimmy Henderson; approved unanimously.</u>

2. Jeremy Snyder – General Contractor

Mr. Jeremy Snyder greeted the Board and stated that he has spent the last thirteen (13) years working for a General Contractor in Birmingham, Alabama. Mr. Snyder stated that the General Contractor he worked for also had an office in Florida from which Mr. Snyder stated that he worked as a project manager for the past eight (8) years. Mr. Snyder further stated that he managed projects that some of which were civil in nature, working for Southern Companies building power plants in Georgia, Alabama & Florida. Mr. Snyder stated that he began and ended his construction career and an employee working for Hoar Construction doing retail construction from pouring the footers to doing the tenant build-outs. Mr. Snyder further stated that he wanted to get away from retail construction so he moved to this area and joined in to help a friend in a business that he was starting. Mr. Snyder stated that he recently started his own company, Gulf Fence and Construction, LLC, which he would like to use to do different forms of construction.

Motion to approve made by Jimmy Henderson; second by Skip Royster; approved unanimously.

Ms. Fay Seketa asked Mr. Snyder if he was planning to focus on residential building or if he intended to also do some commercial construction.

Mr. Snyder stated that he primarily wanted to focus on residential outdoor structures; however he might do some light commercial work. Mr. Snyder stated that he is not looking to get into high-rise work and really doesn't want to deal with anything that is over 3 stories tall.

Ms. Seketa asked Mr. Snyder if he was going to do ICF (formed concrete houses) work.

Mr. Snyder stated that he would be interesting in doing ICF work.

Mr. Randy Wise asked Mr. Snyder to describe the type of residential outdoor structures he wanted to work on.

Mr. Snyder stated that he was thinking of things like pergolas, outdoor kitchens, pool houses and those sorts of smaller outdoor structures built as part of a new construction project.

Chairman Chesser asked Mr. Snyder if he understood that he would be allowed to build houses with the licensure he is requesting.

Mr. Snyder stated that he does understand that he would be permitted to build houses; however, that is not going to be his primary focus.

Chairman Chesser asked Mr. Snyder if he had built a home or commercial structure.

Mr. Snyder stated that he has not built a home from the ground up; however he has built commercial structures. Mr. Snyder further stated that he has built retail centers, i.e. outdoor malls, in North Carolina and Louisiana, from site preparation to finished interior. Mr. Snyder noted that he built those projects as a project manager as opposed to being a laborer on the site.

Chairman Chesser asked Mr. Snyder if he had any employees.

Mr. Snyder stated that he has an office manager, two (2) full time employees and four (4) sub-contractors.

Chairman Chesser asked Mr. Snyder what computer program he uses.

Mr. Snyder stated that he uses Quickbooks Pro® for accounting and various other programs for preparing estimates.

Chairman Chesser explained that these questions are asked of applicants because the Board wants to make certain that applicants will handle their business well, pay their employees and venders in a timely fashion so that a return to this Board for discipline won't be necessary.

Mr. Snyder stated that he is very aware that it is important to pay employees and venders and that is always his first priority; however, he has found that it can sometimes be very difficult to get payment from clients.

Chairman Chesser asked Mr. Snyder if he has had any experience with Mechanic's Liens.

Mr. Snyder stated that he has had experience on both sides of Mechanic's Liens. Mr. Snyder further stated that, as a project manager, he received notice that a lien was going to be filed against that job, and as a business owner he has had to threaten to file a lien in order to receive payment. Mr. Snyder stated that he has never actually had to follow up and file a lien in that situation.

Mr. Damian Curtis commented that Mr. Snyder did receive a degree from Auburn University in Construction Industry.

A brief discussion ensued.

Motion that we approve him for testing made by Skip Miller; second by Randy Wise; approved unanimously.

c. Purged Contractor:

1. Nathan Jones – Nathan Jones Roofing Inc

Ms. Flowers recused herself from this agenda item due to a conflict of interest.

Ms. Lucas informed the Board that Mr. Nathan Jones grandfathered in to Okaloosa County as a Roofing Contractor in August of 1991. Ms. Lucas noted that this was prior to the adoption of County Ordinance 00-12 which instituted the requirement for testing prior to licensure. Ms. Lucas stated that Mr. Jones remained licensed with the Growth Management Department until August 31, of 2011, and his Competency Card was purged on September 1, 2013 after 2 years of non-renewal/non-payment. Ms. Lucas informed the Board that, in a statement provided to staff, Mr. Jones stated that, due to the downturn in the economy after the oil spill, he became a full time employee of Horizon of Okaloosa County and the failure to renew his Competency Card was a major oversight on his part due to the fact that he was not as active in the industry as he had been. Ms. Lucas stated that Mr. Smith kept his continuing education hours up to date during that time. Ms. Lucas

further stated that staff researched and found that Mr. Jones' Roofing Contractor's license, #RC0063187, is current and active and will not expire until August 31, 2017. Ms. Lucas reminded the Board of the provisions of Okaloosa County Ordinance 07-32 Section 3-8(g) & Amended Ordinance 09-20, Section 6 (g) Expiration, Renewal and Retired Certificates:

