Uniform Building Permit Application Workgroup - Meeting 2 Minutes

October 16, 2026, 8:30 am (Web/Teleconference)

Workgroup Members Present

Michael Bourre, Chairman
Anthony Apfelbeck
Hamid Bahadori
James Batts
Erika Lundeen for Jonathan Bilby
Jaime Gascon
Shane Gerwig
Kathy Krafka Harkema
Michael Burchette for Jillian Kraynak
Brad Schiffer
Fred Schilling
Jim Schock
Brian Swope

Workgroup Members Not Present

Ana Barbosa
Joe Belcher
Neal Burdick
John Freeland
Drew Smith
Anna Territo
Tim Tolbert

Staff Present

Alan Burke
Jim Hammers
Mo Madani
Marlita Peters
Justin Vogel

University of Florida Project Members

Jennifer Bridge (lead):jennifer.bridge@essie.ufl.edu
Duzgun Agdas (not present)

Meeting Facilitation

The meeting was facilitated by Jeff Blair from Facilitated Solutions, LLC. Consultation, Process Design & Facilitation. Information at: facilitatedsolutions.org

1. **Welcome and Opening Roll Call**
    a. Welcome: Chair welcomed workgroup and described public comment procedures (Bourre, Chairman)
    b. Meeting participation process provided (Blair)
    c. Roll Call: Roll call performed (Blair). 12 of 20 members were present, representing a quorum.
    d. Project team introduced (Blair): Bridge, Burke, Madani, Vogel, Blair
2. **Agenda, Minutes and Workplan Approvals:**
    a. Motion to approve agenda (Apfelbeck), seconded (Schock). Motion passed unanimously.
    b. Motion to approve September 25, 2026, minutes (Apfelbeck), seconded (Schock). Motion passed unanimously.
    c. Workgroup schedule reviewed (Blair). No changes to the workplan; no action needed (Bridge)
3. **Background Information**
    a. Presentation of background information (Bridge)
        i. Recap of the analysis of 235 permit applications from across the state. Only about 5% contained all components required under Section 713.135, Florida Statutes. The level of detail varies widely
        ii. Presence of fields across applications:
            - About 3/4 included trade information
            - About 40% included subcontractor information
            - About 1/4 required design professional licensing information
        iii. Raised the question of the minimum information needed to process an application, and how a uniform form would feed into more detailed commercial or residential applications
        iv. Noted a list of 55 commercial and 40 residential permit type examples from Shane Kittendorf (Cape Coral), posted with the meeting agenda
        v. Requested that building officials demonstrate at a future meeting how their electronic permitting systems drill down from general information to specific permit types
        vi. Presented additional items for discussion: trade and subcontractor information, site conditions, owner vs. lessee, scope of work detail, legal descriptions, flood/base flood elevation, general vs. separate residential/commercial applications, and applicant vs. owner
    b. Clarifying questions (Apfelbeck):
        i. Applications reviewed were paper forms posted on jurisdiction websites. Electronic systems could not be accessed.

ii. Applications reviewed were mostly master permits, but some included trade-level detail on a single form

4. **Acceptability Ranking and Discussion**
   a. **Overview of the acceptability ranking process (Blair)**
   b. **Conceptual Framework Acceptability Ranking**
      i. Overview of the draft permit application used for initial acceptability ranking (Bridge)
      ii. Draft sections (conceptual framework): General Information, Permit Type, Permit Request, Project Information, Owner Information, Contractor Information, Architect/Engineer Information, Bonding/Mortgage Lender Information (required by statute), and Attestations and Signatures (including notarization).
      iii. Clarifying questions:
         - Whether the form is meant to be multi-discipline, so an applicant could request building, electrical, mechanical and plumbing permits at once, or one permit at a time (Schock). The workgroup will decide this (Bridge).
         - Whether all fields would be mandatory or left to local jurisdictions, and how the form will be adopted (Apfelbeck). The workgroup will decide this, and the form will need clear language on it (Bridge).
      i. Ranking of topical categories (Blair): All nine categories reached unanimous consensus. The conceptual framework was accepted as the starting point.
   c. **Section 1: General Information**
      i. Presentation of draft section (Bridge)
         - Jurisdiction field, since this will be a statewide form
         - Master permit number, if applicable, so sub-permits are linked to the correct master permit
         - Private provider (yes/no), with the Notice to Building Official form attached if yes (based on Broward County's uniform permit application)
      ii. Discussion: Comments provided by workgroup members Schock, Gascon, Krafka Harkema, Lundeen, Swope, Gerwig and Schilling, and by staff (Madani). Comments included:
         - Add check boxes showing whether the private provider will do plan review, inspections or both (Schock, Lundeen, Gerwig).
         - Consider moving the private provider question to the Permit Request section, since it concerns how the application will be processed (Gascon, Lundeen).
         - Add "(NTBO)" after the form reference so applicants recognize it (Gascon), as the form number may change (Lundeen).
         - Add a visual key for required fields (Krafka Harkema), such as "C" for Commission-required and "S" for statute-required (Lundeen).

