**Board Meeting Date:** 8/8/2018

**Category:** Staff Reports

**Department:** Engineering Services

**Title:**

ENGINEERING CUSTOMER SERVICE SURVEY REPORT

**Summary:**
Engineering Services has contracted with a third party vendor, Telcare Retention Services to perform customer service surveys related to TWA’s Private Development processes. Telcare Retention Services was chosen as the third party vendor due to an existing relationship with Customer Service and Field Services.

Telcare is contacting Developers, Engineers and Contractors after the projects are accepted by TWA.

Eighteen contacts were provided to Telcare Retention Services in the last quarter with ten responses received to date.

Results were generally positive but a few customers did have comments and suggestions for improvements. These comments are addressed below:

**Survey Comment:**
A contractor who chose to remain anonymous stated TWA needs to have a better understanding of existing utilities and where the utilities are located.

**Response:**
TWA’s existing utility locations are based largely on documents provided by the development community as “record drawing” – “as-built” locations of utilities constructed by developers and donated to TWA for operation and maintenance. This information is then transferred into TWA’s GIS. TWA staff have developed and implemented in 2015 revised requirements for as-built information to be placed into TWA’s GIS to improve the accuracy of record drawings. These requirements are provided to the developer, contractor’s surveyor and engineer during the preconstruction meeting to ensure uniform, complete and accurate information is provided on utility locations.

However, prior to the development of the new processes, TWA generally accepted submittal documents as accurate because the documents were signed and sealed by
a licensed engineer. Unfortunately, the signed and sealed documents did not always reflect constructed conditions. Additionally, there are significant portions of TWA’s service area that were purchased from private entities including Central Florida Utilities, FGUA, Harmony and others, that were missing or in some cases had incorrect record drawings. Approximately, 50% of TWA’s service area was purchased from these private entities. TWA engineering, customer service and field services staffs’ are working in conjunction with the GIS staff to correct errors in GIS as they are discovered. This is an ongoing and continuous process to improve the GIS utility location information available for staff to use in system maintenance and for the development community to use as well.

**Survey Comment:**
A contractor who chose to remain anonymous, stated GIS review of record drawings took a few months and it is typical for it to take that long.

**Response:**

The review and acceptance for record drawings is a two-step process. Record drawings submitted by the development community are reviewed by the TWA construction inspector as the first step. The inspector follows a checklist to ensure the contractor accurately captures the infrastructure construction and is provided in the proper format on the record drawings. Inspector’s review times vary from 3 – 8 days depending upon the size and complexity of the project. Upon completion of the inspector review the record drawings are returned to the engineer of record for correction and resubmittal. The cycle is repeated until the record drawings reflect the actual construction of the utilities. The inspection review timeframe last quarter was met for all 68 submittals received. The review criteria and timeframes are discussed at the preconstruction meeting with the developer and his representatives and are available for review on the TWA website.

Once the inspector record drawing review is complete and accepted by the inspector the record drawings are sent to the GIS department for the second step. The GIS team reviews the drawings and places the information into TWA’s GIS, making it available for staff to use. Upon completion of GIS staff review the record drawings are returned to the engineer of record and the cycle repeated until the record drawings GIS information is correct. GIS review timeframe is ten business days but the team has recently been averaging five days or less and have not missed a review deadline this fiscal year.

Additionally, the TWA process does not prevent the developer from receiving CO’s on up to 80% of the project’s buildings during the GIS review and acceptance if all other items are completed. Providing accurate record drawing information is a complex
process that requires the contractor’s surveyor and engineer of record to work together to provide the necessary information to TWA. The length of time to complete record drawing reviews is greatly dependent on the quality of the initial submittal and the developer’s engineer’s thoroughness in incorporating staff’s comments. This contractor chose to remain anonymous so it is not possible to get additional information that may help explain why the review process was so lengthy on this project.

Survey Comment:
An engineer stated that for this particular project he cannot remember, but in general TWA asks too much for GIS. The process should be more streamlined and tailored to each project. He’s made this comment in the past and although the process has improved, there is still room for improvement.

Response:
TWA’s GIS requirements are consistent with other local utilities including Orange County Utilities. As previously mentioned, TWA relays the requirements to the engineer and contractor prior to project initiation.

Staff has also reviewed the record drawing requirements with TWA senior management to ensure that requirements are appropriate and provide the level of detail necessary to accurately reflect the infrastructure improvements that will be maintained and operated by TWA.

Survey Comment:
The same engineer stated the closeout procedures should be tailored to each project and not be so rigid. He always has issues during closeout no matter how much planning goes into the closeout process.