> *The Board may give special consideration in purged license cases concerning family illness, military deployment, and other circumstances as the Board deems appropriate.*

Ms. Lucas requested, should the Board choose to reinstate Mr. Jones' Competency Card, that all back fees and penalties, totaling $1,000.00, be paid and that a payment deadline be included as part of the Board's motion. Ms. Lucas further stated that Mr. Jones is present to answer the Board's questions.

Chairman Chesser asked staff if there was any record of complaints lodged against Mr. Jones.

Ms. Lucas stated that questions regarding complaints should be directed to Code Enforcement staff. Ms. Lucas further stated that Ms. Lisa Payton, Code Enforcement Supervisor, is present to answer any questions about complaints specific to Mr. Jones.

Ms. Lisa Payton informed the Board that Mr. Jones' history with the County has been very good; however, there was a recent complaint based on the Ordinance, Section 3.1 which requires that he have a current Competency Card; therefore, Code Enforcement staff cited Mr. Jones for unlicensed contracting. Ms. Payton stated that the fine for unlicensed contracting is two thousand dollars ($2,000.00), of which, Mr. Jones has paid five hundred dollars ($500.00) with the remaining amount to be paid per a payment plan as agreed on by both Mr. Jones and staff. Ms. Payton further stated that the payment plan was set up with the knowledge that Mr. Jones would have to pay back fees and penalties should the Board agree to reinstate his Competency Card. Ms. Payton stated that Mr. Jones understands that if he misses a payment he will be brought back before this Board with staff requesting that his license be suspended or whatever else that the Board deems to be appropriate.

Chairman Chesser asked Ms. Payton if the thousand dollars mentioned by Ms. Lucas was part of the fine given by Code Enforcement.

Ms. Payton stated that Code Enforcement's fine of two thousand dollars ($2,000.00) is separate from the one thousand dollars ($1,000.00) in back fees and penalties set by licensing staff.

Ms. Lucas stated that, when calculating back fees and penalties, staff goes back to the first time that the license holder failed to pay his renewal fees and adds one hundred seventy-five dollars ($175.00) for each year to bring the license holder current.

Mr. Curtis asked staff if the payment plan includes interest accrual.

Ms. Payton stated that the County does not charge interest on payment plans.

Chairman Chesser asked if staff was considering combining the Code Enforcement fine along with the back fees and penalties into one payment plan.

Ms. Payton stated that the two issues are completely different and separate as are the monies associated with them. Ms. Payton stated that the two amounts cannot be lumped into one payment plan as one has nothing to do with the other. Ms. Payton informed the Board that when Code Enforcement staff issues a citation, if offender refuses to sign for it and accept it, the next step is to go before a judge where the offender may well end up owing not only the fine but court costs and interest as well. Ms. Payton stated that the licensing back fees and penalties already include a penalty, which amounts to much more than just interest, attached, and with Board approval and payment of those fees, Mr. Jones can regain his Competency Card, keep it up to date and then continue to repay his Code Enforcement fine.

Chairman Chesser noted that the other option was for the applicant to take the test again and seek a new license.

Ms. Payton stated that Mr. Jones would still have to pay the Code Enforcement fine, and he would also have to seek permission to test from this Board.

Mr. Miller noted that Mr. Jones has an active State registration, and in the past in cases where the applicant has an active State registration they tend to think they have met all the requirements when they actually haven't. Mr. Miller stated that he has been very active in seeking to deal with the unlicensed contractor problem in this County, but he can understand how someone could confuse the issue when they have kept their State registration current.

Ms. Payton stated that she has explained the requirements to Mr. Jones and he understands what he has to do regarding his licensure. Ms. Payton further stated that staff cited Mr. Jones because the lack of a current active Competency Card is specifically mentioned in the Ordinance in Section 3-1, so staff really didn't have a choice. Ms. Payton stated that staff is also working hard to catch and cite unlicensed contractors.

A brief discussion ensued.

Mr. Nathan Jones introduced himself to the Board.

Chairman Chesser asked Mr. Jones to describe the business he works for, Horizon.

