

**Palm Beach County
Building Division
Customer Satisfaction Survey**

**Submitted by:
Dr. Leslie A. Leip
Florida Atlantic University**

May 4, 2004

Introduction

The Palm Beach County Building Division is committed to providing the best services to its customers. In order to assess customer satisfaction with the services provided by the Building Division, surveys were administered in 1997, 2000 and 2004. This report compares the findings from the three survey years, but it primarily focuses on the 2004 survey. In 2004, a four-part survey was sent to customers who use the preconstruction and field inspection services. The first part of the survey focused on service questions about permitting and plan reviews and the second part focused on service questions about field inspections. Part three of the survey contained two questions about the DCA Rule on product approval that was set by the Florida Building Commission in October 2003. In the fourth section, customers were asked to provide any additional comments. (A copy of the survey is included in Appendix A).

The results from the preconstruction portion of the survey are presented first and then the results from the field inspection portion of the survey are presented. Most of the survey questions correspond to questions that were part of the surveys that were administered in 1997 and 2000. Some new questions were added in the 2004 survey and some questions that were used in 1997 and 2000 were deleted, and these changes are noted in the results. The final section provides the results about the DCA Rule on product approval and the additional comments.

The survey was distributed to 2,147 customers, including home builder customers, owner/builders customers, commercial building customers, and general contractors. A total of 301 surveys were completed and returned. The return rate was 14%, which is acceptable for this type of survey project. The margin of error for the results is $\pm 5\%$. Two percent were from general contractors, 5% were from home builders, 12% were from owner/builders, and 81% were from general construction customers. It is important to note that the direct mailing of surveys to the 50 largest home builders and to 50 commercial builders did not result in enough returned surveys to warrant any bivariate analyses by the type of customer.

Results for the Preconstruction Survey Questions

For the 301 customers who answered the preconstruction survey questions, 83% typically submit between 1 and 10 permit applications per month, 14% submit between 11 and 50, 2% submit between 51 and 100, and 1% submit 101 or more permit applications. Seventy-one percent have less than 25% of their permit applications that require corrections, 13% have between 26% and 50% of their applications that require corrections, 5% have between 51% and 75% that need corrections, and 11% have between 76% and 100% of their permit applications that require corrections.

Eighty-three percent indicated that they know they can track their permit application on the Building Division website. Fifty-four percent indicated that they are satisfied or very satisfied with the FAX program for free sub-permits, and only 3% indicated that they were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the FAX program. Twenty-five percent said that they are satisfied or very satisfied with the Annual Permit/Decal Program, 67% chose the "neutral" answer, and 8% were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. Thirty-four percent indicated that they are satisfied or very satisfied with the Master Plan Program, 61% chose the "neutral" answer, and 5% were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied.

On the preconstruction portion of the survey, customers were asked to answer a series of questions about preconstruction services using a scale of strongly disagree to strongly agree. The results, along with the results from the 1997 and 2000 surveys, are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Preconstruction Service Questions. (Survey Items 1-4)

Preconstruction Service Questions									
	Strongly Disagree or Disagree			Neutral			Agree or Strongly Agree		
	1997	2000	2004	1997	2000	2004	1997	2000	2004
Preconstruction staff thoroughly answered questions, citing code sections or policies	18%	13%	13%	30%	25%	17%	52%	62%	70%
Preconstruction staff conducted themselves in a professional manner	10%	4%	4%	24%	23%	12%	66%	73%	84%
Preconstruction staff referred me to the correct staff to handle problems outside of their own area of expertise	17%	6%	11%	24%	22%	18%	59%	72%	71%
My phone calls to the Preconstruction staff were returned within 24 hours	28%	20%	21%	24%	23%	18%	48%	57%	61%

An overwhelming majority of customers indicated that they agree that preconstruction staff answered their questions thoroughly, acted in a professional manner, referred them to the correct staff when necessary, and returned their calls within 24 hours. From 2000 to 2004, there was an increase in all of the percentages of those who agreed with these statements about preconstruction staff, except for the percentage for about the statement for referring to the correct staff. However, there was only a 1% decrease (from 72% in 2000 to 71% in 2004), which is not a significant decrease.

The survey also included questions about the permit application and review process and the results are shown in Table 2. The majority of customers indicated that they agree or strongly agree with the statements about receiving the initial review in a timely manner and adequate guidance being provided by checklists and forms. In 1997 and 2000, customers were asked about prompt notification about problems with applications or plan details, but in 2004, that question was changed to receiving permit review comments describing changes needed. The majority indicated that they agree or strongly agree that they do receive permit review comments describing changes needed. When asked about the comparison between other local permitted jurisdictions and PBC, 56% indicated that they believe that PBS provided superior service, and this percentage did increase since 2000. For the 2004 survey, customers were asked if they have seen improvements in PBC preconstruction during the past two years. Forty-nine percent indicated that they have seen improvements during the past two years. Sixteen percent indicated that they have not seen improvements during the past two years.

Table 2. Preconstruction Survey. (Survey Items 5-9)

Preconstruction Permit Questions									
	Strongly Disagree or Disagree			Neutral			Agree or Strongly Agree		
	1997	2000	2004	1997	2000	2004	1997	2000	2004
My permit application normally received the initial review in a timely manner	30%	26%	25%	24%	24%	20%	46%	50%	55%
Adequate guidance was provided by checklists and forms supplied	7%	11%	14%	32%	26%	25%	61%	63%	61%
Permit review comments I received adequately described corrections needed*	-	-	10%	-	-	22%	-	-	68%
I am notified promptly if there is a problem with my application or plan details**	29%	23%	-	23%	23%	-	8%	54%	-
Compared to other local permitted jurisdictions, PBC provided superior service	35%	13%	13%	15%	32%	31%	50%	55%	56%

* This question was included only on the 2004 survey.

** This question was included only on the 1997 and 2000 surveys.

Customers were asked to identify themselves as a “prime contractor,” “sub-contractor ” or “owner/builder” so that the bivariate analyses could be completed. This “type of customer” variable and survey items 1-9 (listed in tables 1 and 2) were examined via crosstabulations and there were minimal differences between the types of customers and their ratings for each of the survey questions. In other words, the prime contractor customers rated the preconstruction staff the same as the sub contractors and owner/builders. The results of the bivariate analyses are listed in Appendix B.

Customers were asked to rate four service aspects that would assist with directing of resources for preconstruction. Table 3 shows the ratings for the 1997, 2000 and 2004 surveys.

Table 3. Preconstruction questions about directing resources. (Survey questions 12-15)

	Ranking of Priorities		
	1997*	2000	2004
Ensure that proposed construction meets building and land development regulations	1	4 (71% agreed or strongly agreed)	4 (74% agreed or strongly agreed)
Provide consistent and accurate application processing and plan review	2	2 (82% agreed or strongly agreed)	1 (95% agreed or strongly agreed)
Meet customer expectations for plan review and permit issuance time tables	3	3 (75% agreed or strongly agreed)	2 (93% agreed or strongly agreed)
Treat customers in a professional and courteous manner	4	1 (87% agreed or strongly agreed)	3 (94% agreed or strongly agreed)

* In 1997, the priorities were listed according to PBC ranking, and customers were asked to rank the priorities, not to mark based on “Not Important to Very Important” scale. The results of the customers’ rankings were identical to the PBC rankings.

In 2004, the number one priority, as ranked by the customers, is providing consistent and accurate application processing and plan reviews. The second priority is meeting customer expectations, followed by treating customers in a professional and courteous manner, and finally is the priority of ensuring that proposed construction meets regulations. Priorities #1, #2, and #3 changed from 2000 to 2004. The only priority that remained the same was #4.

Customers were asked to identify one thing that they believe the preconstruction staff is doing best. All of the comments are listed in Appendix C. Many customers commented on the courteous, friendly, and helpful manner of the preconstruction staff. Others commented on the increase of efficiency in the intake and permit processes. Several customers noted that the preconstruction staff is very knowledgeable and that they take the time to correctly do the job.

Customers were also asked for suggestions about improving the permitting and plan review processes. All of the comments are listed in Appendix D. Some of the customers mentioned that a faster turnaround time would improve the processes. Others said that more preconstruction staff should be hired.

Overall, customers who use the preconstruction services are satisfied with the services. Based on this analysis, the favorable ratings for these services have increased since 2000.

Results for the Field Inspection Survey Questions

For the 301 customers who answered the field inspection survey questions, 59% typically have between 1 and 10 inspections per month, 34% have between 11 and 50, 4% have between 51 and 100, and 3% have 101 or more.

On the field inspection portion of the survey, customers were asked to answer a series of questions about field inspection services using a scale of strongly disagree to strongly agree. The results, along with the results from the 1997 and 2000 surveys, are shown in Table 4. The majority of customers indicated that they agree that field inspection staff answered their questions thoroughly, acted in a professional manner, referred them to the correct staff when necessary, and returned their calls within 24 hours. However, from 2000 to 2004, there was a decrease in all of the percentages of those who agreed with these statements about field inspection staff, but the decreases were not drastic.

Table 4. Field Inspection Service Questions. Survey Items 1-4.

Field Inspection Service Questions									
	Strongly Disagree or Disagree			Neutral			Agree or Strongly Agree		
	1997	2000	2004	1997	2000	2004	1997	2000	2004
Field Inspection staff thoroughly answered questions, citing code sections or policies	3%	15%	16%	22%	21%	23%	75%	64%	61%
Field Inspection staff conducted themselves in a professional manner	3%	5%	10%	17%	22%	19%	80%	73%	71%
Field Inspection staff referred me to the correct staff to handle problems outside of their own area of expertise	13%	12%	14%	21%	23%	29%	66%	65%	57%
My phone calls to the field inspection staff were returned within 24 hours	20%	26%	24%	10%	15%	21%	70%	59%	55%

Table 5 shows the results for the field inspection survey items 5-12. The majority of customers agreed that adequate guidance was provided by the checklists and forms, but the percentage of those who agreed decreased from 2000 to 2004. The majority of customers agreed or strongly agreed that their requested inspections were normally done by the next business day and that the results of the inspections were available in a satisfactory manner. The 2004 percentages for these two questions increased from 2000. (It is important to note, however, that the question in 2000 was not exactly the same as it was in 2004. In 2000, the question was “usually I am notified quickly and clearly if there is a problem with an inspection.”) In addition, the majority of customers indicated that when they had to have a re-inspection, corrections were seldom added.