Response:
TWA provides a closeout checklist to the customer(s) for each individual project at the project’s preconstruction meeting. Items not applicable to that particular project are marked accordingly in the preconstruction meeting so each private development project is only required to provide closeout items relevant to that specific project.

This particular project was a multi-phase apartment project. At the preconstruction meeting, the developer requested to expand the phasing plan for the TWA accepted plans from 2 phases into 4 phases.
During preconstruction meetings, staff works with the engineer, contractor and developer to establish a phasing plan that will meet, as much as possible, the needs of the developer and TWA.

In this case, staff declined the request for 2 additional phases due to the amount of resources that would be required to closeout each phase relative to the overall size of the project. Staff explained that each building could be CO’d separately but only after the infrastructure improvements for that particular phase were accepted.

Multiple factors are considered in project utilities phasing including how utility services transition through the site. TWA cannot serve a phase of a project by accepting water or sewer infrastructure that runs through an unfinished or undeveloped phase of the project. This may create unnecessary and potentially dangerous maintenance issues for TWA. TWA could risk needing to perform repairs on infrastructure that new customers are relying on for service in the middle of an active construction site with large construction equipment in use.

Staff continued to work with the developer after the preconstruction meeting and during project closeout a 3 phase plan was developed to enable the developer to meet his closing dates due to his contractor being behind schedule.

Often the closeout of a project requires flexibility by TWA to help the developer meet their development schedules. Staff when possible, assists developers meet scheduled closings while ensuring requirements are met to ensure TWA and its stakeholders are protected.

Survey Comment:
A developer stated TWA requirements are more stringent than in other areas that he has worked but TWA’s requirements are very straightforward. He doesn't have to guess what the requirements are because TWA provides a checklist and enough documentation to help prepare him for the job. He also stated that it would be nice to pay all fees upfront instead of waiting to the end of the job he would like to have a check cut and ready to go.

Response:
TWA Engineering staff continually work collaboratively with the development community to improve the private development process so that it runs smoothly for all stakeholders. Over the past several years, multiple changes have been made to processes and he TWA Standards and Specifications based on input from the development community. TWA requirements ensure all stakeholders are protected by
Board Meeting Date: 8/8/2018

Category: Staff Reports

Agenda Item: 11A

a sound well-constructed infrastructure system and undue cost is not placed on ratepayers for development.

Staff requires water meter fees be paid after the project is approved for meters based upon FDEP requirements. Fee amounts are provided at the beginning of the job in the System Development Charge Assessment letter. This includes meter and connection fees. Providing this information allows the developer to know his costs and when they are due. Developer’s also have an opportunity to set up escrow accounts with TWA which allow fees to be paid from escrow as they are requested.

Survey Comment:
A developer who remained anonymous said that the time for a meter installation takes forever.

Response:
The current Customer Service meter set timeframe is 15 business days. Customer Service is currently in the bid process to outsource meter sets. This should greatly reduce the time required to set a meter.

Survey Comment:
A developer stated that TWA requirements are strict but fair.

Response:
Staff agrees with his comment and appreciates candid feedback.

Survey Comment:
A developer who remained anonymous stated TWA requirements are typical. The only issue he has is with turnover inspections. Phasing and turnover is arduous.

Response:
TWA final inspections are performed to ensure all infrastructure visually inspected has met the plan and specification requirements. This is a typical inspection required by all utilities prior to project acceptance and accepting ownership of the newly installed infrastructure.

Coordination Meetings:

Staff held coordination meetings with AV Homes and Pulte Homes in July 2018. The developers praised TWA staff and specifically mentioned they were appreciative of TWA staffs willingness to work with them as they transition with new staff. TWA’s
Senior Inspector offered a training session with new AV Homes staff to help ensure they understand TWA requirements. AV Homes field teams accepted the offer to receive training for sewer connection, TWA’s water conservation program – “Toho Efficiency Program” (TEP) and final inspections to reduce inspection failure rates. Staff has also scheduled a coordination meeting with Tavistock scheduled for mid-August for the first Sunbridge project. Staff has also reached out to Lennar, Mattamy, Encore and DR Horton to schedule coordination meetings in the next quarter. Staff will also reach out again to the smaller builders in our community over the summer to discuss changes since the previous small builder meeting last year.

