Special Occupancy

PART 1 OF 1

WITH COMMENTS

Proposed Code Modifications

This document created by the Florida Department of Business and Professional Regulation - 850-487-1824

Total Mods for **Special Occupancy** in **Approved as Modified: 1**

Total Mods for report: 9

Sub Code: Existing Building

Date Submitted	7/22/2012	**Section**	402.2, 403.2, 404.5, 408.2, 601.3	**Proponent**	Rebecca Quinn obo DEM
Chapter	4	**Affects HVHZ**	No	**Attachments**	No

TAC Recommendation Approved as Modified
Commission Action Pending Review

Comments

General Comments Yes **Alternate Language** No

Related Modifications

Summary of Modification

For compliance with flood provisions, refer to the FBC, Building or FBC, Residential, as applicable. Approved as Submitted (EB-14) and FEMA will submit public comment to extend to rest of the EB as shown here.

Rationale

Approved as Submitted for 2015 IBC Group A (EB14-12) to modify 1302.6 only; at the suggestion of the IBC committee FEMA submitted a public comment to modify the proposal to as shown here.

This modification carries the proposed language in EB14 to other flood provisions of the IEBC. The justification for making the change to Section 1302.6 extends to those other flood provisions. If a state or community adopts the IEBC and applies it to all buildings, including dwellings within the scope of the IRC, it is appropriate that when existing dwellings are required to be brought into compliance because of substantial improvement that compliance be determined by the IRC. For dwellings within the scope of the IRC there is one significant difference between compliance with Sec. 1612 and compliance with R322 – Sec. 1612 by reference to ASCE 24 requires an additional foot of elevation. Thus existing dwellings would be required to meet a different standard than new dwellings. This proposal would require compliance with the IRC, thus avoiding unequal treatment.

Fiscal Impact Statement

Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code

Makes enforcement of SI requirements consistent with requirements for new dwellings.

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

Makes enforcement of SI requirements consistent with requirements for new dwellings.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

Slightly reduces costs of bringing dwellings into compliance when SI/SD is determined because the added foot of elevation required by 1612/ASCE 24 isn't required.

Requirements

Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public

Treats existing dwellings (SI/SD) the same as new dwellings.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

No effect on products.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

No effect on materials.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Compliance of SI/SD dwellings will be same as new dwellings in flood hazard areas.

Is the proposed code modification part of a prior code version? No

402.2 [Additions] Flood hazard areas. For buildings and structures in flood hazard areas established in Section 1612.3 of the ~~*International Building Code*~~*,Florida Building Code, Building* or Section R322 of the ~~*International Residential Code*~~*, Florida Building Code, Residential* as applicable*,* any addition that constitutes substantial improvement of the existing structure, as defined in Section 202*,* shall comply with the flood design requirements for new construction and all aspects of the existing structure shall be brought into compliance with the requirements for new construction for flood design.

For buildings and structures in *flood hazard areas* established in Section 1612.3 of the ~~*International Building Code*~~*,Florida Building Code, Building* or Section R322 of the ~~*International Residential Code*~~*, Florida Building Code, Residential*, as applicable, any *additions* that do not constitute *substantial improvement* of the existing structure, as defined in Section 202, are not required to comply with the flood design requirements for new construction.

403.2 [Alterations] Flood hazard areas. For buildings and structures in flood hazard areas established in Section 1612.3 of the ~~*International Building Code*~~*,Florida Building Code, Building* or Section R322 of the ~~*International Residential Code*~~*, Florida Building Code, Residential*, as applicable, any *alteration* that constitutes *substantial Improvement* of the existing structure, as defined in Section 202, shall comply with the flood design requirements for new construction, and all aspects of the existing structure shall be brought into compliance with the requirements for new construction for flood design.

For buildings and structures in *flood hazard areas* established in Section 1612.3 of the ~~*International Building Code*~~*,Florida Building Code, Building* or Section R322 of the ~~*International Residential Code*~~*, Florida Building Code, Residential*, as applicable, any *alterations* that do not constitute *substantial improvement* of the existing structure, as defined in Section 202, are not required to comply with the flood design requirements for new construction.

