

March 20, 2014

Attendees

Jack Leyden – Building Commissioner – Co-chair

Jack Charter – State Fire Marshal – Co-chair

Stephen Olsen – Olsen Eng. – Structural Eng. Assoc.

Roger Peters – Robinson & Cole – Attorney Bld. & Construction

Cyndi Gerlach – RGB – AIA RI

Len Bradley – Deprite Eng. – Environmental Engineer

Frank Silva – Capt. Fire Prevention Prov. – League of City & Town

**Nancy Scorduzio – Dept. Management & Budget Sm. Buss.
Ombudsmen**

Co-chair Leyden opened the meeting at 1:05 4th meeting last meeting had DEM and CRMC and how they handle their process. Asked everyone to get together any conflicts in the code and email to me, I did not get any response.

Committee put out questions but got very little reply. The one did get was elevator and had to do with sump pump. That has to do with elevator code not building code.

Co-chair Leyden that is not doing anything with the conflicts between our codes and that's what we are assigned to do.

Council spoke about the differences between IDC and IEDC with dangerous condition.

Co-chair Leyden stated that isn't a conflict yet as we have not adopted the IDEC. Members from his office and the fire marshal's are already going over different areas will get together with two boards to try to adopt the new rehab code. Once they get a new executive secretary to the FSCB they can adopt a new rehab code. Do we have conflicts in the code that come to mind because by next month we have to rap up our recommendations.

Co-chair Chartier called senate policy office to get guidance on what they are looking for. Want us to give our consensus points and those that aren't code stuff they still want to know about. We are supposed to send up this up by the first of April and they are going to look at it and if they need us to be pulled back together to expand or change whatever, that gives them a year. Would not be surprised that we submit our suggestions and we don't hear anything till the fall and then they pull us back together to look at specifics.

Committee spoke about what DEM and CRMC brought to the previous meeting about time frames on permits. How they have adopted the LEAN process and committee gave their thoughts on it.

- one of the things the towns do is when you submit for land development they have a certificate of completeness do you have

this, do you have this, and essentially the clock does not start till they determine you submit a complete application. I think DEM needs to implement something of that nature.

– I took away bld/fire codes are descriptive you have to follow or change. With DEM a lot of existing conditions with sites they try to work with you to come up with a solution.

– DEM said they were working at building a drop off desk where they go over your application with you to see if complete right there.

– Recommend DEM and CRMC adopt a reasonable time frame schedule.

- To have some kind of decision tree or mapping for permits.

Committee said if the client is paying money for this application they should be getting that service. If it is because they are understaffed there should be that extra fund to get that outside party to review it weather it's building, fire. DOT, DEM, any of those this would go a long way in being more business friendly.

Having the pre-app meeting; that could almost be instituted across the board for a lot of these different processes and get all issues out right away. Big issues vetted right away to some degree. If you have

anything out of the ordinary or extraordinary variance that require explanation that would need to go before the board go to the pre app. You may solve 75% of your issues up front before you have to come in and start spending money.

As for Cities and towns and pre app meetings, if you want to you should be able to have it. I think every town if asked it is granted.

I think that process should be carried up to DEM, CRMC and the other one we haven't touched in is DOT when we submit for a curb cut there is no timeframe on that. It has become slower than DEM. It could be up to 6 months to get a curb cut approved. And you cannot proceed with project till you get it? You can not. Before you can submit back to town for preliminary you need to have all state permits, DEM, fresh water wetlands, ripties, CRMC and you need to have DOT alterations permit. You cannot submit back to town for second stage of approval until you have all of them. One of the conflicts is with CRMC they want to be the last reviewing agency. So you have to go through the whole town process and get feedback from town DEM and then submit to CRMC. So if they change anything significantly you need to go back through the town process again. So it cost clients and taxpayers a lot of money if you have a big project CRMC, Hazard eng. or biological changes the layout.

What is the recommendation?

I would recommend having an efficient permitting flow path uniform

statewide applied. Timetable that ties all required state permitting in place/flow path. DEM looks at storm water DOT looks at storm water CRMC looks at storm water the town looks at storm water, everyone is looking at storm water erosion there are redundant reviews being done. Try to make those all work in an expeditious way would save time, resources. If I need a permit from DEM and CRMC have worked out where one of the engineers does salt water review they will take the one for the two agencies. It would be great if that could happen with cities and towns, DOT to eliminate redundancy.

Couldn't we Legislate to CRMC that they be simultaneous with DEM?
Do they really need to be last?

You should be able to make a joint application as they are all looking at different things.

Storm water is a very big issue. My preference is to see one entity in the state. If there was a panel of representatives of different agencies with one stop shopping everyone gave input based on project so you won't go into 3-4 separate steps. Have one person that owns it and solicit feedback from the various parties maybe helpful.

With regard to timelines, if agencies take the 6 months they are given to approve an application it could cost money to someone on the purchase and sales agreement.

Recommendation that the standard permits from any agency should take 30 days or less.

A local community can make a more restrictive rule on their own?

Yes

Legislation that is under consideration this year which I don't think passed but this committee came out to come up with a consistent set of set backs state wide. They are looking at each town to compare what they have but it is difficult as each town is different, environment pools, etc. committee is charged to look at that and report back in a year.

With regard to setting timeframes for permits start at 30 days and let legislature hammer it out. After 30 days they at least have to give an answer. Or and answer with conditions.

One process map. Setting out exactly what the steps are.

Storm water issue in area's where multiple agencies looking at same issue one of them needs to be named as lead they do majority of review.

MOU between CRMC and DEM one agency agrees and approves the other guy accepts it. If anything comes up send me a email.

Most consistent needing more staffing and education.

Recommendation that once e-permitting roll out that in a certain timeframe the remainder of the agencies go on it. Mandate that all cities and towns participate. Make a recommendation that that happen.

Next meeting 3/27/14

Meeting adjourn 2:20