Table 5. Field Inspection Survey. Questions about Field Inspections (Survey Items 5-12)

	Field Inspection Questions								
	Strongly Disagree or Disagree			Neutral			Agree or Strongly Agree		
	1997	2000	2004	1997	2000	2004	1997	2000	2004
Adequate written guidance was provided by Inspection checklists, forms and instructions	17%	11%	25%	13%	25%	23%	70%	63%	52%
My requested inspections were normally done by the next business day	3%	7%	3%	17%	11%	11%	83%	82%	86%
My results of inspections were available in a satisfactory manner.*	30%	38%	7%	11%	18%	13%	70%	44%	80%
When my jobs were re-inspected, other corrections were seldom added	27%	24%	22%	20%	21%	20%	53%	54%	58%
My requests for CO's and CC's were promptly handled**	6%	7%	4%	24%	28%	35%	70%	65%	61%
My requests for power releases were promptly handled	-	-	8%	-	-	45%	-	-	47%
The automated telephone inspection scheduling system met my needs	5%	5%	6%	20%	8%	12%	75%	87%	82%
Compared to other local field inspection jurisdictions, PBC provided superior service	7%	14%	13%	38%	29%	31%	55%	57%	56%

* In 2000, the question was “usually I am notified quickly and clearly if there is a problem with an inspection

** In 1997 and 2000, the question about CO's and CC's and the power releases question were combined

In 1997 and 2000, the question about CO's, CC's, and power releases being promptly handled was split into two questions and in 2004 it was one question. Although the majority of customers in 2004 indicated that their CO's and CC's were promptly handled, only 47% indicated that their power releases were promptly handled. Eighty-two percent of the customers said that the automated telephone inspection scheduling system did meet their needs, but the percentage slightly decreased from 2000.

The majority of customers indicated that PBC field inspection provided superior service when compared to other local field inspection jurisdictions. The percentages for this question have remained relatively stable since 1997.

The bivariate analyses for the types of inspections that are normally requested and the survey items 1-12 did not produce reliable results because very few customers indicated that they normally requested only plumbing inspections (6 customers), mechanical inspections (10 customers), and electrical inspections (25 customers). These numbers are too small to make any generalizations based on the crosstabulations. The majority of customers (181) indicated that they normally request building inspections and 73 customers said that they normally request all four types of inspections.

Customers were asked to rate four service aspects that would assist with directing of resources for field inspection. Table 6 shows the ratings for the 1997, 2000 and 2004 surveys. In 2004, the number one priority, as ranked by the customers, is providing consistent, accurate, and timely inspections. The second priority is clearly and concisely communicated with customers, followed by treating customers in a professional and courteous manner, and finally is the priority of ensuring that new construction meets building and land development codes. Priorities #1 and #4 remained the same for 2000 and 2004, but priorities #2 and #3 switched.

Table 6. Field Inspection questions about directing resources. (Survey questions 15-18)

	Ranking of Priorities		
	1997*	2000	2004
Ensure that new construction meets building and land development codes	1	4 (71% agreed or strongly agreed)	4 (77% agreed or strongly agreed)
Provide consistent, accurate, and timely inspections	2	1 (91% agreed or strongly agreed)	1 (97% agreed or strongly agreed)
Clearly and concisely communicated with customers	3	3 (90% agreed or strongly agreed)	2 (95% agreed or strongly agreed)
Treat customers in a professional and courteous manner	4	2 (88% agreed or strongly agreed)	3 (94% agreed or strongly agreed)

* In 1997, the priorities were listed according to PBC ranking, and customers were asked to rank the priorities, not to mark based on “Not Important to Very Important” scale. The results of the customers’ rankings were identical to the PBC rankings.

Customers were asked to identify one thing that they believe the field inspection staff is doing best. All of the comments are listed in Appendix E. Many customers commented on the timeliness of completing field inspections. Several customers noted that the field inspection staff is very knowledgeable and professional.

Customers were also asked for suggestions about improving the field inspection process. All of the comments are listed in Appendix F. Some of the customers mentioned that there needs to be more consistency and that perhaps the same inspectors who did the original field inspection should also complete the re-inspection. Others said that communication needs to be improved. Some customers suggested that the scheduled time slots for field inspections should be narrowed.

Overall, the majority of customers who use the field inspection services provided favorable ratings. Some of the favorable percentages did decrease from 2000 to 2004, but none were drastic decreases.

DCA Rule (9B-72), Product Approval and Additional Comments

Part three of the survey contained two questions about the DCA Rule that was set by the Florida Building Commission. The purpose of the rule was to set new procedures that dictate how local or optional statewide approvals of construction products must be evaluated and decided. Customers were asked if they had any experience seeking product approval and their level of satisfaction with the 9B-72 procedures. Fifty-eight percent of the customers have not had any experience with the rule. Of those who have had experience with it, 5% indicated that they were very dissatisfied, 9% were dissatisfied, 11% were neutral, 16% were satisfied, and 1% were very satisfied.

In the final section of the survey, customers were asked to provide additional comments. All of the comments are listed in Appendix G. Several customers commented that PBC is doing an excellent job. Some commented that the automated inspection system is very simple and effective. Other customers commented that the new state product approval rule has caused some problems. Many customers made specific suggestions about ways to improve some of the services.

Conclusion

Overall, customers who use the preconstruction services are satisfied with the services. Based on this analysis, the favorable ratings for these services have increased since 2000. Many customers made useful comments about the preconstruction processes and the permitting/plan review processes. It is highly recommended that all of the comments be reviewed and that some of the suggestions be considered for implementation.

Overall, the majority of customers who use the field inspection services provided favorable ratings. Some of the favorable percentages did decrease from 2000 to 2004, but none were drastic decreases. Many customers made useful comments about the field inspection processes and the permitting/plan review processes. It is highly recommended that all of the comments be reviewed and that some of the suggestions be considered for implementation.

The majority of customers (58%) have not had any experience with the new DCA rule for product approval. For those customers who have had experience with it, 17% were satisfied or very satisfied and 14% were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied.

The majority of customers believe that PBC is providing superior service in both preconstruction and field inspections when compared to other jurisdictions. Furthermore, the majority of customers have seen improvements in the preconstruction services during the past two years. Clearly, the Palm Beach County Building Division is committed to providing the best services to its customers.

Appendix A. The 2004 Survey.

I. PRECONSTRUCTION SERVICES CUSTOMER SURVEY

Based on your experiences with the PBC permitting and plan review, please rate the following:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1) Preconstruction staff thoroughly answered questions, citing code sections or policies.....	1	2	3	4	5
2) Preconstruction staff conducted themselves in a professional manner.....	1	2	3	4	5
3) Preconstruction staff referred me to the correct staff to handle problems outside of their own area of expertise.....	1	2	3	4	5
4) My phone calls to the preconstruction staff were returned within 24 hours.....	1	2	3	4	5
5) Adequate guidance was provided by checklists and forms supplied.....	1	2	3	4	5
6) My permit application normally received the initial review in a timely manner.....	1	2	3	4	5
7) Permit review comments I received adequately described corrections needed.....	1	2	3	4	5
8) I have seen improvements in PBC preconstruction during the past two years.....	1	2	3	4	5
9) Compared to other local permitted jurisdictions, PBC provided superior service	1	2	3	4	5

10) How many permit applications per month do you typically submit?
 1-10 11-50 51-100 101 or more

11) What percent of your applications typically requires corrections?
 Less than 25% 26-50% 51-75% 76-100%

In order to assist with directing resources to the service aspects of greatest importance to you, please rate the following:

	Not at all Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Neutral	Somewhat Important	Very Important
12) Ensure that proposed construction meets building and land development regulations	1	2	3	4	5
13) Provide consistent and accurate application processing and plan review.....	1	2	3	4	5
14) Meet customer expectations for plan review and permit issuance time tables.....	1	2	3	4	5
15) Treat customers in a professional and courteous manner.....	1	2	3	4	5

If you use the following services offered in the Permit Centers, please rate your level of satisfaction: (If not, skip to question 19)

	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
16) The Fax Program for free sub-permits.....	1	2	3	4	5
17) Annual Permit/Decal Program.....	1	2	3	4	5
18) Master Plan Program.....	1	2	3	4	5

19) Do you know that you can track your application on the Building Division website? (www.pbcgov.com/pzb) No Yes

20) Are you a: Prime Contractor Sub Contractor Owner/Builder

21) What is the one thing that you believe the preconstruction staff is doing best? _____

23) What are your suggestions for making the permitting or plan review processes better? _____

II. FIELD INSPECTIONS CUSTOMER SURVEY

Based on your experiences with the PBC Building Division Field Inspections, please rate the following:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1) Field Inspection staff thoroughly answered questions, citing code sections or policies..	1	2	3	4	5
2) Field Inspection staff conducted themselves in a professional manner.....	1	2	3	4	5
3) Field Inspection staff referred me to the correct staff to handle problems outside of their own area of expertise.....	1	2	3	4	5
4) My phone calls to the field inspection staff were returned within 24 hours.....	1	2	3	4	5
5) Adequate written guidance was provided by Inspection checklists, forms and instructions	1	2	3	4	5
6) My requested inspections were normally done by the next business day.....	1	2	3	4	5
7) My results of inspections were available in a satisfactory manner.....	1	2	3	4	5
8) When my jobs were re-inspected, other corrections were seldom added.....	1	2	3	4	5
9) My requests for CO's and CC's were promptly handled.....	1	2	3	4	5
10) My requests for power releases were promptly handled.....	1	2	3	4	5
11) The automated telephone inspection scheduling system met my needs.....	1	2	3	4	5
12) Compared to other local field inspection jurisdictions, PBC provided superior service.	1	2	3	4	5

13) How many inspections per month do you usually request?
 1-10 11-50 51-100 101 or more

14) What type of inspections do you normally request? (Check all that apply)
 Building Plumbing Mechanical Electrical

In order to assist with directing resources to the service aspects of greatest importance to you, please rate the following:

	Not At All Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Neutral	Somewhat Important	Very Important
15) Ensure that new construction meets building and land development codes....	1	2	3	4	5
16) Provide consistent, accurate, and timely inspections.....	1	2	3	4	5
17) Clearly and concisely communicated with customers.....	1	2	3	4	5
18) Treat customers in a professional and courteous manner.....	1	2	3	4	5

19) What is the one thing that you believe the Field Inspection staff is doing best? _____

20) What are your suggestions for making the Field Inspection process better? _____

Appendix B. Bivariate Analyses for Preconstruction Survey Questions.

The tables below are the crosstabulations for preconstruction survey questions #1-9 by the type of company (prime contractor, sub-contractor, and owner/builder). The survey question and the corresponding ratings are listed in the left-hand column and the types of company are listed in the right-hand columns.

The interpretation of the information is provided in the following example: For survey question 1, 68% of the prime contractors agreed or strongly agreed that preconstruction staff thoroughly answered their questions, 69% of the sub-contractors agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, and 77% of the owner/builders agreed or strongly agreed with the statement.