404.5 [Repairs] Flood hazard areas. For buildings and structures in flood hazard areas established in Section 1612.3 of the ~~*International Building Code*~~*,Florida Building Code, Building* or Section R322 of the ~~*International Residential Code*~~*, Florida Building Code, Residential*, as applicable, any *repair* that constitutes *substantial improvement* of the existing structure, as defined in Section 202, shall comply with the flood design requirements for new construction, and all aspects of the existing structure shall be brought into compliance with the requirements for new construction for flood design.

For buildings and structures in *flood hazard areas* established in Section 1612.3 of the ~~*International Building Code*~~*,Florida Building Code, Building* or Section R322 of the ~~*International Residential Code*~~*, Florida Building Code, Residential*, as applicable, any repairs that do not constitute *substantial improvement* or repair of *substantial damage* of the existing structure, as defined in Section 202, are not required to comply with the flood design requirements for new construction.

408.2 [Historic Buildings] Flood hazard areas. Within flood hazard areas established in accordance with Section 1612.3 of the ~~*International Building Code*~~,*Florida Building Code, Building* or Section R322 of the ~~*International Residential Code*~~, *Florida Building Code, Residential*, as applicable, where the work proposed constitutes substantial improvement as defined in Section 202, the building shall be brought into conformance with Section 1612 of the ~~*International Building Code*~~,*Florida Building Code, Building* or Section R322 of the ~~*International Residential Code*~~, Florida Building Code, Residential, as applicable,

Remainder unchanged

601.3 Flood hazard areas. In flood hazard areas, repairs that constitute *substantial improvement* shall require that the building comply with Chapter 1612 of the ~~*International Building Code*~~,*Florida Building Code, Building* or Section R322 of the ~~*International Residential Code*~~, *Florida Building Code, Residential*, as applicable.

606.2.4 [Structural] Flood hazard areas. In flood hazard areas, buildings that have sustained *substantial damage* shall be brought into compliance with Section 1612 of the ~~*International Building Code*~~,*Florida Building Code, Building* or Section R322 of the ~~*International Residential Code*~~, *Florida Building Code, Residential*, as applicable.

701.3 Flood hazard areas. In flood hazard areas, alterations that constitute *substantial improvement* shall require that the building comply with Section 1612 of the ~~*International Building Code*~~,*Florida Building Code, Building* or Section R322 of the ~~*International Residential Code*~~, *Florida Building Code, Residential*, as applicable.

1103.5 Flood Hazard Areas. Additions and foundations in flood hazard areas shall comply with the following requirements:

1. For horizontal additions that are structurally interconnected to the existing building:

1.1 If the addition and all other proposed work, when combined, constitute substantial improvement, the existing building and the addition shall comply with Section 1612 of the ~~*International Building Code*~~,*Florida Building Code, Building* or Section R322 of the ~~*International Residential Code*~~, *Florida Building Code, Residential* as applicable.

1.2 If the addition constitutes substantial improvement, the existing building and the addition shall comply with Section 1612 of the ~~*International Building Code*~~,*Florida Building Code, Building* or Section R322 of the ~~*International Residential Code*~~, *Florida Building Code, Residential*, as applicable.

2. For horizontal additions that are not structurally interconnected to the existing building:

2.1 The addition shall comply with Section 1612 of the ~~*International Building Code*~~,*Florida Building Code, Building* or Section R322 of the ~~*International Residential Code*~~, *Florida Building Code, Residential*, as applicable.

2.2 If the addition and all other proposed work, when combined, constitute substantial improvement, the existing building and the addition shall comply with Section 1612 of the ~~*International Building Code*~~,*Florida Building Code, Building* or Section R322 of the ~~*International Residential Code*~~, *Florida Building Code, Residential*, as applicable.