**Engineering Software Update:**

A cross divisional team from Engineering, IT, Business Services, Procurement and Customer Service are working together with a consulting team from EMA to develop a software solution to automate much of the development review and approval process with a focus on improved customer experiences and improved efficiencies. The software development team has, and will continue to solicit input from the development community. Recently a project kick-off meeting with a select cross sectional group of several large developers, engineers and underground utility contractors who have the resources and incentive to commit to a successful implementation was held. Several attendees expressed an interest in being involved in the development and testing for this project.

Over the past several months, staff and EMA developed processes and requirements to be included in a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) to select a software vendor. The RFQ was advertised on Monday, July 30th and is scheduled to close at the end of August and anticipate short listing (developing a list of no more than three firms for a detailed evaluation) in September. The tentative “go live” period is early 2020 and will depend on the progress of implementing and testing the selected software.

**Total Costs:**

none

**Recommended Action:**

none

Initials: RB
Survey Responses

1: Attended
   1 - Yes

2: Meeting Rating
   5 - 5

3: Meeting Comment
   100 - Not Applicable

4: Requirements Rating
   5 - 5

5: Areas Comment
   100 - Not Applicable

6: Received Booklet
   1 - Yes

7: Infrastructure Lead-time Rating
   4 - 4

8: Schedule Inspection Comment
   99 - Comment: 48 Hours

9: Inspection Lead-time Rating
   4 - 4

10: Final Inspection Schedule
    99 - Comment: 48 Hours

11: Main Contact
    99 - Comment: Gary

12: Response Rating
    5 - 5

13: Improve Response
    100 - Not Applicable

14: Inspector Rating
    5 - 5

15: Improve Steps
    2 - No

16: Would Pay
    3 - No Improvements

17: Has Comment
    2 - No

18: Anonymous
    2 - No - Anonymous
Survey Responses

1: Attended
   1 - Yes

2: Meeting Rating
   4 - 4

3: Meeting Comment
   88 - Refused: There weren't any problems. There's always room for improvement.

4: Requirements Rating
   5 - 5

5: Areas Comment
   100 - Not Applicable

6: Received Booklet
   1 - Yes

7: Infrastructure Lead-time Rating
   5 - 5

8: Schedule Inspection Comment
   100 - Not Applicable

9: Inspection Lead-time Rating
   5 - 5

10: Final Inspection Schedule
    100 - Not Applicable

11: Main Contact
    99 - Comment: Elizabeth

12: Response Rating
    5 - 5

13: Improve Response
    100 - Not Applicable

14: Inspector Rating
    4 - 4

15: Improve Steps
   1 - Yes: Toho needs to have a better understanding of existing utilities and where the utilities are located.

16: Would Pay
   2 - No

17: Has Comment
   1 - Yes: Toho's requirements are more strict than any other municipality.

18: Anonymous
   2 - No - Anonymous
Survey Responses

1: Attended
   1 - Yes

2: Meeting Rating
   4 - 4

3: Meeting Comment
   88 - Refused: He had no issues, but there's always room for improvement.

4: Requirements Rating
   5 - 5

5: Areas Comment
   100 - Not Applicable

6: Received Booklet
   1 - Yes

7: Infrastructure Lead-time Rating
   5 - 5

8: Schedule Inspection Comment
   100 - Not Applicable

9: Inspection Lead-time Rating
   5 - 5

10: Final Inspection Schedule
    100 - Not Applicable

11: Main Contact
    99 - Comment: Elizabeth

12: Response Rating
    5 - 5

13: Improve Response
    100 - Not Applicable

14: Inspector Rating
    5 - 5: The final walkthrough was very informative.

15: Improve Steps
    2 - No: The GIS took forever; it took a few months. It's typical for GIS to take that long.

16: Would Pay
    3 - No Improvements

17: Has Comment
    2 - No

18: Anonymous
    2 - No - Anonymous
Survey Responses

1: Request Meeting
   1 - Yes

2: Meeting Rating
   4 - 4

3: Questions Comment
   99 - Comment: All of his questions were answered.

4: Website Rating
   0 - No Response: He didn't use the website.

5: Website Improvements
   0 - No Response: He didn't use the website.

6: Added Comments
   0 - No Response: The project began almost two years ago, so he doesn't remember.

7: Met Turnaround Time
   1 - Yes

8: Review Completed
   0 - No Response: For this particular project, he can't remember. In general, Toho asks too much for GIS. The process should be more streamlined and tailored to each project. He's made these comments in the past and although the process has improved, there is still room for improvement.

9: Main Contact
   99 - Comment: Elizabeth George.

10: Response Rating
    5 - 5

11: Improve Response
    100 - Not Applicable

12: Improve Steps
    99 - Comment: The closeout procedures should be tailored to each project and not be so ridged. He always has issues during closeout no matter how much planning goes into the closeout process.