If the percentage difference between the three types of companies is less than 30%, then there isn't a significant difference between the ratings of the prime contractors, sub-contractors, or owner/builders. According to all the results below, there were no significant differences for any of the survey questions, except survey question 8. Sixty-one percent of the sub-contractors have seen improvements in preconstruction during the past two years, but only 31% of the owner/builders have seen improvements.

Survey Question 1: Preconstruction staff thoroughly answered questions by Type of Company

	Prime contractor	Sub contractor	Owner/Builder
Preconstruction staff thoroughly answered questions			
Strongly Disagree or Disagree	14.1%	9.3%	10.0%
Neutral	17.6%	20.9%	12.5%
Agree or Strongly Agree	68.3%	69.8%	77.5%

Survey Question 2: Preconstruction staff conducted themselves in a professional manner by Type of Company

	Prime contractor	Sub contractor	Owner/Builder
Preconstruction staff conducted themselves in a professional manner			
Strongly Disagree or Disagree	4.9%	2.3%	2.4%
Neutral	13.7%	6.8%	12.2%
Agree or Strongly Agree	81.4%	90.9%	85.4%

Survey Question 3: Preconstruction staff referred me to correct staff by Type of Company

	Prime contractor	Sub contractor	Owner/Builder
Preconstruction staff referred me to correct staff			
Strongly Disagree or Disagree	10.3%	11.4%	17.1%
Neutral	18.6%	15.9%	17.1%
Agree or Strongly Agree	71.1%	72.7%	65.9%

Survey Question 4: Preconstruction staff returned my phone calls in 24 Hours by Type of Company

	Prime contractor	Sub contractor	Owner/Builder
Preconstruction staff returned my phone calls in 24 Hours			
Strongly Disagree or Disagree	23.2%	18.2%	14.6%
Neutral	18.8%	18.2%	14.6%
Agree or Strongly Agree	57.9%	63.6%	70.7%

Survey Question 5: Adequate guidance was provided by checklists and forms by Type of Company

	Prime contractor	Sub contractor	Owner/Builder
Adequate guidance was provided by checklists and forms			
Strongly Disagree or Disagree	15.1%	6.7%	15.0%
Neutral	24.4%	20.0%	32.5%
Agree or Strongly Agree	60.5%	73.3%	52.5%

Survey Question 6: Permit application received initial review in timely manner by Type of Company

	Prime contractor	Sub contractor	Owner/Builder
Permit application received initial review in timely manner			
Strongly Disagree or Disagree	28.2%	15.9%	19.0%
Neutral	21.8%	20.5%	14.3%
Agree or Strongly Agree	50.0%	63.6%	66.7%

Survey Question 7: Permit review comments adequately described corrections needed by Type of Company

	Prime contractor	Sub contractor	Owner/Builder
Permit review comments adequately described corrections needed			
Strongly Disagree or Disagree	13.8%	4.5%	7.3%
Neutral	20.7%	25.0%	24.4%
Agree or Strongly Agree	65.5%	70.5%	68.3%

Survey Question 8: I have seen improvements in PBC preconstruction during past two years by Type of Company

	Prime contractor	Sub contractor	Owner/Builder
I have seen improvements in PBC preconstruction during past two years			
Strongly Disagree or Disagree	19.4%	9.1%	4.9%
Neutral	30.8%	29.5%	63.4%
Agree or Strongly Agree	49.8%	61.4%	31.7%

Survey Question 9: Compared to other local permitted jurisdictions, PBC provided superior performance by Type of Company

	Prime contractor	Sub contractor	Owner/Builder
Compared to other local permitted jurisdictions, PBC provided superior performance			
Strongly Disagree or Disagree	26.6%	20.0%	9.5%
Neutral	27.6%	24.4%	40.5%
Agree or Strongly Agree	45.8%	55.6%	50.0%

APPENDIX C. ONE THING PRECONSTRUCTION IS DOING BEST.

ACCEPTING PERMIT APPLICATIONS
ADJUSTING TO NEW BUILDING CODE
ADVISEMENT
ANSWER QUESTIONS IN A TIMELY MANNER
ANSWERING QUESTIONS
ANSWERING QUESTIONS AND SENDING US TO THE RIGHT PEOPLE
ANSWERING QUESTIONS ON CODE ISSUES
APPLICATION IN-TAKE
APPLICATIONS PROCESSED TIMELY & PROPERLY
ASSIST IN PLAN DEFICIENCIES
ATTITUDE AND PROFESSIONALISM
AVAILABLE TO ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS
BEING CLOSE TO WHERE NEW CONSTRUCTION IS TAKING PLACE
BEING COURTEOUS
CALLING ON PERMIT PROBLEMS IN AN EFFICIENT MANNER
CAN'T IMPROVE ON N. COUNTY BRANCH SYSTEM
CHANGING PROTOCOL; TO MEET GROWTH IN AREA
CHECKING REQUIRED INFO
COMMUNICATING- ON THE WHOLE THE BEST COUNTY TO WORK FOR
COMMUNICATING PROBLEMS TO THE BUILDER
COMMUNICATIONS
COURTEOUS
COURTEOUS AND HELPFUL
COURTEOUS RECEIPT AND FOLLOW-UP OF SUBMITTALS
CUSTOMER CARE
DRAGGING THEIR FEET AND BEING DISCOURTEOUS
EMPLOYEES ARE KNOWLEDGEABLE, COURTEOUS, AND HELPFUL
EXPEDITING THE PERMIT PREP PROCESS
EXPLAIN ANY PROBLEMS OR ITEMS MISSING ON APPLICATIONS
EXPLAINING THINGS ON PLANS THAT NEED CORRECTING
FAST WHEN APPLYING AND PICKING UP PERMITS
FRIENDLY
FRIENDLY & COURTEOUS
FRIENDLY AND PROMPT
FRIENDLY, COURTEOUS, HELPFUL
GENERALLY, THE COUNTER STAFF IS COURTEOUS AND PROFESSIONAL SINCE MR. HOLT BECAME BUILDING OFFICIAL
GETTING INFO FOR PERMITS INTO THE COMPUTER SYSTEM
GETTING PERMITS BACK
GETTING PERMITS OUT FAST
GIVING ENOUGH INFO TO SUBMIT THE PERMIT AND APPLICATIONS FIRST TIME
GIVING IN TO GET THE PERMIT PROCESS DONE MORE EASILY
GOOD AVAILABILITY ALWAYS SOMEONE THERE
HANDLING QUESTIONS AND CONCERNS
HANDLING THE INITIAL SUBMITTAL QUICKLY-NO LINES IN LOBBY
HAVING AN ON-LINE SERVICE
HELP PROCESSING THE PERMITS
HELPFUL- WILLING TO WORK WITH YOU
HELPFUL
HELPFUL IN ANSWERING QUESTIONS & HELP OBTAIN CORRECT PERMITS
HELPFUL IN GIVING DIRECTION OF APPLICATION AND NECESSARY INFO

HOW STAFF HANDLES PROBLEMS OUTSIDE THEIR AREA
INFORMATION GIVEN
INFORMATIVE & CLEARING APPLICATION IN DUE PROCESS
INITIAL APPLICATION PROCESS AND SUBMITTAL
INTAKE AND KEEPING TRACK OF APPLICATIONS
INTAKE IS HAPPENING QUICKER
KEEP IN CONTACT ABOUT PERMIT PROCESS
KEEPING CONTRACTORS UP TO DATE ON PERMIT STATUS
KEEPING THE APPLICANTS MOVING, THERE'S SELDOM A LONG LINE
KNOWLEDGEABLE
KNOWLEDGEABLE AND COURTEOUS
KNOWLEDGEABLE AND PROFESSIONAL
KNOWLEDGE OF THEIR DEPARTMENT
LOOKING OVER PLANS TO MAKE SURE ALL IS OK DURING INITIAL APPLICATION PROCESS
MAKE CUSTOMER FEEL AT EASE AND COMFORTABLE WHEN DISCUSSING PLANS
MAKE TIME TO ANSWER QUESTIONS
MAKING SURE ALL DOCUMENTS ARE SUBMITTED
MAKING SURE PERMITS ARE COMPLETED CORRECTLY
MOST STAFF MEMBERS ARE VERY THOROUGH & HELPFUL @ N. COUNTY OFFICE
N. COUNTY DOES A GOOD JOB OF HANDING PERMIT APPLICATIONS
NICE DURING APPLICATION PROCESS
NICE IN S. COUNTY
ORGANIZATION
PBC IS MORE ORGANIZED THAN OTHER MUNICIPALILITES. AND TREATS CONTRACTORS AND TIME AS IMPORTANT
PERMIT APPLICATION
PERMIT PROCESS EFFICIENT AND TIMELY
PERMIT REVIEW COMMENTS AND CHECKLISTS
PERSONAL SERVICE
PLAN REVIEW & PERMIT ISSUANCE IS MORE TIMELY
PLAN REVIEW @ N. COUNTY OFFICE
PLAN REVIEW IS QUICK W/DETAILED CORRECTIONS
PLAN REVIEW PERSONNEL WILL CALL OUR OFFICE WHEN THEY HAVE AN ISSUE VERSUS JUST PUTTING IT ON HOLD
PLAN REVIEW UPON INITIAL SUBMITTAL
PLAN REVIEWERS ARE ALWAYS ACCESSIBLE TO ANSWER QUESTIONS
PLAN REVIEWERS WORK QUICKLY
PLAN REVIEWING. CODE INFORMATION TO US. SUPERB PLAN REVIEWING, VERY PROFESSIONAL
PRECONSTRUCTION STAFF GIVES AN OUTLINE OF WHAT THEY ARE EXPECTING
PROCESSING PERMITS QUICKLY
PROCESSING THE AMOUNT OF PERMITS THEY DO
PROFESSIONAL AND COURTEOUS CUSTOMER SERVICE
PROFESSIONAL CUSTOMER SERVICE
PROMPT & EFFICIENT SERVICE
PROMPTLY RECEIVING AND REVIEWING THE PERMIT APPLICATIONS WHEN SUBMITTED
PROVIDES GREAT SERVICE WHEN STAFFED PROPERLY
PROVIDING INFORMATION
QUALIFIED AND ORGANIZED STAFF
QUICK SERVICE
QUICKER PROCESSING. TOO MANY DEPARTMENTS TO GO THROUGH BEFORE GETTING PERMIT THROUGH THE SYSTEM
RECORD DEPT. IS SUPERIOR IN THE AREA OF IMMEDIATE RESPONSE AND ACCURACY OF INFO PROVIDED
REPRESENTING THE COUNTY