3. For vertical additions and all other proposed work, when combined, that constitute substantial improvement, the existing building shall comply with Section 1612 of the ~~*International Building Code*~~,*Florida Building Code, Building* or Section R322 of the ~~*International Residential Code*~~, *Florida Building Code, Residential*, as applicable.

4. For a new, replacement, raised, or extended foundation, if the foundation work and all other proposed work, when combined, constitute substantial improvement, the existing building shall comply with Section 1612 of the ~~*International Building Code*~~,*Florida Building Code, Building* or Section R322 of the ~~*International Residential Code*~~, *Florida Building Code, Residential*, as applicable.

1201.4 Flood hazard areas. In flood hazard areas, if all proposed work, including repairs, work required because of a change of occupancy, and alterations, constitutes substantial improvement, then the existing building shall comply with Section 1612 of the ~~*International Building Code*~~,*Florida Building Code, Building* or Section R322 of the ~~*International Residential Code*~~, *Florida Building Code, Residential*, as applicable.

Remainder unchanged

1302.6 Flood hazard areas. If relocated or moved into a flood hazard area, structures shall comply with Section 1612 of the ~~*International Building Code*~~,*Florida Building Code, Building* or Section R322 of the ~~*International Residential Code*~~, *Florida Building Code, Residential*, as applicable.

1401.3.3 Compliance with flood hazard provisions. In flood hazard areas, buildings that are evaluated in accordance with this section shall comply with Section 1612 of the ~~*International Building Code*~~,*Florida Building Code, Building* or Section R322 of the ~~*International Residential Code*~~, Florida Building Code, Residential, as applicable, if the work covered by this section constitutes substantial improvement.

2nd Comment Period 10/31/2012 - 12/14/2012

Proponent Joy Duperault **Submitted** 12/10/2012 **Attachments** No

SP5573-G2

Comment:

FBC staff brought to DEM's attention a difference between the foundation code and the language DEM used to submit one part of this proposal (Sec. 408.2).

Four sections with flood provisions are similarly phrased: 402.3, 403.2, 404.5 and 408.2. When ICC moved all definitions into Section 202, it made global changes to point all references to definitions to Section 202. That was done in 402.3, 403.2, and 404.5. It was NOT done in 408.2, which continues to say "substantial improvement as defined in Section 1612.2." Because 1612.2 lists the definitions and refers to Chapter 2, there is no basis for confusion. FEMA advised DEM that it has submitted a request to ICC to issue an errata for 408.2 to refer to Section 202 directly.

1st Comment Period History 08/09/2012 - 09/23/2012

Proponent BOAF CDC **Submitted** 9/23/2012 **Attachments** No

SP5573-G1

Comment:

This change was submitted to the ICC process.

The change is unnecessary, if this is needed it will be approved in Portland for inclusion into the 2015 IEBC.

The new Model Flood Ordinance form DEM very adequately covers this issue.

The amendment does not demonstrate by evidence or data that the geographical jurisdiction of Florida exhibits a need to strengthen the foundation code beyond the needs or regional variations addressed by the foundation code. Per FS 553.73 (7) (g)

402.2 [Additions] Flood hazard areas. For buildings and structures in flood hazard areas established in Section 1612.3 of the International Building Code, or Section R322 of the International Residential Code, as applicable, any addition that constitutes substantial improvement of the existing structure, as defined in Section 202, shall comply with the flood design requirements for new construction and all aspects of the existing structure shall be brought into compliance with the requirements for new construction for flood design.

For buildings and structures in flood hazard areas established in Section 1612.3 of the International Building Code, or Section R322 of the International Residential Code, as applicable, any additions that do not constitute substantial improvement of the existing structure, as defined in Section 202, are not required to comply with the flood design requirements for new construction.

403.2 [Alterations] Flood hazard areas. For buildings and structures in flood hazard areas established in Section 1612.3 of the International Building Code, or Section R322 of the International Residential Code, as applicable, any alteration that constitutes substantial Improvement of the existing structure, as defined in Section 202, shall comply with the flood design requirements for new construction, and all aspects of the existing structure shall be brought into compliance with the requirements for new construction for flood design.