Mr. Jones stated that he works for Horizon doing landscape maintenance mostly on County owned properties, such as at the airport, on Okaloosa Island and at the sewage treatment plant. Mr. Jones further stated that Horizon provides work for the handicapped as well, and it is those Horizon employees who collect the recycling from all County offices. Mr. Jones stated that he still wants to get his Competency Card back even though he is employed full time.

Chairman Chesser asked Mr. Jones to explain what sort of work he does at Horizon.

Mr. Jones stated that he is a full time employee of Horizon and works on one of their mobile work crews. Mr. Jones stated that he wants to get his Competency Card returned, pay his fine and then put his Competency Card into retired status until the economy picks up more.

Chairman Chesser asked Mr. Jones how much time he would need to pay the penalties and back fees for his license.

Mr. Jones stated that he would need two (2) months.

Ms. Seketa asked Mr. Jones if the two (2) months to pay would also include the fine from Code Enforcement.

Mr. Jones stated that the two (2) month time frame only applies to the licensing fees and penalties as he already has a payment plan set up with Code Enforcement. Mr. Jones further stated that if his license is returned he wants to put it into retirement as he has a good job and would like to have his license available to reinstate in the event that the roofing business picks up more.

Ms. Seketa asked Mr. Jones if he would be sub-contracting any roofing for Horizon.

Mr. Jones stated that Horizon doesn't do any such work in the construction industry at all.

Chairman Chesser asked Mr. Jones if he has set up a separate company or if he was going to let another company use his license with him as the qualifier.

Mr. Jones that he doesn't intend to use his license until the business picks up more.

Chairman Chesser asked Mr. Jones what types of roofing he has worked with.

Mr. Jones stated that he has worked with hot tar and asphalt shingles mostly and worked in the business for fifteen (15) or sixteen (16) years.

Mr. Skip Royster stated that, in his opinion, Mr. Jones should have to pay off all of the fine to Code Enforcement, no matter how long that takes before he comes back to the Board to ask for his Competency Card to be reinstated. Mr. Royster further stated that perhaps the motion could be worded to the effect that Mr. Jones' request for the reinstatement of his Competency Card would be dealt with by the Board after he has paid his Code Enforcement fine. Mr. Roster stated that he feels that giving Mr. Jones his license back while he still has to pay the Code Enforcement fine as well as the licensing fees and penalties is just wrong. Mr. Royster offered to make just such a motion.

Assistant County Attorney Kerry Parsons informed the Board that for Code Enforcement to be able to abate the violation so that Mr. Jones can just pay the fine and not have to go to court, he has to be licensed. Attorney Parsons stated that it is for that reason that the license issue has to be taken care of first.

Mr. Royster asked what would happen if the Board decides to deny Mr. Jones' request for reinstatement.

Attorney Parsons stated that if the Board denies Mr. Jones' request for reinstatement then the Code Enforcement violation cannot be abated and Mr. Jones would have to go to court.

A brief discussion ensued.

Mr. Curtis asked Counsel to explain to him why Mr. Jones must have his license reinstated so that he pay the Code Enforcement fine.

Attorney Parsons stated with Code Enforcement, under the provision established both here and at the State level, a person who is found to be in violation and is cited must be given the opportunity to abate the violation within a certain amount of time. Attorney Parsons further stated that if the violation cannot be abated within the allotted time, then the issue must then go through the courts. Attorney Parson stated that in Mr. Jones case, to abate his violation he has to be licensed. Attorney Parsons further stated that if the Board reinstates Mr. Jones' license then his Code Enforcement violation will be abated, he will be able to pay the fine and then he can just go about his life.

Mr. Curtis asked Counsel what would happen if it the applicant didn't have and never had a license at all.

Attorney Parsons stated that in that situation, the applicant could try to get licensed but it wouldn't abate any code violations that the applicant might have.

Mr. Royster stated that Mr. Jones needs to pay his Code Enforcement fine off before the Board decides whether or not to reinstate his Competency Card.

Attorney Parsons stated that she understands how Mr. Royster feels; however, in this particular case, in order for Mr. Jones to just pay the fine and avoid going in front of a judge he would have to have his license reinstated to be abated.

Mr. Royster stated that he didn't want to give Mr. Jones his license back now, he wants Mr. Jones to pay his Code Enforcement fine first.

Attorney Parsons stated that she understands; however the Code Enforcement fine and the Licensing issue with its penalties and back fees are two entirely different issues.

Mr. Royster stated that he understands all of that; however, he is sitting on the Board and can make a motion that says Mr. Jones is not approved and will have to go back and take the tests. Mr. Royster further stated that he did not want to do that to Mr. Jones, but he does want to make sure that the County gets the money that is owed to it before a decision is made regarding Mr. Jones license.