REVIEW OF BUILDING PERMIT FOR BUILDING CODE ISSUES
S. COUNTY EMPLOYEES HELPFUL SOMETIME
S. COUNTY OFFICE IS ALWAYS FRIENDLY AND HELPFUL SERVICE
SERVICING APPLICANTS W/CONCERN FOR PROJECTS
SPEED BY WHICH PLANS ARE REVIEWED
SPEED OF TURNAROUND AND COURTEOUS COMMUNICATION
STAFF GIVES GOOD SERVICE
STAFF HANDLES PROBLEMS OUTSIDE THEIR OWN AREA WELL
STAFF IS FRIENDLY AND HELPFUL
TAKE OUR MONEY
TAKING APPLICATIONS
TAKING APPLICATIONS AND REVIEWING THEM
TAKING CARE OF PEOPLE IN A TIMELY MANNER
THE STAFF IS ABLE TO TELL WHAT ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IS NEEDED
THEIR KNOWLEDGE
THEY ARE HELPFUL AND PROFESSIONAL
THEY ARE KNOWLEDGEABLE
THEY ARE NOT VERY PRAGMATIC. DIRECT ACCESS TO THE TOP WHEN NEEDED
THEY CALL IF THERE IS A PROBLEM, PROBLEMS SOLVED QUICKLY
THEY DO ALL PHASES OF THEIR JOB WELL
THEY DO JOB IN A TIMELY & PROFESSIONAL MANNER
THEY GET QUESTIONS ANSWERED VERY QUICKLY
THEY TRY TO BE HELPFUL
TIMELY AND HELPFUL
TIMELY PROCESSING
TIMELY REVIEWS
TIMELY WITH LARGE WORKLOAD
TRACKING THE STATUS OF A PERMIT PACKAGE
TREATING YOU LIKE A CUSTOMER
TRY TO BE HELPFUL
TRY TO DO THEIR BEST
TRYING
TRYING TO KEEP UP WITH WORK LOAD
TURNAROUND TIME FOR PERMITS
USING VOICE MAIL INSTEAD OF ANSWERING THEIR CALLS
USUALLY PLEASANT AND HELPFUL
VERY HELPFUL IN GETTING THE PAPERWORK COMPLETED
VERY HELPFUL IN TALKING ABOUT PERMIT PROCESS
WORKING W/CONTRACTOR TO HAVE PLANS MEET CURRENT CODES

APPENDIX D. SUGGESTIONS FOR MAKING THE PERMITTING AND PLAN REVIEW PROCESSES BETTER

24 HOUR TURN OVER ON SUB PERMITS
ACCEPTING CREDIT CARDS, GIVE CUSTOMERS ACCESS, FOR A FEE, TO COPY MACHINE, SHOULD BE MONITORED BY CAMERAS TO WATCH STAFF
ADDITIONAL STAFF TO MAKE PERMIT REVIEW FASTER
ANSWER PHONE, RETURN CALLS
APPLY FOR PERMITS ON LINE
ASSIGN STAFF OUT OF COUNTY CONTRACTORS
BE CONSISTENT ON CODE CHANGES
BEING ABLE TO DROP OFF COMPLETED PERMIT APPLICATIONS WITHOUT HAVING TO WAIT
BETTER ACCESSIBILITY OF QUALIFIED TRADES INSPECTORS TO ANSWER QUESTIONS
BETTER AND MORE RAPID REVIEW ON ANY PROBLEMS W/REVIEWER AND RETURNING CALLS
BETTER ATTITUDE AND TREATMENT OF CONTRACTORS
BETTER COMMUNICATION-LIST ALL CORRECTIONS TOGETHER
BETTER ONLINE TRACKING OF PLAN REVIEW/UPDATE WEBSITE
BETTER RETURNING OF PHONE CALLS
BETTER TRACKING INFO WHERE PLAN IS DURING REVIEW. BETTER ESTIMATE OF TIME
BLDG. DEPT. SHOULD BE MORE ACCOUNTABLE FOR VERIFYING ARCHITECTURAL PLANS ARE DRAWN TO CODE AND MEETS ZONING REQUIREMENT
CALL CONTRACTOR WHEN PERMIT IS READY, IF THERE ARE COMMENTS LIST THEM ALL AT SAME TIME, ALL FIELD INSPECTORS SHOULD HAVE SAME REQUIREMENTS
CALL WHEN PERMITS ARE READY
CATCH PLAN ISSUES SOONER AND REVIEW PROMPTLY
CHANGE STAFF
CLEARLY STATE WHAT THE ARCH. OR ENG. NEEDS TO PROVIDE IN DETAIL ONCE PLANS HAVE BEEN REVIEWED- FIELD INSP. SHOULD ACCEPT THE REVIEW
CONSISTENCY
CONSISTENT KNOWLEDGE OF STAFF, UNDERSTAND NEW PROGRAMS PRIOR TO IMPLEMENTATION
COULD BE A LITTLE QUICKER
DEVELOP CONSISTENCY-THE REQUIREMENTS SEEMS TO CHANGE FROM ONE PERMIT TO THE NEXT
DO NOT NOTIFY OF IMPORTANT CHANGES SUCH AS INCREASES, CODE CHANGES, POLICY CHANGES
DO NOT SEND PARTS OF A SUBMITTED PACKAGE TO SATELLITE OFFICES
EACH AGENCY SHOULD KNOW WHAT CODE IS. MORE KNOWLEDGEABLE STAFF FOR REVIEWING
EDUCATE STAFF BETTER
EDUCATING THE STAFF TO BETTER SERVE THE PUBLIC
EDUCATION, CHECKLISTS, TIMELINES
ELIMINATE THE FOUR DAY WORK SCHED. STOP ROTATING SUPPORT STAFF
ELIMINATE THE SUBMISSION OF CODE APPROVAL FOR PRODUCTS JUST USED ON THE JOB SITE.
ELIMINATE T OWNER /BUILDERS NEEDING NOTICE OF COMMENCEMENT
EXPAND THE DECAL PROGRAM
EXPEDITE PERMITS CONSISTENTLY-TURNAROUND TIME VARIES TOO MUCH
EXPEDITE TIME TO PROCESS
FASTER PROCESS. ALSO NEEDS COMPREHENSIVE CHECKLISTS FOR PERMIT REQUIREMENTS
FASTER SERVICE AND EXPEDITION OF PERMITS
FASTER TURN AROUND TIMES ON PERMITS
FASTER TURNAROUND
FASTER TURNAROUND TIME
FOR THE SMALL SUBS, NOT HOLDING THE SPECS FOR SO LONG
GARAGE DOOR PERMITS, ALARM, WATER HEATER, OR AC CHANGE OUT- SHOULD BE WALK THRU
GET MORE EMPLOYEES

GET PERMITS OUT FASTER, NOTIFY US OF CODE CHANGE
GETTING DONE IN A MORE TIMELY FASHION
GIVING APPROXIMATE COMPLETION TIME OF IN-TAKE
GUIDELINES PRINTED IN BASIC NOT TECHNICAL FORMAT
HAVE PERMITS TECHS KNOW A LITTLE MORE ABOUT CODES
HIRE MORE PEOPLE
HIRE MORE PEOPLE TO SPEED UP PROCESS
HOLD DOWN TURNOVER OF CLERKS
IF ONE DEPT. IS BACKED UP, SEND PERMIT TO ANOTHER
IT SEEMS AS GOOD AS IT CAN GET- BUT STILL ROOM FOR IMPROVEMENT
KEEP BETTER TRACK OF THE APPLICATION AND PLANS BEING REVIEWED; EXPEDITE BETTER
KEEP GOING IN SAME DIRECTION
KEEP PEOPLE AT FRONT DESK KNOWLEDGEABLE
KEEP PRODUCT APPROVAL IN OFFICE SO WE DON'T HAVE TO MAKE SO MANY COPIES EVERY TIME WE SUBMIT AN APPLICATION
KEEPING PLAN REVIEW SPECS THE SAME INSTEAD OF ALWAYS CHANGING SPECS
LESS DEPARTMENTS
LESS PAPERWORK
LESS PAPERWORK AND SPEED UP TYPE 1 PERMIT PROCESSING
MAINTAIN FEES AT A LEVEL THAT WILL ENSURE RAPID PROCESSING, STANDARDIZE PERMIT APPLICATIONS
MAKE "TYPICAL" DRAWINGS OF HC CODE STRIPING AVAILABLE, SWALE CONSTRUCTION IN R.O.W., SIGNAGE REQUIREMENTS
MAKE ALL PRECONSTRUCTION LIKE S. COUNTY
MAKE FASTER
MAKE PLAN REVIEW TIME SHORTER
MAKE SOME APPLICATIONS, IE RE-ROOFING, ABLE TO BE APPLIED FOR ONLINE
MAKE STAFF MORE ACCESSIBLE
MEETING TARGET TURNAROUND TIME
MORE COMPLETE CHECK LIST FOR APPLICATION AND PERMIT PROCESS
MORE CONSISTENCY IN PLAN REVIEW-LESS INSIGNIFICANT CHANGES OR CORRECTIONS THAT HOLD UP PROCESS
MORE CONTRACTOR INFORMATION AT PLAN SUBMITTAL FOR ZLL PERMITS
MORE KNOWLEDGEABLE STAFF. MORE TRAINING
MORE ORGANIZATION AND BETTER GUIDELINES FOR STAFF
MORE PARKING SPACES AT AUSTRALIAN AVE.
MORE PERSONNEL AT THE COUNTER TO SPEED UP TIME
MORE PLAN REVIEWERS SO THAT PERMITS CAN BE ISSUED QUICKER
MORE PROCESSORS
MORE STAFF
MORE STAFF , EVERYTHING SHOULD BE ONLINE
MORE SUB OFFICES
MORE TIMELY PROCESSING- 3-4 WEEKS IS UNACCEPTABLE
MORE TIMELY/SPEED UP PROCESS
NEED MORE STAFF
NEW PERMIT APPS ARE DIFFICULT TO FILL OUT- GO BACK TO OLD ONES
NEW SIGN CODES NEED TO BE EXPLAINED TO PERMITTING STAFF. CALL TO CONFIRM WHETHER A BUSINESS IS SUBJECT TO MSP.
NOTIFY WHEN PERMIT IS READY
ON LINE PERMITS LIKE MARTIN COUNTY
OVER REGULATION- TOO MANY CHANGES OF RULES/CODES. THE PROTECTION OF THE PUBLIC HAS BECOME SECONDARY TO THE B&Z DEPTS.
PB GARDENS OPERATES FASTER AND WITH WAY LESS PEOPLE
PBC N. COUNTY IS OUTSTANDING