For buildings and structures in flood hazard areas established in Section 1612.3 of the International Building Code, or Section R322 of the International Residential Code, as applicable, any alterations that do not constitute substantial improvement of the existing structure, as defined in Section 202, are not required to comply with the flood design requirements for new construction.

404.5 [Repairs] Flood hazard areas. For buildings and structures in flood hazard areas established in Section 1612.3 of the International Building Code, or Section R322 of the International Residential Code, as applicable, any repair that constitutes substantial improvement of the existing structure, as defined in Section 202, shall comply with the flood design requirements for new construction, and all aspects of the existing structure shall be brought into compliance with the requirements for new construction for flood design.

For buildings and structures in flood hazard areas established in Section 1612.3 of the International Building Code, or Section R322 of the International Residential Code, as applicable, any repairs that do not constitute substantial improvement or repair of substantial damage of the existing structure, as defined in Section 202, are not required to comply with the flood design requirements for new construction.

408.2 [Historic Buildings] Flood hazard areas. Within flood hazard areas established in accordance with Section 1612.3 of the International Building Code, or Section R322 of the International Residential Code, as applicable, where the work proposed constitutes substantial improvement as defined in Section 202, the building shall be brought into conformance with Section 1612 of the International Building Code, or Section R322 of the International Residential Code, as applicable.

Remainder unchanged

601.3 Flood hazard areas. In flood hazard areas, repairs that constitute substantial improvement shall require that the building comply with Chapter 1612 of the International Building Code, or Section R322 of the International Residential Code, as applicable.

606.2.4 [Structural] Flood hazard areas. In flood hazard areas, buildings that have sustained substantial damage shall be brought into compliance with Section 1612 of the International Building Code, or Section R322 of the International Residential Code, as applicable.

701.3 Flood hazard areas. In flood hazard areas, alterations that constitute substantial improvement shall require that the building comply with Section 1612 of the International Building Code, or Section R322 of the International Residential Code, as applicable.

1103.5 Flood Hazard Areas. Additions and foundations in flood hazard areas shall comply with the following requirements:

1. For horizontal additions that are structurally interconnected to the existing building:

1.1 If the addition and all other proposed work, when combined, constitute substantial improvement, the existing building and the addition shall comply with Section 1612 of the International Building Code, or Section R322 of the International Residential Code, as applicable.

1.2 If the addition constitutes substantial improvement, the existing building and the addition shall comply with Section 1612 of the International Building Code, or Section R322 of the International Residential Code, as applicable.

2. For horizontal additions that are not structurally interconnected to the existing building:

2.1 The addition shall comply with Section 1612 of the International Building Code, or Section R322 of the International Residential Code, as applicable.

2.2 If the addition and all other proposed work, when combined, constitute substantial improvement, the existing building and the addition shall comply with Section 1612 of the International Building Code, or Section R322 of the International Residential Code, as applicable.

3. For vertical additions and all other proposed work, when combined, that constitute substantial improvement, the existing building shall comply with Section 1612 of the International Building Code, or Section R322 of the International Residential Code, as applicable.

4. For a new, replacement, raised, or extended foundation, if the foundation work and all other proposed work, when combined, constitute substantial improvement, the existing building shall comply with Section 1612 of the International Building Code, or Section R322 of the International Residential Code, as applicable.

1201.4 Flood hazard areas. In flood hazard areas, if all proposed work, including repairs, work required because of a change of occupancy, and alterations, constitutes substantial improvement, then the existing building shall comply with Section 1612 of the International Building Code, or Section R322 of the International Residential Code, as applicable.

Remainder unchanged

1302.6 Flood hazard areas. If relocated or moved into a flood hazard area, structures shall comply with Section 1612 of the International Building Code, or Section R322 of the International Residential Code, as applicable.

1401.3.3 Compliance with flood hazard provisions. In flood hazard areas, buildings that are evaluated in accordance with this section shall comply with Section 1612 of the International Building Code, or Section R322 of the International Residential Code, as applicable, if the work covered by this section constitutes substantial improvement.