- Add "Florida" to the form title so contractors working in several states know they have the right form (Krafka Harkema).
- Question whether jurisdictions could add their logo to the form (Krafka Harkema).
- Add an application date field (Lundeen, Schilling). Gascon cautioned that the date ties the application to a code edition, forms are often filled out days before filing, and the form will already carry other dates such as the notary date. Jurisdictions usually rely on the received stamp or the electronic submission date.
- Add a residential/commercial designation at the top of the form, since permit technicians need it first to start processing (Lundeen).
- Question whether there will be carve-outs for trade permits such as reroofs, pools and electrical. Much of the information suits new construction but would burden small projects (Swope). Bridge noted the attestation already says separate permits are required for electrical, plumbing, pools and similar work.
- Question whether the form will be reviewed by the Commission's Technical Advisory Committees (TACs) (Swope). Madani said the Code Administration TAC is the lead, and other TACs can review the findings.
- Suggestion that an electronic form show only the fields needed for the permit types selected (Schock). Bridge repeated her request for jurisdictions to demonstrate their electronic permitting systems.
- Reminder that many jurisdictions still accept paper applications or submissions by email, and many owner-builders and small contractors apply in person. The form must work for all of them (Lundeen).
- Question whether the code edition in effect should be required (Bridge). Schock supported it. Apfelbeck, Schilling and Lundeen opposed it as another opportunity for error, and the group leaned against including it. Bridge suggested a “for office use only” section. To be discussed at a later meeting.

d. Section 2: Permit Type

i. Discussion: Comments provided by workgroup members Apfelbeck, Schock, Schilling, Lundeen, Bourre and Gascon, and by staff (Madani, Vogel). Comments included:

- Workgroup discussed whether the form should cover trade sub-permits (fire, MEP, site work, zoning, public works) or focus on a master building permit only.
- Schilling supported keeping permit types while removing zoning and public works, with supplemental forms collecting additional details.

- Schock noted that jurisdictions often route zoning, land development, historic, health department, and water management approvals through the building permit. Florida Building Code Chapter 1 prohibits holding a building permit for other required approvals.
- The workgroup agreed that strong language should clarify permit approval does not authorize construction without other approvals, or a clearance sheet should be used.
- An attestation already requires separate permits for electrical, plumbing, and similar work; Apfelbeck confirmed this is sufficient, as contractors understand their permits are limited to their license scope.
- Schock proposed a dynamic form (similar to the milestone inspection form) where selecting a permit type displays only the relevant fields, accommodating anything from a single trade permit to a full building.
- Apfelbeck emphasized that if the form includes local customization, rulemaking should clearly allow it; otherwise, uniformity goals require a complete package.
- Apfelbeck cautioned that his jurisdiction has 150+ workflows tied to permit type, and a partial approach could undermine uniformity across Florida.
- Lundeen noted that one application cannot realistically cover everything—her jurisdiction uses about 16 application types and 183 workflows.
- Gascon proposed limiting scope to a master permit for building construction with no trade checkboxes, since trade sub-permits are obtained separately anyway.
- Apfelbeck explained that the master permit issued to the general contractor covers their scope, with separate MEP and fire sub-permits required afterward.
- Apfelbeck distinguished permit type (e.g., building new construction) from scope of work (whether the project includes mechanical, electrical, etc.); both he and Gascon supported no trade checkboxes.
- Bourre stated that if the purpose of this effort is to streamline a building permit application, then it should include all information required to process it, without local jurisdictions adding additional requirements. Requested staff clarification.
- Staff responses indicated the statute is broad enough to allow the workgroup's discretion (Madani, Vogel). Given the July 2027 deadline and the need for TAC review, Bridge recommended focusing on the master building permit first, with trade permits addressed later if authorized.

- The workgroup agreed the scope of the workplan should be limited to a master building permit for commercial and residential construction, with trade sub-permits not included at this time.
- Broward County's existing form, already uniformly used across all Broward jurisdictions, will serve as the starting point for the draft, which Bridge has already begun based on Broward's application with additions from other jurisdictions and Meeting 1 comments.

e. Next Steps

i. Bridge will revise the draft form based on threshold agreements, prepare options for General Information and Permit Type sections for the next meeting, and may retitle the Permit Type section.

ii. Apfelbeck suggested inviting a Broward staff member to explain how their permitting system works in practice and identify potential issues; Bridge will follow up with Ana Barbosa on this.

5. Public Comment

a. Public comments provided by Michelle Dadich, Conner Wulf and Tatiana Gust:

i. The form should distinguish the date submitted, the date accepted as complete and the date of response, so jurisdictions can track compliance and fees. The notarization section should also allow for online notaries. (Dadich, Delray Beach Housing Board)

ii. The bill's language is vague. Based on review of existing permitting software (Accela, Tyler Technologies), recommended identifying the permit types common across the state (e.g., new construction, addition, alteration, AC change-out) and creating an application for each, rather than one application for everything. Offered to share expertise with the workgroup. (Wulf, Innovative Construction Inspections, private provider)

iii. Contractors are often rejected or delayed because language and forms vary between municipalities. Supports a standard form that captures what is needed to deem an application complete and move it into review. (Gust, Elite Permits)

6. Workgroup Member and Staff Comment

a. Next steps (Blair): Workgroup members and the public should submit proposed options to Bridge and Blair by close of business Thursday, November 5, 2026. They will be included in the worksheet for the next meeting.

b. Next meeting: November 20, 2026, at 10:00 am

c. The Chair thanked members for the discussion (Bourre, Chairman).

7. Adjourn

a. No motion to adjourn was recorded; the Chair adjourned the meeting.

b. Meeting adjourned at 10:54 am.