PEOPLE NEED TO BE AVAILABLE TO TALK TO AT ALL TIMES. BETTER TRAINING. BETTER DEPARTMENTAL COMMUNICATION
PERMIT APPS VIA FAX OR EMAIL, PROCESS FASTER, MORE ACCESSIBLE, IMMEDIATE FAX CORRECTIONS-SAVE TIME
PERMIT FEES ARE TOO HIGH. MORE THINGS SHOULD BE WALK THRU PERMITS (HURRICANE SHUTTERS)
PERMIT REVIEW SHOULD NOT GO IN DEPARTMENT SEQUENCE WHEN ONE DEPT. IS BACKED UP- IT SHOULD BE SENT TO ANOTHER DEPT. MEANWHILE
PHONE CALL IF PROBLEM IS FOUND IN PERMIT PACKAGE
PLAN REVIEW DOESN'T KNOW WHAT ZONING WANTS AND VICE VERSA. STAFF NEEDS TO BE BETTER EDUCATED AND PRODUCTIVE
PLAN REVIEW NOT TO NIT PICK PLANS JUST TO DENY THEM- MARK THEM UP AND SEND THEM ON
PLAN REVIEW PROCESS NEEDS TO BE EXPEDITED QUICKLY IN A PROFESSIONAL MANNER
PLAN REVIEW STAFF SHOULD TRYING TO MICR MANAGE THE REVIEW OF PRODUCT APPROVALS
PLANS NEED TO BE REVIEWED FASTER AND CORRECTIONS PROCESS QUICKER
PRIORITIZE BASED ON URGENCY. WE ARE IN NATURAL GAS AND REPLACE THINGS THAT ARE NECESSARY EVERYDAY
PROCESS APPLICATIONS FASTER
PROCESS PERMITS FASTER FROM 6 WEEKS TO 4 WEEKS.
PROCESS PERMITTING FASTER
PRODUCT APPROVAL, CHECKLIST ON PERMIT . NO NEED TO SUBMIT PRODUCT APPROVAL FOR EACH PERMIT WHEN ITS THE SAME PRODUCT PERMIT
PROMPTNESS
PROVIDE A WRITTEN CHECKLIST OF THE REQUIREMENTS NECESSARY TO OBTAIN A CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY
QUICKER FORWARDING FROM TECHS
RELEASE COMMENTS TO ENGINEER AS THEY ARE ADDRESSED TO ALLOW FOR FASTER TURN AROUND OR RESUBMITTALS
REPLACE THE ENTIRE STAFF
RETURNING PHONE CALLS WHEN LEFT WITH REVIEWER SO ISSUES CAN BE RESOLVED QUICKLY
REVIEW HELD UP FOR WEEKS-STAFF AND WEBSITE SHOULD BE ABLE TO OFFER EXPLANATION FOR THIS
SEND PERMITTING AND PLAN PROCEDURES TO CONTRACTORS ONCE A YEAR TO NOTIFY OF CHANGES
SIMPLER APPLICATIONS (RE-ROOFS) SHOULD BE HANDLED SEPARATELY THAN LENGTHIER ONES
SIMPLIFY SYSTEM & SPEED UP OUTPUT
SIMPLIFY THE FBC
SPEED IT UP. PLAN REVIEWERS NEED TO PICK UP PERMIT APPLICATION AND HAVE IT EXPEDITED QUICKER
SPEED UP A LITTLE
SPEED UP COMMERCIAL PLAN REVIEW
SPEED UP PROCESS
SPEED UP PROCESS AND WORK HARDER
SPEED UP PROCESS FOR SMALL JOB PERMITS
SPEED UP PROCESSING TIME
STOP USING ANY OTHER MANNER OF REVIEW EXCEPT WHAT CODE BOOK READS.
SUB STATION SHOULD BE SET UP TO HANDLE ANY AREA
TAKES AN AVG. OF 3 WEEKS TO GET A PERMIT FOR A SCREEN ENCLOSURE OR POOL FENCE. PRICES DOUBLED LAST YEAR W/ NO IMPROVEMENT IN SERVICE
TAKES TOO LONG FOR BUILDING PERMITS
THE HEALTH DEPT. IS BACKED UP AND SLOW
THEY NEED MORE PERMIT TECHS AND BETTER ATTITUDES-TAKES TOO LONG TO GET A PERMIT
TIME FRAME FROM ISSUING TO RECEIVING A PERMIT
TIMELY DETERMINATION OF PRODUCT APPROVAL ISSUES
TOO MUCH BOUNCING BETWEEN DEPARTMENTS ON BUILDING AND ZONING ISSUES. GIVE MORE

PEOPLE AUTHORITY TO BE ABLE TO MAKE A DECISION
USE STAFF TO IMPROVE PROCESS, THEY HAVE GOOD IDEAS
WALK THRU FOR SMALL PERMITS
WALK THRUS ON CERTAIN DAYS
WHEN A PERMIT APPL. GOES ON HOLD W/OPEN COMMENTS, THERE SHOULD BE A CONSISTENT FORM OF REPORTING THE INFO TO CONTRACTOR
WHEN A PERMIT IS IN ONE PLACE FOR TOO LONG THERE SHOULD BE A CHECK SYSTEM FOR IN & OUT
WHEN SUBMITTING PLANS MEET W/PLAN REVIEW FOR 10 MIN. TO GO OVER GENERAL CONCERNS
WHY HAVE A PLAN REVIEWER IF PE HAS STAMPED THE PRINTS. PLAN REVIEWER SHOULD ONLY LOOK AT NON-STRUCTURAL PARTS IF STAMPED BY PE

APPENDIX E. ONE THING FIELD INSPECTIONS IS DOING BEST.

ADHERING TO CODE COMPLIANCE AND CONSISTENCY TO PLANS
ADVISE US OF PROBLEMS AND WHAT HE WANTS FOR APPROVAL; THE SAME INSPECTOR COMES OUT MOST OF THE TIME
ALL CODES ARE TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION AND FOLLOWED AS THEY ARE WRITTEN DURING INSPECTION
ALLOWING CONTRACTORS TO CARRY MORE WEIGHT OF KNOWLEDGE OF THEIR DAY TO DAY ROUTINES (I.E. NAIL LETTERS)
ALLOWING FOLLOW UP OF SMALLER ITEMS THAT MAY BE MISSED FOR AN INSPECTION, SO DOESN'T HINDER PROGRESS
ALLOWING MINOR VIOLATIONS AND NOT HOLDING UP INSPECTIONS. PERMITTING CERTIFIED CONTRACTOR TO FIX VIOLATION W/OUT RETURN INSPECT
ALMOST ALL INSPECTIONS ARE NEXT DAY
ANSWERING QUESTIONS DURING CONSTRUCTION PROCESS
APPLICATIONS ARE ALWAYS ON REQUESTED DAY
APPOINTMENTS ARE KEPT, INSPECTORS ARE COURTEOUS AND KNOWLEDGEABLE
AVAILABLE IN AM FOR PHONE CALLS, TRY TO BE ACCOMMODATING WHEN POSSIBLE
BEING CONSISTENT
BEING THERE THE NEXT DAY
BUILDING INSPECTORS ARE HELPFUL AND SEEK TO KEEP A JOB MOVING.
CLEAR COMMUNICATION ON HOW TO REMEDY CORRECTION NOTICES
CODE COMPLIANCE
COMMENTS ON FAILED INSPECTIONS ARE CLEAR AND UNDERSTANDABLE, PHONE CALLS ARE RETURNED TIMELY
COMMUNICATE W/CUSTOMERS
COMMUNICATING THROUGH NEXTEL TO REINSURE EFFICIENCY
COMMUNICATING W/CONTRACTOR VIA PHONE 7-8 AM
COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE CONTRACTOR ON QUESTIONS AND ESTIMATES TIME OF ANNUAL COMPLETING SCHEDULED INSPECTIONS
COURTEOUS
COURTEOUS AND CONSISTENT
DOING INSPECTIONS WHEN THEY ARE SUPPOSE TO
DONE IN A TIMELY MANNER
ENFORCING CODER
ENFORCING NEW BUILDING CODES
FIELD INSP. USUALLY COME THE NEXT DAY. SOME INSPECTORS ARE PROFESSIONAL AND PROVIDE A REASONABLE TIME
FIELD INSPECTORS DO A GREAT JOB
FIELD INSPECTORS ANSWER PHONES IN THE AM. INSPECTORS ARE COURTEOUS AND PROFESSIONAL
FIELD INSPECTORS ARE UNPROFESSIONAL, CONFRONTATIONAL, VAGUE
FOLLOWING CODES
GENERALLY DO A GOOD JOB
GETTING OUT TO INSPECTIONS WHEN SCHEDULED
GETTING THERE IN A TIMELY MANNER
GETTING TO INSPECTIONS IN A TIMELY MANNER
GOOD ONE ON ONE COMMUNICATION
GIVING RED TAGS
GOOD AT EXPLAINING PROBLEMS, USUALLY SHOW UP WHEN THEY SAY THEY WILL HELP TO MOVE PROJECT FORWARD WITH TIMELY INFO AND SUGGESTIONS
HELPFUL WHENEVER I CALL

INSPECTING
INSPECTING WHEN SCHEDULED
INSPECTING WITHIN 24 HRS.
INSPECTIONS DONE IN TIMELY, EASY TO ACCESS RESULTS AND CORRECTIONS, INSPECTORS RESPONSIVE & HELPFUL
INSPECTION DONE WITHIN A DAY
INSPECTION REQUEST HANDLED WITHIN 24 HRS
INSPECTION RESULTS
INSPECTION W/IN 24 HRS
INSPECTIONS ARE ACCURATE
INSPECTIONS ARE FAIR AND CONSISTENT
INSPECTIONS CONDUCTED IN A TIMELY MANNER
INSPECTIONS DONE IN TIMELY MANNER
INSPECTIONS DONE NEXT DAY
INSPECTIONS DONE ON DAY SCHEDULED
INSPECTIONS DONE WITHIN 24 HRS
INSPECTORS ALWAYS SHOW ON DATE SCHEDULED
INSPECTORS ARE ACCOMMODATING WITH TIMELY INSPECTIONS, PROBS. ALWAYS SOLVED BY CHIEF
INSPECTORS ARE KNOWLEDGEABLE AND HELPFUL
INSPECTORS ARE PROPERLY TRAINED
INSPECTORS COMMUNICATION WITH THE CONTRACTOR
INSPECTORS SHOW UP ABOUT SAME TIME EVERY DAY
IT SEEMS INSPECTS ARE TRYING TO BE MADE ON THE SCHEDULED DAY
KEEPING TO SCHEDULED INSPECTION TIMES
KNOWING THIS TRADE
LEARNING ALL THE NEW CODES
MAKING SURE ALL REQUIREMENTS ARE MET
MEETING CUSTOMERS TIME SCHEDULE
MEETING W/CONTRACTOR ON
MOST INSPECTORS ARE FIELD ORIENTED
NEXT DAY INSPECTIONS
NOT ALL FIELD INSPECTORS ARE THE SAME. MOST ARE KNOWLEDGEABLE
NOT ROLLING INSPECTIONS W/OUT TELLING US
OFFERING TO RE-INSPECT BUT NO HOLD UP ON MINOR CORRECTIONS
ON TIME
OPEN TO CUSTOMER QUESTIONS AM OR PM
PERFORMING INSPECTIONS ON DAY SCHEDULED
PROFESSIONAL
PROFESSIONAL AND COURTEOUS
PROFESSIONAL & ACCURATE
PROMPT RESPONSE TO INSPECTION REQUESTS
PROMPT SERVICE
PROMPT TO SCHEDULE, INFORM OF UPDATES, MAKE THOROUGH INSPECTIONS
PROMPT WHEN CALLED FOR
PROVIDING INFORMATION TO PASS INSPECTION
PUTTING RESULT IN COMPUTER
REPRESENTING THE COUNTY'S INTEREST
RESULTS OF INSPECTION
RESULTS OF INSPECTIONS
SERVICE IN THE FIELD IS GOOD
SERVICE WITH A SMILE
SHOWING UP
SHOWING UP AS SCHEDULED