Total Mods for **Special Occupancy** in **Approved as Submitted: 3**

Total Mods for report: 9

Sub Code: Building

Date Submitted	7/31/2012	**Section**	1816.1.7	**Proponent**	Steven Dwinell
Chapter	18	**Affects HVHZ**	No	**Attachments**	No

TAC Recommendation Approved as Submitted
Commission Action Pending Review

Comments

General Comments Yes **Alternate Language** No

Related Modifications

Summary of Modification

Modify language to state that contracts offered for termite protection compy with Chapter 482, F.S., the Florida Structural Pest Control Act.

Rationale

The proposed modification would clarify that contracts offered for termite protection be in compliance with the Florida Structural Pest Control Act, Chapter 482, F.S. Building officials could verify compliance by consulting with the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, rather than review and interpret the contract itself. The proposed modification would increase consistency of application of this code provision by allowing this consultation rather than requiring interpretation of contracts by the building official. In addition, termite protection contract requirements are periodically changed when Chapter 482, F.S. and its associated rules are amended. This modification would allow this provision to stay current without additional code modifications.

Fiscal Impact Statement

Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code

No fiscal impact is anticipated. The proposed modification would simplify determination of compliance since code officials could consult with the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services to determine compliance rather than having to review and interpret these contracts.

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

No impact is anticipated. Contracts must already be provided as required by Chapter 482, F.S.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

No impact is anticipated. Contracts must already be provided as required by Chapter 482, F.S.

Requirements

Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public

The proposed code modification clarifies that termite protection contracts be in compliance with the Florida Structural Pest Control Act, Chapter 482, F.S. Termite protection contracts protect the public by requiring retreatment or damage repair when preventive treatments fail.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

The proposed code modification improves the code by making interpretation of this provision more consistent, since building officials could verify compliance by consulting with the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, rather than review and interpret the contract itself.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

The proposed modication does not discriminate against legal termite protection contracts since all contracts must be in compliance with Chapter 482, F.S.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

The proposed code modification improves the effectiveness of the code as described above.

Is the proposed code modification part of a prior code version? No

2nd Comment Period 10/31/2012 - 12/14/2012

Proponent Charlene Mertz **Submitted** 12/7/2012 **Attachments** No

SP5801-G17

Comment:

I misunderstood the intent of the modification and am now in support of the recommended changes to this code section.

2nd Comment Period 10/31/2012 - 12/14/2012

SP5801-G18

Proponent Joe Hughes **Submitted** 12/7/2012 **Attachments** No

Comment:
I originally misunderstood the intent of the modification and now support the recommended changes to this code section.

2nd Comment Period 10/31/2012 - 12/14/2012

SP5801-G19

Proponent Priscilla Wenner **Submitted** 12/7/2012 **Attachments** No

Comment:
I was misinformed about the proposed modification and now support it.

2nd Comment Period 10/31/2012 - 12/14/2012

SP5801-G20

Proponent Joe Hughes **Submitted** 12/10/2012 **Attachments** No

Comment:
I misunderstood the original intent of the building code modification and I am now in favor of it.

2nd Comment Period 10/31/2012 - 12/14/2012

SP5801-G21

Proponent Suzanne Graham **Submitted** 12/13/2012 **Attachments** No

Comment:
I support this modification.

In 2003 this issue came before the Florida Building Commission.

I was the original Petitioner of the Declaratory Statement DCA03-DEC-222.

This modification has been overlooked during the last few code cycles.

This modification is merely codifying what the Florida Building Commission approved back in 2003.

2nd Comment Period 10/31/2012 - 12/14/2012

SP5801-G22

Proponent ian robinson **Submitted** 12/13/2012 **Attachments** No

Comment:
I agree with the modification.

2nd Comment Period 10/31/2012 - 12/14/2012

SP5801-G23

Proponent Louis Hadley **Submitted** 12/13/2012 **Attachments** No

Comment:
I support the modification.