Attorney Parsons stated that, unfortunately how the mechanism is established, is that if the Board decides not to reinstate his license, but rather require him to test as a new applicant, then instead of the fine, he would have to go in front of a judge because he would no longer be able to abate the violation.

Mr. Royster stated that Mr. Jones is not asking the Board to be allowed to take the test, he is asking the Board to reinstate his Competency Card, and the issue is getting the fine paid first before the Board potentially gives him the opportunity to just move on with his life instead of paying the fine that he owes.

Attorney Parsons stated that she understands; however, the Board has no say regarding when and how the Code Enforcement violation fee is paid. Attorney Parsons further stated that this Board's sole responsibility is to decide whether or not Mr. Jones'

Competency Card should be reinstated and whether or not he needs to pay the licensing penalties and back fees.

Mr. Elliot Kampert addressed the Board, stating that he understands Mr. Royster's concern that the Code Enforcement fine be paid before this Board makes a determination regarding Mr. Jones license. Mr. Kampert asked Counsel if it was possible to word a motion with a condition, such as this license cannot be reinstated until such time as the record reflects that the Code Enforcement violation fine has been paid.

Attorney Parsons stated that the Board could certainly choose to do that; however, if they do so, from the Code Enforcement perspective, Mr. Jones will not be allowed to pay the fine because he will not be able to abate the violation; instead, he will have to appear before a judge in court who will institute a fine, etc. Attorney Parsons noted that once Mr. Jones pays whatever fine and fees that the court determines, he could then come back before the Board regarding his Competency Card.

Mr. Royster asked what a judge had to do with the situation, since Mr. Jones has already made a down payment on and agreed to a payment plan to pay off the Code Enforcement fine. Mr. Royster asked how Mr. Jones was supposed to also pay the one thousand dollars ($1,000.00) to get his Competency Card reinstated, if the Board approves his request, in addition to the payment plan he has for the Code Enforcement fine.

Attorney Parsons stated that Mr. Royster's statement makes sense; however, she was trying to make the Board aware of the other proceedings Mr. Jones will have to go through if the Board chooses to wait to decide until after the Code issue is taken care of or chooses to deny his request altogether.

Mr. Royster again asked what a judge would have to do with the situation since a payment plan has already been set up.

Attorney Parsons replied that if Mr. Jones can't abate the violation then the judge might have to get involved.

Mr. Miller asked Counsel how long that process could take. Mr. Miller stated that if the process is going to take as long as six months to a year, he believes that Mr. Jones will pay off his fine long before that time. Mr. Miller asked what would happen to Mr. Jones if he had his fine paid off before he gets to stand in front of the judge.

Attorney Parsons stated that Mr. Jones would still not be licensed and therefore would still have to appear before the judge.

Mr. Miller asked what would happen if he paid his fine and then appears before this Board again and his license is returned, what would happen.

Attorney Parsons stated that staff would research the issue but the Board can process as it wills.

Ms. Seketa asked if, in doing this could Mr. Jones end up in a situation, throughout this process, wherein the penalties and back fees for reinstating his Competency Card actually increase.

Ms. Lucas stated that when staff gave Mr. Jones the total of his back fees and penalties the fees for 2017 were included. Ms. Lucas further stated that she did not find out until this meeting that Mr. Jones intends to put his license into retirement. Ms. Lucas explained how staff calculates the back fees and penalties, stating that beginning at the first missed year, a retired fee of $75.00 plus a late fee of $100.00 dollars is charged for each year up to the current year. Ms. Lucas stated that current year fees are $100.00. Ms. Lucas noted that the total would change if Mr. Jones is putting his license into retirement.

Mr. Royster stated that he believes that an active fee of $100.00 should be used instead of a retired fee of $75.00 when calculating the back fees and penalties.

A brief discussion ensued.

Attorney Parsons informed the Chairman that a solution to the Code Violation/reinstatement issue may have been found. Attorney Parsons stated that if the Board wants the Code Enforcement fine paid first prior to any discussion of reinstatement of the Competency Card, then the answer would be to table this request until the Code Enforcement fine is paid.

A brief discussion ensued.

Motion to table this request until the Code fine is paid made by Skip Royster; second by Jimmy Henderson; approved unanimously.

VII. Other Business:

Ms. Lucas reminded the Board that at the last meeting she was asked to have the work history and experience affidavits updated. Ms. Lucas stated that on the Exterior Applications affidavits, there is room for the applicant to list all facets of their experience. Ms. Lucas further stated that the various facets were also broken out by how the tests were set up. Ms. Lucas stated that there are separate exams for Garage Doors, Hurricane Shutters, Stucco and Masonry. Ms. Lucas further stated that Siding, Windows and Doors are all encompassed in a single exam and include any work such as stucco, and masonry patching work as being ancillary to the license. Ms. Lucas gave a brief description of what type of information is included in each of the exams.