SHOWING UP FOR INSPECTION
SHOWING UP IN A REASONABLE TIME FRAME FOR SCHEDULE INSPECTIONS
SHOWING UP ON DATE SPECIFIED
SHOWING UP ON THE DAY OF INSPECTION
SHOWING UP WHEN SCHEDULED
SHOWING UP WHEN SCHEDULED, FAIR ABOUT MEETING THE CODES
SHOWING UP WHEN THEY SAY THEY WILL
SOME INSPECTORS ARE BETTER THAN OTHERS
SOME PERSONNEL TRY TO WORK WITH YOU
SPENDING MORE TIME AT JOB SITE TO COMPLETE INSPECTIONS
TELLING TIME OF INSPECTION
THEIR JOB
THEIR DOING THEIR JOB
THEIR KNOWLEDGE OF CODES
THEY ARE ABLE TO PERFORM A NUMBER OF INSPECTIONS DAILY
THEY ARE CONSIDERATE AND ACCOMMODATING
THEY ARE PROFESSIONAL
THEY ATTEMPT TO BE FAIR AND IMPARTIAL AND PROVIDE A GENERALLY ACCEPTABLE INTERPRETATION OF FLORIDA CODE
THEY DO A GREAT JOB
THEY KNOW THE WRITTEN CODE
THEY PROVIDE THE PROPER INFORMATION ON THE CORRECTION NOTICES SO MULTIPLE TRIPS ARE NOT REQUIRED
THEY SHOW UP THE DAY OF THE INSPECTION
THEY TRY TO DO THE BEST JOB
THOROUGH INSPECTIONS FIRST TIME OUT SO ALL ISSUES CAN BE CORRECTED
TIMELY
TIMELY AND REASONABLE INSPECTIONS
TIMELY INSPECTIONS
TIMELINESS OF INSPECTION
TRYING
TRYING TO GET RID OF BAD INSPECTIONS-
UNDERSTANDING DIFFICULTIES IN DEALING WITH SYSTEM
USUALLY COOPERATIVE W/TIMING; GOOD COMMUNICATION
USUALLY THOROUGH, HELPFUL, INFORMATIVE, AND ACCURATE
VERY KNOWLEDGEABLE IN CODES
VERY PROFESSIONAL
VERY TIMELY AND WELL ORGANIZED
WILLING TO WORK WITH THE CONTRACTOR
WORKING WELL WITH BUILDERS ON CONSTANTLY CHANGING CODE ISSUES
WORKING WITH THE BUILDER AND NOT AGAINST
WORKING WITH US IN THE FIELD IN READING NEW CODES

APPENDIX F. SUGGESTIONS FOR MAKING FIELD INSPECTIONS PROCESS BETTER

A WAY TO FIND OUT A TIME ON SITE FOR INSPECTIONS
A WEBSITE WHERE YOU CAN TRACK THE INSPECTOR TO APPRX. INSPECTION TIME. DAD HAS THIS SERVICE ON THEIR WEBSITE
ABILITY TO REQUEST AM OR PM APPOINTMENTS OR ABILITY TO CALL INSPECTOR ON CELL PHONE
ALLOW FOR A PLACE ON INSPECTION SHEET FOR DIRECTIONS TO THE JOB AND OR PERMIT
ALLOWING CONTRACTOR TO PROGRESS WITH CERTAIN PARTS OF THE PROCESS WHILE CORRECTION ITEMS ARE BEING ADDRESSED
AM OR PM APPOINTMENTS
AM OR PM INSPECTION
ATTITUDE OF INSPECTORS NEED TO IMPROVE
BE AVAILABLE FOR PHONE CALLS IN THE TIME PERIOD ALLOTTED
BE CLEARER ON REASONS PERMIT FAILS
BE CONSISTENT AND NOT ADD TO RE-INSPECTION LIST
BE CONSISTENT, KEEP SAME GROUP OF INSPECTORS ON EACH PROJECT
BE MORE AVAILABLE TO ANSWER PHONES, BETTER COMMUNICATION
BE ON TIME AND KEEP INSPECTION DATES
BE PROFESSIONAL AND COURTEOUS TO CONTRACTORS IN THE FIELD AND HAVE LESS INSPECTORS W/ATTITUDE
BETTER COMMUNICATION BETWEEN INSPECTORS AND CONTRACTORS
BETTER COMMUNICATION WITH INSPECTOR ON DAY OF INSPECTION
BETTER COMMUNICATION. THE ABILITY TO WORK WITH CONTRACTOR
BETTER COMMUNICATIONS, STOP MAKING FIELD CALLS BUT STAY WITH THE CODE BOOK, EACH INSPECTOR HAS OWN WAY- MORE CONSISTENT
BETTER HUMAN RELATIONS
BUILDERS SHOULD BE NOTIFIED AHEAD OF TIME
CARRY A LADDER FOR INSPECTIONS
CELL PHONE ACCESSIBLE
CHOICE OF AM OR PM INSPECTION AND ABILITY TO PHONE INSPECTOR DURING THE DAY
COMPUTERIZE INSPECTION ON A REAL TIME BASIS
CONSISTENCY AMONG INSPECTORS
CONSISTENCY BETWEEN INSPECTORS
CONSISTENCY WITH CODES
CONTRACTOR NEEDS TO BE ABLE TO COMMUNICATE W/INSPECTOR MID MORNING/MIDDAY IF PROBLEMS OCCUR FOR THE CONTRACTOR
CREATE CHECK LIST FOR MAJOR BUILDING INSPECTIONS TO HELP FIRST TIME PASSES HAPPEN
DECIDE ON A PLACE FOR PERMIT. JOBS HAVE BEEN FAILED BECAUSE INSPECTOR LOOKED FOR PERMIT IN WRONG PLACE
DECREASE THE INTERVAL BETWEEN RE-INSPECTIONS BY GIVING CONTRACTORS INFORMATION QUICKER
DIFFERENT INSPECTORS CITE DIFFERENT THINGS
DO A COMPLETE INSPECTION
DO NOT USE BCV TELL WHAT REASON IT FAILED
EARLY NOTIFICATION OF CANCELLED INSPECTIONS
EASIER TO READ CORRECTION NOTICES & CALL TO BUILDER WITH TIME OF INSPECTION WITHIN HALF HOUR OF TIME
ELECTRICAL INSPECTIONS NOW REQUIRE A WAIVER. THIS CAUSES DELAYS. HIRE ADDITIONAL ELECTRICAL INSPECTORS ARE NOT HELPFUL AT ALL
ELECTRICAL INSPECTORS ARE AVAILABLE IN AM FOR CALLS, OTHER TRADES NOT SO AVAILABLE. BETTER ESTIMATES FOR INSPECTIONS SHOW TIME
EXPAND DECAL PROGRAM

FIELD INSPECTORS INSTEAD OF FAILING AN INSPECTION SHOULD CONSULT A SUPERVISOR.
FIELD STAFF SEEMS PRESSED FOR TIME-DIFFICULT TO SPEAK TO INSPECTOR, PHONES OFTEN BUSY AND DON'T RETURN PHONE CALLS
GET RID OF INCOMPETENT INSPECTORS
GET RID OF VIGILANTLY INSPECTORS. SOME OF THEIR ATTITUDES ARE UNWARRANTED
GET TIME OF INSPECTION WITHIN 2 HR. TIME FRAME.
GIVE APPROX. TIME OF INSPECTION
GIVE BETTER WINDOW OF TIME OF INSPECTION-BETTER ATTITUDE
GIVING AN OPTION OF AM OR PM INSPECTIONS FOR HOMEOWNERS WHO MUST BE PRESENT AT INSPECTION
HAVE INSPECTION PROCEDURES TO MATCH REQUIRED JOBS
HAVE ONE INSPECTOR ASSIGNED TO EACH PROJECT
HAVE PERMIT PROCESSING BY AWARE WHAT INSPECTORS ARE LOOKING FOR
HAVE SAME INSPECTOR COME BACK FOR CORRECTIONS
HIRE MORE STAFF
I WOULD APPRECIATE A TIME PREFERENCE. FOR EX: AM INSPECTION 9:30-12 OR PM 1-4
IF INSPECTION IS FAILED, NOTIFICATION SHOULD BE W/IN 24 HRS.
IF THERE IS A CHANGE IN THE CODE, WE SHOULD BE INFORMED.
IMPROVE TELEPHONE COMMUNICATIONS FOR APPROX INSPECTION TIMES
INSPECTORS SHOULD CALL AND EXPLAIN WHY INSPECTION FAILED. AUTOMATED ONLY TELLS WHETHER PASS/FAIL NOT WHY; HARD TO TALK TO PERSON
INSPECTION TIME FRAMES NEED TO BE SMALLER SO I CAN BE THERE WITH INSPECTOR
INSPECTIONS NEED TO BE DONE IN COORDINATION WITH CONTRACTORS TIME AVAILABLE- TOO MUCH TIME WASTED WAITING FOR INSPECTORS
INSPECTIONS NOT COMPLETED IF INSPECTOR FINDS PROBLEM; INSPECTOR SHOULD COMPLETE INSPECTION SO IS AWARE OF EVERYTHING TO BE FIXED
INSPECTOR CONSISTENCY, UNIFORM IMPLEMENTATION OF NEW PROGRAMS, DON'T ADD ITEMS AFTER INITIAL INSPECT
INSPECTOR SHOULD CALL IF NOT COMING
INSPECTOR SHOULD NOT MAKE ANY ASSUMPTIONS
INSPECTOR SITES INFRACTION ONLY AT HAS DISCRETION AND CODE INTERPRETATION
INSPECTORS CAN BE A LITTLE MORE POLITE AT TIMES AND COULD BE IN LESS OF A HURRY AND ANSWER MORE QUESTIONS
INSPECTORS HAVE POOR ATTITUDE. SHOULD BE ABLE TO TELL CONTRACTOR ARRIVAL TIME WITHIN 2 HRS. INTERNET SCHEDULING WOULD BE GOOD
INSPECTORS LACK CONSISTENCY IN TERMS OF INTERPRETATION OF CODE
INSPECTORS NEED CONTINUITY
INSPECTORS NEED TO BE UP TO DATE ON CODE CHANGES
INSPECTORS NEED TO CLEARLY STATE PROBLEM TO REMEDY FAILED INSPECTIONS
INSPECTORS NEED TO USE MORE COMMON SENSE AND FRIENDLIER TO CONTRACTORS
INSPECTORS NEED TO WRITE CORRECTIONS MORE LEGIBLY
INSPECTORS SHOULD ALL BE ON SAME PAGE
INSPECTORS SHOULD KNOW WHAT THEY ARE AT THE JOB TO INSPECT, NEED TO BE MORE PROFESSIONAL
INSPECTORS SHOULD NOT DISAGREE WITH THE ENGINEER OF RECORDS. INSPECTORS SHOULD BE THE SAME AND CONSISTENT
INSPECTORS SHOULD UNDERSTAND THEY WORK WITH THE BUILDERS AND FOR THE COUNTY- TOO ONE SIDED
INSPECTORS SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO USE THEIR OWN JUDGMENT INSTEAD OF HAVING TO FOLLOW ENGINEERING TO EVERY DETAIL
INSPECTORS TO COMMUNICATE BETTER ON CORRECTION NOTICES, UNIFORM INSPECTIONS, NO MORE INCOMPLETE INSPECTIONS
INSPECTORS TREAT CONTRACTORS POORLY. COMMENT CARDS SHOULD BE AVAILABLE ON THE WEB
INTERNET SCHEDULING OF INSPECTIONS