2nd Comment Period 10/31/2012 - 12/14/2012

SP5801-G24

Proponent Mike Adams **Submitted** 12/13/2012 **Attachments** No

Comment:
I approve and i am in support of this modification.

2nd Comment Period 10/31/2012 - 12/14/2012

SP5801-G25

Proponent Stacey Miller **Submitted** 12/13/2012 **Attachments** No

Comment:
I misunderstood the original intent of the modification and I am now in favor of it. Sorry for the confusion..

2nd Comment Period 10/31/2012 - 12/14/2012

SP5801-G26

Proponent Adam Jones **Submitted** 12/14/2012 **Attachments** No

Comment:
I support the proposed changes

2nd Comment Period 10/31/2012 - 12/14/2012

SP5801-G27

Proponent Marcie Downing **Submitted** 12/14/2012 **Attachments** No

Comment:
I am in support of this modification.

The proposed modification would codify the Declaratory Statement DCA03-DEC-222 which was passed in 2003.

2nd Comment Period 10/31/2012 - 12/14/2012

SP5801-G28

Proponent Edward Blumenthal **Submitted** 12/14/2012 **Attachments** No

Comment:
I approve of this modification

2nd Comment Period 10/31/2012 - 12/14/2012

SP5801-G29

Proponent zayne bailey **Submitted** 12/14/2012 **Attachments** No

Comment:
I approve of this modification

2nd Comment Period 10/31/2012 - 12/14/2012

SP5801-G30

Proponent Tom Cooper **Submitted** 12/14/2012 **Attachments** No

Comment:
I approve and support this modification.

2nd Comment Period 10/31/2012 - 12/14/2012

SP5801-G31

Proponent Allen Fugler **Submitted** 12/14/2012 **Attachments** No

Comment:
The member companies of the Florida Pest Management Association support the proposed changes in the Florida Building Code expressed in SP5801-G31. They believe the changes reflect current technologies for responsible termite control and benefit Florida consumers.

1st Comment Period History 08/09/2012 - 09/23/2012

SP5801-G1

Proponent Jim Blaney **Submitted** 8/22/2012 **Attachments** No

Comment:
I am in support of this building code modification. As a pesticide applicator, I am governed by Chapter 482 and new construction building inspectors are responsible to the Florida Building Code. This will tie the two together and eliminate the need to interpret FBC 1816.1.7 and resulting disagreements in those interpretations. It will also allow everyone to be in compliance of the department that they are governed by.

1st Comment Period History 08/09/2012 - 09/23/2012

SP5801-G2

Proponent Richard Alsen **Submitted** 8/23/2012 **Attachments** No

Comment:
I strongly support this building code modification as current verbage discriminates against state approved subertanean termite baiting systems. It will allow for easier interpretation. This will bring the two together allowing for compliance for all.

1st Comment Period History 08/09/2012 - 09/23/2012

SP5801-G3

Proponent Laura Claypool **Submitted** 9/4/2012 **Attachments** No

Comment:
The wording of having a "signed contract for Five years" provided prior to the pouring of the slab needs to be omitted. As a pest control provider, our contract for baiting in new construction is for first year paid by the builder with four more renewable years upon payment of contract by homeonwer. This is very confussing and up for interpretation by Building Officals looking for a Five Year contract, not accepting "four renewable years". This is holding up homes for builders and allowing officials to interpret our chapter 487. Also is it is not renewed after closing by the homeowner, that is not relavent to the code. Please remove any language stating a five year contract. Allowing pest control compaines wishing to install baiting systems for their builders a smooth process without being denied by inspectors/officals.

1st Comment Period History 08/09/2012 - 09/23/2012

SP5801-G4

Proponent Charlene Mertz **Submitted** 9/20/2012 **Attachments** No

Comment:

I am opposed to the proposed modification of section 1816.1.7. As I understand it, there are 3 options for termite protection: liquid soil, wood, and bait stations. The latter, bait stations, offers only notification of a problem, thus delivering zero protection on the actual structure. The soil and wood treatments offer residual protection for several years. The 5 year prepaid warrenty is vital in the protection of the consumer. Given the unstable economic status and challenges of survival consumers face, the proposed change leaves a wide open door for structural damage via termites on an untreated property. Pest Control Companies can demand annual payment or removal of the stations. Leaving the code as is at least offers 5 years inclusive with no additional monies exchanged.