13: Would Pay
    2 - No

14: Has Comment
    2 - No

15: Anonymous
    1 - Yes - Display Name
Survey Responses

1: Reviewed Material
   2 - No

2: Website Rating
   100 - Not Applicable

3: Website Improvements
   100 - Not Applicable

4: Received Overview
   1 - Yes

5: Overview Rating
   5 - 5

6: Overview Comment
   100 - Not Applicable

7: Requirements Rating
   4 - 4: Toho's standard requirements are more stringent than other utilities, but Toho's requirements are very straightforward. He doesn't have to guess what the requirements are because Toho provides a checklist and enough documentation to help prepare him for the job.

8: Staff Rating
   5 - 5

9: Modification Comment
   99 - Comment: It would be nice if the fees were paid up front, currently, the process holds up finalization. He would like to be able to have a check cut and ready to go.

10: Would Pay
    1 - Yes

11: Specific Issues
    2 - No

12: Anonymous
    1 - Yes - Display Name
Survey Responses

1: Reviewed Material
   1 - Yes

2: Website Rating
   5 - 5

3: Website Improvements
   100 - Not Applicable

4: Received Overview
   1 - Yes

5: Overview Rating
   5 - 5

6: Overview Comment
   100 - Not Applicable

7: Requirements Rating
   5 - 5

8: Staff Rating
   5 - 5

9: Modification Comment
   0 - No Improvements

10: Would Pay
    3 - No Improvements

11: Specific Issues
    1 - Yes: The time for a meter install takes forever.

12: Anonymous
    2 - No - Anonymous
Survey Responses

1: Reviewed Material
   1 - Yes

2: Website Rating
   5 - 5

3: Website Improvements
   100 - Not Applicable

4: Received Overview
   2 - No

5: Overview Rating
   100 - Not Applicable

6: Overview Comment
   100 - Not Applicable

7: Requirements Rating
   4 - 4: Toho's requirements are strict but fair.

8: Staff Rating
   5 - 5

9: Modification Comment
   0 - No Improvements

10: Would Pay
    3 - No Improvements

11: Specific Issues
    2 - No

12: Anonymous
    1 - Yes - Display Name
Developer Survey

Anonymous
This respondent has chosen to be anonymous.

Survey Date: 6/29/18

Survey Responses

1: Reviewed Material
   2 - No

2: Website Rating
   100 - Not Applicable

3: Website Improvements
   100 - Not Applicable

4: Received Overview
   2 - No

5: Overview Rating
   100 - Not Applicable

6: Overview Comment
   100 - Not Applicable

7: Requirements Rating
   3 - 3: There are no issues, the requirements are typical.

8: Staff Rating
   5 - 5

9: Modification Comment
   0 - No Improvements

10: Would Pay
    3 - No Improvements

11: Specific Issues
    1 - Yes: The only problems he has is with turnover inspections. Phasing and turnover are arduous.

12: Anonymous
    2 - No - Anonymous
Survey Responses

1: Request Meeting
   2 - No

2: Meeting Rating
   100 - Not Applicable

3: Questions Comment
   100 - Not Applicable

4: Website Rating
   5 - 5

5: Website Improvements
   2 - No

6: Added Comments
   2 - No

7: Met Turnaround Time
   1 - Yes

8: Review Completed
   0 - No Response: He hasn't reached this stage.

9: Main Contact
   99 - Comment: Kevin Anthony.

10: Response Rating
    5 - 5

11: Improve Response
    100 - Not Applicable

12: Improve Steps
    99 - Comment: Ordering the water meters and getting the water meters to the job site should be faster.

13: Would Pay
    2 - No

14: Has Comment
    2 - No

15: Anonymous
    1 - Yes - Display Name
**Survey Responses**

1: Request Meeting  
   2 - No

2: Meeting Rating  
   100 - Not Applicable

3: Questions Comment  
   100 - Not Applicable

4: Website Rating  
   0 - No Response: He didn’t use the website.

5: Website Improvements  
   0 - No Response: He didn’t use the website.

6: Added Comments  
   2 - No

7: Met Turnaround Time  
   1 - Yes

8: Review Completed  
   1 - Yes

9: Main Contact  
   99 - Comment: Elizabeth George.

10: Response Rating  
    5 - 5

11: Improve Response  
    100 - Not Applicable

12: Improve Steps  
    0 - No Improvements

13: Would Pay  
    3 - No Improvements

14: Has Comment  
    2 - No

15: Anonymous  
    2 - No - Anonymous