KEEP GOING IN SAME DIRECTION
KEEP SAME INSPECTOR FOR RE-INSPECTIONS
KEEP SAME INSPECTOR ON SAME JOB FOR AT LEAST A YEAR
KEEP UP WITH CODES
KNOW WHAT PRODUCT YOU ARE INSPECTING
KNOWING TIME OF DAY THEY ARE COMING
LEARN MORE ABOUT LARGE MECHANICAL SYSTEM, PIPING SYSTEMS
LEAVE SOME DISCRETION TO CONTRACTORS TO CORRECT VIOLATIONS AND IMPROVE TIMING OF JOB SCHEDULE
LESS INSPECTIONS
LIST ALL CORRECTIONS THE 1ST RED TAG, HAVE SAME INSPECTOR RE-INSPECT
LOCAL INSPECTORS
LOOK AT PLAN DETAILS CLOSER
MAINTAINING CONSISTENCY
MAKE CORRECTION INFO AVAILABLE ON AUTOMATED SYSTEM
MAKE IT EASIER TO TALK TO INSPECTORS CALLING BEFORE 7:30. THEY SHOULD HAVE CELL PHONES AND ANSWER ALL TIME
MAKE REACHING THE INSPECTIONS FOR A TIME FRAME
MAKE SURE INSPECTOR SIGNS PERMIT CARD
MEET ALL SCHEDULED INSPECTIONS
MORE DETAIL ON CORRECTION NOTICE
MORE DETAIL ON FAILURE NOTICES
MORE DETAIL ON INSPECTION FORM
MORE QUALIFIED INSPECTORS
MORE TIMELY AND FRIENDLY
NARROW INSPECT TIME DOWN
NARROW INSPECTION TIMES
NARROW TIME RANGE OF INSPECTION
NEED A PERSON TO FIND OUT INSPECTOR ASSIGNED OR A MESSAGE CENTER TO ENTER ADDITIONAL INFO ABOUT A SCHEDULED INSPECTION
NEED MORE CONSISTENCE IN HOW THEY APPLY THEIR CODE. NEED TO COMMUNICATE W/THEM DURING THE DAY- NOT JUST 7-8 AM
NEED MORE TIME TO SPEND WITH FIELD INSPECTORS
NEED TO BE ABLE TO GET A HOLD OF INSPECTORS AND STAFF. COMMUNICATE W/PUBLIC
NEVER KNOW WHAT TIME INSPECTORS ARE GOING TO BE THERE
ON BIG FENCE JOBS HAVE THEM LOOK HARDER FOR PERMITS
ONCE PLANS HAVE BEEN REVIEWED, INSPECTORS SHOULD NOT REQUEST MORE DETAILS UNLESS THERE IS A NOTICEABLE CHANGE
PASS MORE OFTEN
PROMPT INSPECTION, LESS ADVERSARIAL
PROVIDE AM OR PM TIMES FOR INSPECTIONS
PROVIDE CELL PHONE & CONSISTENCY IN INSPECTIONS
PROVIDE LAP TOP TO INSPECTORS FOR VIOLATION TRACKING
PROVIDE PASS PENDING INSPECTIONS
PROVIDE SCHEDULED INSPECTIONS
RETURNING CALLS WITHIN 24HRS.
SEND OUT 2 MEN & CARRY THEIR OWN LADDERS
SHORTEN TIME FRAME OF INSPECTION TIME
SHOULD BE ABLE TO GIVE APPROX. INSPECTION TIME, BE MORE COURTEOUS, AND CALL IF CAN'T MAKE IT
SHOULD BE ABLE TO SCHED. AM OR PM APPOINTMENTS
SOME INSPECTORS ARE CONFRONTATIONAL
SOME INSPECTORS HAVE THEIR OWN AGENDA AND INTERPRETATION OF CODES
SOMEONE IN THE OFFICE TO TAKE CALLS AFTER THEY LEAVE IN THE AM. FAX INFORMATION SO WE DON'T HAVE TO DEPEND ON AM PHONE MEETINGS

STICK TO THE CODES AND HAVE INSPECTORS KNOWLEDGEABLE
STOP INTERJECTING PERSONAL THOUGHTS DURING INSPECTION. CHECK ENTIRE JOB WHILE THERE. TREAT CONTRACTORS BETTER
STOP MIAMI PRODUCT CONTROLS, PBC IS STILL ASKING FOR COMPLIANCE WITH MIAMI
STREAMLINE ELECTRICAL INSPECTIONS. TOO RESTRICTIVE ON LARGER PROJECTS
SUGGESTIONS INVOLVE INSPECTORS: ATTITUDE, PROFESSIONALISM, RESPECT, COURTEOUSLY, ACCOUNTABILITY
TAKE A CELL PHONE AND #'S OF CONTRACTORS TO CALL FROM SITE OF THEIR ARE PROBLEMS BEFORE RED TAGGING SOMETHING
TAKE TIME AND REVIEW THINGS CAREFULLY SO ALL THINGS ARE TAKEN CARE OF THE FIRST TIME
TEAM NEEDS TO READ PLANS, BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF CODES, ARRANGE BETTER SCHEDULING SYSTEM, CALL IF NOT GOING TO MAKE IT
THE AUTOMATED INSPECTION SYSTEM DOES NOT ALWAYS WORK, IS NOT UPDATED, ADN NEEDS IMPROVEMENT
THE COUNTY IS EXCELLENT-SOME OF THE INCORPORATED AREAS ARE LACKING
THE FIELD INSPECTORS SHOULD ATTEND OUR ASSOCIATION MEETINGS AND INDUSTRY TRAINING EVENTS
THE FIELD PEOPLE ARE OK, BUT THE PAPERWORK BACKUP FOR THEM IS SUBSTANTIAL IN THE AMOUNT OF TIME REQUIRED FOR C-O..
THEY DO A PLUS PROCESS3
THEY SHOULD HAVE CELL PHONES THAT CONTRACTORS CAN CALL. THEY SHOULD BE ABLE TO MAKE APPTS. OR CALL TO RESCHED.
TIME INSPECTOR WILL BE AT SITE
TOO MUCH RUN AROUND IN THE DEPT., INSPECTORS ARE NOT AT THEIR PHONES
TRY TO BE CONSISTENT IN CODE INTERPRETATIONS
TRY TO GIVE AN APPROX. TIME FOR INSPECTIONS
USE SAME INSPECTOR FOR RE-INSPECTION
USE SAME INSPECTOR ON RE-INSPECTION
VOICE MAILS WITH INSPECTORS- HAVE A HARD TIME REACHING THEM
WORKING WITH CONTRACTORS TO FACILITATE BUILDING PROGRESS.
WRITE CLEARLY ON INSPECTION FORMS-VIEW ENTIRE JOB AND LIST PROBS. SO ALLL CORRECTIONS CAN BE FIXED AT ONCE
WRITE LEGIBLY ON PERMIT THE EXACT REASON FOR PERMIT FAILURE
YELLOW TAGS ARE HARD TO READ, RE-INSPECT COULD BE AVOIDED IF PHONE # AVAILABLE AT JOB TO CALL AND DISCUSS TAG

