

Report to the Environmental Review Commission

Pursuant to S.L. 2014-120, Sec. 29 REFORM AGENCY REVIEW OF ENGINEERING WORK

January 14, 2015

Name of Local Government Unit: *Type name*

Approved/delegated program subject to reporting requirements:

☐ Sedimentation/erosion control

☐ Stormwater

☒ Water/sewer

☒ Cross-connection

☐ 401 certifications

☐ Other *Type program name*

Joseph C. Wilson, PE

Signature of report preparer

January 14, 2015

Date

*Submit this report electronically to Mariah Matheson, Commission Assistant,
Environmental Review Commission, at Mariah.Matheson@ncleg.net.*

Name of local government unit: City of Charlotte, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Utility Department,
Installation and Development Services Division

***Please attach any written procedures that may have been developed to implement the provisions of this law.*

☒ Check to indicate that this plan review program implemented procedures whereby plan reviewers distinguish between plan changes that are required by statutory or other legal authority and those that the reviewer offers as suggestions for improvement. Refer to S.L. 2014-120, Section 29.(b)(1) for further details about this requirement.

☒ Check to indicate that this plan review program identifies the statutory or regulatory authority for any revisions or requests for additional information that are required by the program in order to grant the requested plan permit, approval, or license. Refer to S.L. 2014-120, Section 29.(b)(2) for further details about this requirement.

☒ Check to indicate that this plan review program implemented procedures for local governments to follow when (1) a Professional Engineer submits a sealed design or practice that is not in the local government's guidance, manuals, or standard operating procedures, and (2) the submitting Professional Engineer requests additional internal review of that design or practice. Refer to S.L. 2014-120, Section 29.(c)(1) for further details about this requirement.

☒ Check to indicate that this plan review program established a procedure whereby the plan reviewer's supervisor OR the approving/delegating state agency can provide further review and oversight of these design details. Refer to S.L. 2014-120, Section 29.(c)(1) for further details about this requirement.

☒ Check to indicate that this plan review program either employs a Professional Engineer who can conduct further review of these innovative designs, or maintains a list of consulting Professional Engineers of the local government unit's choice that may conduct this review, if requested by and paid for by the submitting Professional Engineer. Refer to S.L. 2014-120, Section 29.(c)(1) for further details about this requirement.

☒ Check to indicate that this plan review program established an informal internal process to address disputes when a plan reviewer identifies a change to the plans as being "required" under a specific, identified legal authority. Refer to S.L. 2014-120, Section 29.(c)(2) for further details about this requirement.

☒ Check to indicate that this plan review program discontinued use of the word "engineer" in the job titles of all program employees whose responsibilities include review of plans in affected programs, *unless* those employees hold Professional Engineer licenses. Refer to S.L. 2014-120, Section 29.(h) for

further details about this requirement.

Name of local government unit: Ty City of Charlotte, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Utility Department, Installation and Development Services Division

☒ Check to indicate that this plan review program reviewed the titles of all employees conducting plan reviews for this program. Refer to S.L. 2014-120, Section 29.(h)(1) for further details about this requirement.

☒ Check to indicate that this plan review program proposed revisions to those employees' job titles in order to eliminate use of the word "engineer" when publicly identifying those employees, if those employees do not hold Professional Engineer licenses. Refer to S.L. 2014-120, Section 29.(h)(2) for further details about this requirement.

Additional information:

1. Implantation of a plan review checklist is complete, in circulation and use by the Plan Reviewers.
2. Plan review comments are noted "required" versus "suggested."
3. Plan review redlines pertaining to land development are accompanied by a letter from the division manager, a Professional Engineer.
4. The Division offers meetings with the design consultants/engineers to discuss redlines and or innovative practices as needed or requested.
5. Working titles of Staff who are not Professional Engineers, but perform plan reviews of projects submitted by Professional Engineers, have been changed to eliminate the title "engineer."