



BUILDING INDUSTRY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
Community Development / Public Works Building
1500 Monroe Street, Fort Myers, FL 33901
First Floor Conf. Room 1B

THURSDAY, October 15, 2026
8:30 A.M.

AGENDA

1. Call to Order/Review of Affidavit of Posting
2. Approval of Minutes – July 16, 2026
3. Revenue/Expense Reports/Fund Balance Report
4. Adjournment – Next Meeting Date: January 21, 2026

To view a copy of the agenda, go to www.leegov.com/dcd/calendar. For more information, contact Tad Delnay, (239) 533-8108.

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, Lee County will not discriminate against qualified individuals with disabilities in its services, programs, or activities. To request an auxiliary aid or service for effective communication or a reasonable modification to participate, contact the ADA Coordinator, Ranice Monroe, at (239) 533-0255, ADArequests@leegov.com or Florida Relay Service 711. Accommodation will be provided at no cost to the requestor. Requests should be made at least five business days in advance.

**MINUTES REPORT
BUILDING INDUSTRY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (BIOC)
THURSDAY, JULY 16, 2026**

Committee Members Present:

Steve Gabor
Matthew Johnson
Marc Malaniak
Steve Wojcechowkyj

Committee Members Absent

Bobby Lyons

Lee County Government Staff Present:

Christy Barker, Senior Manager, Operations
Erika Compean Garcia, Sr Team Executive Assistant
Tad Delnay, Building Official
Jack McStravic, Deputy Bldg Official
Antia Richards, Senior Fiscal Officer
Christopher Santiago, Accela Project Manager

CALL TO ORDER AND AFFIDAVIT:

The meeting was called to order at 8:30AM. Confirmation was provided that the meeting had been properly posted and was legally sufficient.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – FEBRUARY 5, 2026 AND FEBRUARY 24, 2026

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes from February, and all were in favor.

DCD BUILDING FEE SCHEDULE UPDATE

Mr. Gabor asked where the group would like to begin. Ms. Barker suggested summarizing activity from April 15th forward. The expectation for today's meeting was a conversational and collaborative discussion to determine what information would be most helpful to present going forward. The format may evolve over time—possibly focusing on the top 10 record types by volume or those most significantly impacted, to better understand cost recovery and compare projections to actuals.

On April 15th, the new fee schedule was implemented along with substantial system changes. Enhancements are still ongoing to ensure fees are assessed automatically. Because the Accela team only had about two weeks to prepare after the fee schedule was finalized, the workload was significant and required prioritization. Application and technology fees were implemented consistently across all record types. Most plan review fees—about 90%—were automated upfront. Some permit types remain difficult to automate due to more complex calculations (e.g., dock permits, sign permits), and those fees are still assessed manually.

The team is close to fully automating the proposed collection policy, including validations and system blocks to ensure fees are collected before services are provided. System controls for resubmissions have not yet been implemented due to a learning curve among staff. Plan reviewers were accustomed to adding fees manually, which caused duplication when automation was introduced. Supervisors and managers had to manually review every processed record to ensure accuracy. This

required cleanup, retraining, and collaboration between plan review and inspections, which ultimately improved understanding of field requirements.

Through this process, staff identified opportunities to streamline certain fees. One example was windows and doors. Some require a frame inspection (105); some do not, and this is determined in the field. To simplify inspection fee assessment, the team previously charged \$75, covering up to two inspections. After internal review, they added an acknowledgment checkbox on the application allowing applicants to confirm compliance with installation requirements and thereby avoid scheduling the 105 inspection. This allowed a fee reduction from \$75 to \$50. That change was implemented last night. Other similar “edge case” fees are being reviewed and may result in reductions.

Time accounting has also required additional training. The system is not user-friendly, and staff sometimes entered minutes instead of hours due to unclear labeling. Accuracy is essential because time accounting drives fee calculations. Some entries look accurate and may support reductions; others indicate training needs. The team is reviewing averages and identifying staff who may need additional support. Overall, substantial progress has been made over the past two and a half months, including increased revenue.

A financial report was discussed. Technology fee revenue has been separated from regular revenue. Year-to-date, \$9.89 million in standard revenue has been collected, plus \$350,000 in technology revenue. Technology funds are not part of general operating revenue and are kept separate for their intended uses.

The department began adding money to the fund balance in May for the first time instead of drawing from it. Construction activity appears to be increasing, which may improve revenues. Permit volume is currently lower than last year, partially because summer is historically a slow period. April, May, and June permit volumes were reviewed, showing dips similar to last year’s seasonal trends. Residential permits followed the same pattern.

Technology revenue is averaging about \$140,000 per month. However, annual technology program costs total about \$1.3 million. With current volume, the department will not fully cover annual technology expenses until approximately February and will need to draw from reserves in the interim. Long-term projections show a potential annual surplus of roughly \$300,000 beginning in fiscal year 2027–2028 if trends hold.

Expenditures vary month to month depending on timing of technology and insurance payments. The average monthly operating expenditure is about \$1.3 million, but spikes occur when annual payments are due. The team is working to separate technology expenses in future reporting, so the financial picture is clearer.

Upcoming insurance and technology payments will require dipping into reserves—approximately \$435,000 in September and another \$200,000 to \$300,000 in November/December. However, overall “bleeding” has significantly slowed.

The department is actively pursuing operational efficiencies and cost savings. Staff have been reviewing fleet needs, phones, devices, and all invoices before payment. Operating expenses have already decreased compared to budget. Several potential countywide efficiencies were identified, such as eliminating redundant devices (desk phones vs. cell phones).

Regarding long-term reserves, statutory guidance suggests a target equal to the average of four years of operating expenditures. The group agreed this should be explored further in upcoming meetings once more months of data and the new budget are available.

The fee schedule was designed for cost recovery based primarily on direct labor. An operational support fee (OSF) may still be needed but will only be implemented after verified time accounting data is available. Staff expect to bring forward recommendations, possibly both fee reductions and increases at the next meeting.

Technology costs will eventually be managed in a dedicated fund, so they do not affect operating reserves. If removed from operating expenses, annual costs would decrease substantially.

The team is preparing a comprehensive package for the next meeting, including:

- verified time accounting vs. projected time accounting
- fee alignment analysis
- a section-by-section financial comparison (permitting, inspections, plan review, regulatory review)
- OSF considerations
- possible fee adjustments
- updated budget projections

The goal is to share this package at least one month before the next meeting.

Mr. Santiago presented early-stage permit fee schedule analytics covering May and June. These grouped fees by section (permitting, inspections, plan review, regulatory review) to show cost coverage. Future versions can break down commercial vs. residential, record type, or other categories based on committee preference. Several new fees (resubmissions, supplemental fees, SFH review, partial inspection fees) may warrant focused monitoring.

Revenue reporting categories have been simplified. The team can reorganize revenue reporting however the committee prefers—by department, workflow phase, record type, or fee category.

Additional improvements are planned so revenue in the financial system aligns more easily with data in the permitting system. Power BI dashboards are also being explored.

The meeting concluded with agreement that today's information was clear and appropriately high-level, and that more refined reporting will follow.

Agenda Item 5 – Adjournment

Mr. Wojcechowkyj made a motion to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Mr. Johnson. The chair called the motion, and it passed 4-0.

The meeting adjourned at 9:35 AM.

The next scheduled meeting will be held on Thursday, October 15, 2026, at 8:30 AM.