APPENDIX G. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

A LIAISON BETWEEN CONTRACTORS AND BUILDING DIVISION TO RESOLVE PROBS. MAKE PRE-INSPECTION VISITS ON REMODELS & VIOLATIONS
A NEUTRAL PARTY SHOULD MAKE CODE INTERPRETATIONS. INSPECTORS NEED TO BE MORE UNIFIED WITH CODES AND INSPECTIONS
ALL PRODUCTS SHOULD BE APPROVED PRIOR TO SALE, THIS WOULD REDUCE PAPERWORK AND SPEED UP REVIEW TIME
ALLOW FOR AM OR PM INSPECTIONS, SCHEDULE ONLINE INSPECTIONS, PERMIT STAFF ARE GOOD, INSPECTORS ARE MOSTLY RUDE AND ARROGANT
AS A CONTRACTOR I AM LIMITED TO GOING ALONG WITH THE PROGRAM AND PASSING COSTS TO THE OWNER, THIS LEADS TO FRAUD AND FLY BY NIGHTS
BAD ATTITUDE BY PEOPLE IN THE BUILDING DEPT., TOO MANY LAWS AND CODES THAT LIMIT CONTRACTORS ABILITY TO PROFIT
BE MORE COURTEOUS AND HELPFUL. NEED TO BE BETTER LISTENERS
BETTER SYSTEM OF PUTTING PRODUCT APPROVAL IN THE PLAN SETS. CERTIFIED ARCHITECTS/ENGINEERS BE TRUSTED WHEN SPECIFY PRODUCT APPROVAL
CERTAIN PRODUCTS NOT ALLOWED IN PBC WHICH HAS MADE OBTAINING CERTAIN PERMITS IMPOSSIBLE. PBC IS BECOMING AS BAD AS BROWARD AND MIAMI
CHIEF BUILDING OFFICIAL SHOULD SEEK OUTSIDE EXPERTISE, PLACING MANUFACTURERS SPECS FOR TIE DOWN DEVICE AND REQUIRING ENGINEER TO SEAL THEM
CODE REQUIREMENTS SHOULD BE STANDARDIZED BETWEEN COUNTIES
COOPERATION IN PBC VERY GOOD. BUILDERS AND COUNTY PROFESSIONALS NEED TO WORK TOGETHER AND ENJOY THE GROWTH
EVERY WEEK SOMETHING NEW-PLANS DENIED WITH NO NOTICE TO CONTRACTOR AS WHAT THEY DENY-SAME WITH PRODUCT APPROVAL
EXCESSIVE TIME IN ERRORS BY PBCBD COSTS MORE MONEY. INSPECTORS DO NOT FOLLOW CODES THE SAME. HEALTH PERMIT DIV. THE WORST.
FIELD EMPLOYEES ARE GREAT, OFFICE PERSONNEL NOT AS GOOD
FOR THE MOST PART EXPERIENCES HAVE BEEN GOOD W/BUILDING DEPT. EXCEPT SOME MIS INFO THAT CAUSES DELAY AND MONEY, AND FIELD INSPECTORS. EXCEPT BRUCE MEYERS
GARAGE DOOR PERMITS SHOULD BE WALK THRU WITH PROPER PAPERWORK & RETRO FOR APPLICATIONS. FEE CHARGING PER DOOR IS UNFAIR
GREAT JOB IN S. COUNTY
HAVE FIRE REVIEW PEOPLE GET ON THE SAME PAGE AS THE BUILDING DEPT.-INCONSISTENT
HELP CONTRACTORS DO A BETTER JOB INSTEAD OF JUST POINTING OUT SHORTCOMINGS
IF INSPECTOR CAN'T COME IN THEY SHOULD MAKE A PHONE CALL, SHOULD TRY AND STAY ON SCHEDULE OR CALL
IF WORK IS DONE CORRECTLY, NOBODY HAS PROBLEMS
IMPLEMENT REASONABLE COMMUNICATION TOOLS TO ELIMINATE UNNECESSARY TRAVEL TO BUILDING DEPT.
INSPECTION STAFF IS EASY TO REACH BY PHONE. PHONES VERY HELPFUL
INSPECTORS ARE INCONSISTENT AND VARY GREATLY. THE PLAN REVIEW PROCESS IS GENERALLY QUICK. IT IS ALSO GOOD THAT FIELD REVISIONS ARE DONE BY ARCHS. & CONTRACTORS
INSPECTORS DON'T RETURN CALLS
INSPECTORS NEED TO BE ROTATED. IF INSPECTION IS FAILED THEY SHOULD TELL YOU WHAT TO FIX
INSPECTORS SHOULD NOT TALK TO HOMEOWNERS ABOUT CONTRACTORS. ALSO, THE SAME INSPECTORS SHOULD CONDUCT RE-INSPECTIONS
ISSUES RELATED TO PERMIT REVIEWS SHOULD BE ADDRESSED DURING & BEFORE A PERMIT IS ISSUED TO PREVENT JOB DELAY
JOE SHERPITS, CHIEF STRUCTURAL INSPECTOR IS A GREAT PROBLEM SOLVER//LYNN KIRK IS THE BEST FIRE INSPECTOR

LEAVE MIAMI DADE AND ALL OTHER PRODUCT APPROVAL FORMS OUT OF THE BUILDING PACKAGE, USE AFFIDAVIT FORM LIKE PT. ST. LUCIE
LIKE ABILITY TO DOWN LOAD DRAWINGS
MAIN OFFICE PEOPLE NEED TO BE MORE PROFESSIONAL, KNOWLEDGEABLE, AND NICER
MANY OF PEOPLE SPOKEN TO ON THE PHONE NEED BETTER CUSTOMER SERVICE SKILLS
MOST OF THE PROBLEMS LIE W/INSPECTOR'S RANDOM INTERPRETATION OF CODES. ALSO VARYING DEGREES OF INCONSISTENCY AT PLAN REVIEW
NEW & UPDATED PERMIT APPLICATION, PLACE ON PERMIT TO PUT PRODUCT APPROVAL INSTEAD OF SUBMITTING PAPERWORK FOR EACH PERMIT, TYPE 1 PERMITS SHOULD BE ONE DAY TURNAROUND
NEW PERMIT FEE IS OUTRAGEOUS
NEW PRODUCT APPROVAL SYSTEM HAS CAUSED SHORT TERM DISRUPTION IN APPROVAL PROCESS
NOT READY FOR NEW STATE BUILDING CODE
ON MORE THAN ONE OCCASION, PERMIT APPS HAVE BEEN SENT TO WRONG DEPT. AND GETTING SOMEONE ON THE PHONE MADE THE PROCESS LONGER
ONE OF OUR SUPPLIES (ELITE ALLUMINUM) HAD TROUBLE W/ PRODUCT APPROVAL WHICH SLOWED US DOWN& CAUSED PROBS.
OTHER THAN MINOR INSPECTOR PROBLEMS, PBC IS ONE OF THE BEST TO DEAL WITH
OVERALL I HAD GOOD EXPERIENCE
OVERALL PBC DOES GOOD JOB. THEY ARE USUALLY TIMELY AND WILLING TO CALL BACK AND TALK ABOUT PROBLEMS
OVERALL PBC HAS THE BEST SYSTEM IN PLACE
OVERALL, EXCELLENT JOB GIVEN WORKLOAD
PBC FEES ARE TOO HIGH AND SERVICE NOT GOOD.
PBC INSPECTORS RATE HIGH ABOVE OTHER CITIES
PBC IS BEST TO PULL PERMITS. ELECTRICAL INSPECTORS ARE MOST INCONSISTENT IN INSPECTIONS. ALWAYS A DIFFERENT INSPECTOR. NO CONTINUITY
PBC IS BETTER THAN ANY OTHER CITY IN TRI COUNTY AREA. SHORTEN THE PERMIT REVIEW PROCESS
PBC STAFF AND BUILDING DEPT ARE GREAT EMPLOYEES, WE ARE WELL TREATED
PEOPLE ON 1ST FLOOR DON'T SEEM KNOWLEDGEABLE REGARDING NEEDS OF PERMIT APPLIC. AND HAVE NO IDEA ABOUT OTHER DEPTS.. PLANS FOR REVISIONS TAKE WAY TOO LONG
PLAN REVIEWERS COST CONTRACTORS MONEY BY HAVING US DO UNNECESSARY PAPERWORK OR ADD MATERIAL ON THE JOB
PRODUCT APPROVAL IS A WASTE OF TIME AND PAPER
PRODUCT APPROVAL SHOULD BE COUNTY AND STATE WIDE AND ONLY NEED REF. # OF PRODUCT TO BE USED
PRODUCT APPROVALS SHOULD BE WITH PLAN REVIEWS AND APPLICATION SHOULD ONLY INDICATE WHICH PRODUCT IS TO BE USED
ROLAND HOLT AND STAFF VERY ACCESSIBLE AND PRAGMATIC WHILE MAINTAINING HIGH STANDARD
SEEMS TO TAKE TOO LONG
SETBACK REQUIREMENTS FOR SOLID ROOFS SHOULD BE DIFFERENT THEN THE MAIN HOUSE STRUCTURE
SINCE ANDREW, BUILDING BECOME TOO TECHNICAL AND EXPENSIVE
SOME FIELD INSPECTORS FAIL DUE TO OVERLOOKING DETAILS ON APPROVAL PLAN. INSPECTOR SHOULD CALL CONTRACTOR FROM SITE TO SAVE TIME
STRONGLY SUGGEST AN ONLINE PERMIT PROCESS LIKE MARTIN COUNTY. EXPAND AUTOMATED INSPECTION SCHED. TIMES
STAFF IN THE INSPECTION OFFICE ARE GOD AND HELPFUL/INSPECTORS SEEM TO BE OVER WORKED
SUB OFFICE AT THE B&Z BUILDING AT PBIA. ALSO MORE UNLICENSED PEOPLE NEED TO BE PROSECUTED.
SYSTEM IS CLEAR AND EASY TO FOLLOW
SYSTEM IS WASTEFUL. PLANS ARE OVER DOCUMENTED. TOO MUCH PAPERWORK. TOO MANY

LAWYERS, PROCESS TOO LONG
THE AUTOMATED INSPECTION SYSTEM IS VERY SIMPLE AND EFFECTIVE
THE BUILDING DEPT. SHOULD HELP TO MOVE PROJECTS ALONG AND WORK WITH CONTRACTORS AND SUBS
THE FEE FOR PERMITS TO DO HURRICANE SHUTTERS IS NOW 150. FOR FIRST 20 OPENINGS, NOT 2% OF CONTRACT COST- THAT IS WRONG. BEFORE PRICE INCREASE PERMITS WERE APPROVED FASTER
THE PERCENTAGE SYSTEM WAS MUCH MORE FAIR THAN THE INCREASED PERMIT FEES THAT HAVE BEEN IMPLEMENTED
THIS PROGRAM SEEMS TO BE MISUNDERSTOOD BY EVERYONE INVOLVED- REGROUP/RE-IMPLEMENT
TIME PERMIT APPLICATIONS TO APPROVAL NEEDS TO BE SPEED UP
TOO MUCH PAPERWORK
TOO MUCH TO GET INTO
TROUBLE HAVING QUESTIONS ANSWERED IN THE BUILDING DEPARTMENT, COSTS TIME AND MONEY
TYPE 2 PERMITS ARE RARELY IN PLAN REVIEW AFTER 6 WEEKS- CALLS SHOULD BE GIVEN TO CONTRACTOR WHEN A HOLD IS PLACED
VIEW OF RESULTS AND PERMIT PROCESS SHOULD BE ON INTERNET IN REAL TIME. COMMUNICATE W/ INSPECTOR VIA EMAIL SHOULD BE
WE APPRECIATE S. PALM BEACH BRANCH TO FILL PERMITS
WE ARE VERY PLEASED W/EFFICIENCY OF PBCBD
WE NEED SEWER TREATMENT PLANTS. ADVANCE TECHNOLOGY TO SOLVE OUR PROBLEMS
WHY DO WE STILL DROP OFF 2 SETS OF PRODUCT APPROVALS WITH EACH RE-ROOF. MASTER COPIES SHOULD BE ON FILE
WHY FOR THE SAME PRODUCT DO WE KEEP GETTING DELAYED? I PUT THE REQ. DOCUMENTATION IN THE PERMIT PACKAGE FOR THE SAME PRODUCT AND THOSE PERMITS TAKE MUCH LONGER TO BE APPROVED