A brief discussion ensued.

Mr. Curtis asked what sort of business courses were included.

Ms. Lucas stated that Business and Law is a separate exam that every Board approved applicant has to take and pass to get licensed.

Mr. Royster suggested that instructions to write legibly be included.

Mr. Henderson stated that those facets that go together, like siding windows and doors should all appear in one line to make it easier for us to see.

Chairman Chesser suggested that applicants should only apply for a license in those fields where they have experience. Chairman Chesser stated that under “Exterior Applications” in the middle block, there should be check boxes a.) through e.) for each testing facet

under Exterior Applications showing that they are seeking licensure and have experience in those facets checked.

Ms. Lucas reminded the Board of the steps taken by staff to verify applicants' experience.

Mr. Royster asked how staff could tell that there isn't a fraudulent signature on the affidavits.

Mr. Kampert stated that falsifying public documents is illegal.

Attorney Parsons stated that such a warning could be included, but she would research the issue and let staff know what is found.

A brief discussion ensued.

a. Update on Insurance Requirements and Other Provisions of Building Code

Mr. Kampert stated that staff discussed the issue with both Risk Management & County Legal staff, and found that the requirement for having the County as additional insured is a Purchasing requirement for County projects and should never have applied to Contractors licensed to work through the department on private (not County) projects. Mr. Kampert further stated that staff will work on getting the requirement removed from the Ordinance.

A brief discussion ensued.

Attorney Parsons stated that she was asked at the last meeting if the County could further regulate Workman's Compensation beyond what the State provides. Attorney Parsons further stated that local governments are not allowed to add additional regulation beyond what the State provides. Attorney Parsons stated that, in her research, she looked into the enforcement of Worker's Compensation and found that there is a Fraudulent Investigations Department under the Department of Financial Services Division of Workman's Compensations; however, they only have 5 investigators. Attorney Parsons stated that they do have a phone number and their website does have the capacity to file a complaint online. Attorney Parsons further stated that most of the investigators seem to be located in other areas of the State. Attorney Parsons noted that inspectors can also call that the Fraudulent Investigations number to report problems.

Ms. Lucas stated that, for those contractors who only have an exemption on file, then only that Contractor names on that exemption is allowed to by permits and call for inspections.

Buddy Gordon stated that it should be a red flag when a roofer with an exemption pulls permits for 20 or more jobs.

Chairman Chesser suggested that perhaps inspectors could be asked to include checking for their Workman's Compensation status.

Mr. Curtis stated that he didn't want inspectors slowing up his jobs by constantly checking for Workman's Compensation.

A brief discussion ensued.

Mr. Royster asked Mr. Kampert why County Building Inspectors were inspecting underground stormwater systems.

Mr. Kampert stated that it was probably due to the Builder pulling an Underground Utilities permit, which falls under the Building Code. Mr. Kampert further stated that all of the underground piping for stormwater has to be inspected per the Building Code.

Mr. Royster stated that Public Works engineers reviews and approves the stormwater plans. Mr. Royster further stated that an Inspector shouldn't be out inspecting stormwater pipes when there are houses that need to be inspected.

Mr. Kampert stated that if there is something there that falls under the Building Code, like stormwater piping, then it must be inspected. Mr. Kampert further stated that the engineers at Public Works are looking at things like elevations, soil compaction and drainage when they do their inspections.

Mr. Henderson stated that he has always understood that Public Works does the inspections on infrastructure.

Mr. Kampert stated that underground utility plans are submitted for plans review and those are what the inspections are based on. Mr. Kampert further stated that he understands that the issue here is to remove redundancy and stated that he will look into the issue.

Mr. Gordon stated that he has an issue because he called in for roof inspections on July 8, 2016 and yet he got a call from Code Enforcement asking why he hadn't had an inspection done on a house. Mr. Gordon asked why Code Enforcement had to get involved regarding his roofing permit and inspection.

Mr. Kampert stated that unless the permit was expired, Code Enforcement would only be involved based on a complaint.

Mr. Gordon stated that the Inspectors are generally very good but he doesn't understand why Code Enforcement had to get involved.

A brief discussion ensued.

VIII. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn made by Skip Royster; Second by Linda Flowers; approved unanimously.

Prepared by: Teresa A. Mullins

Teresa Mullins, Recording Secretary
8.8.2016