1st Comment Period History 08/09/2012 - 09/23/2012

SP5801-G5

Proponent John Cooksey **Submitted** 9/21/2012 **Attachments** No

Comment:

I support of this building code modification. As a pesticide applicator, I am governed by Chapter 482 and new construction building inspectors are responsible to the Florida Building Code. This will tie the two together and eliminate the need to interpret FBC 1816.1.7 and resulting disagreements in those interpretations. It will also allow everyone to be in compliance of the department that they are governed by.

1st Comment Period History 08/09/2012 - 09/23/2012

SP5801-G6

Proponent Kidwell Raymond **Submitted** 9/21/2012 **Attachments** No

Comment:

I support the modification.

1st Comment Period History 08/09/2012 - 09/23/2012

SP5801-G7

Proponent Blackburn Jude **Submitted** 9/21/2012 **Attachments** No

Comment:

I am opposed to the proposed modification of section 1816.1.7. As I understand it, there are 3 options for termite protection: liquid soil, wood, and bait stations. Bait stations offer only evidence of termite presence after the fact and offer no true preventative measure, this method delivers no protection whatsoever on the actual structure. The soil and wood treatments offer residual protection for several years. The 5 year prepaid warranty is vital in the protection of the consumer. Leaving the code as is at least offers 5 years inclusive with no additional monies exchanged, thus providing consumers protection from exposure to termite damage.

1st Comment Period History 08/09/2012 - 09/23/2012

SP5801-G8

Proponent David Cooksey **Submitted** 9/21/2012 **Attachments** No

Comment:

I am strongly in favor of the proposed changes. It allows the agency in charge of regulating our industry to interpret the code that applies to us. This allows greater clarity for the operator and a more consistent interpretation of the code for the consumer. In addition it puts the "greener" termite products (baits) on an even playing field with the liquid termiticides.

1st Comment Period History 08/09/2012 - 09/23/2012

SP5801-G9

Proponent Joe Hughes **Submitted** 9/21/2012 **Attachments** No

Comment:

I am a Florida Certified Pest Control Operator with over 25 years experience. I am opposed to the proposed modification to Florida Building Code 1816.1.7. The proposed modification is to make the warranty criteria the same for bait station termite pretreats as it is for soil and wood termite pretreats. Currently if you perform a termite pretreat with bait stations the pest company has to maintain the stations for 5 years. The original purpose of this requirement was to protect the consumer because of the ability for pest companies to remove the stations if the homeowner did not pay for the warranty. If the stations were removed then there would be no termite protection on that house. Wood and soil treatments only require a one year prepaid warranty followed with an option for the homeowner to renew for an additional 4 years. This warranty stipulation is different because both wood and soil treatments are applied to the structure and cannot be removed. If the homeowner decides not to continue the warranty they at least have a treatment on the home that will protect against termite attack. If this change is allowed it will force homeowners to pay for a termite warranty or have all termite protection removed from their home. This could leave thousands of homes in Florida totally unprotected against termite attack. The fact is that most consumers do not have any idea what type of termite treatment the builder has purchased for their new home. They only find out after they have closed on the home . They expect that the price they paid for the home includes a treatment that will protect their home against termite attack. Another interesting fact from an article written in the Sun Sentinel in May of 2000, it was stated that most new homeowners do not renew their termite warranties. This means that if the new home is pretreated with bait stations, the home will be left with no termite protection.

1st Comment Period History 08/09/2012 - 09/23/2012

SP5801-G10

Proponent al formella **Submitted** 9/21/2012 **Attachments** No

Comment:

I am in support of this building code modification. As a pesticide applicator, I am governed by Chapter 482 and new construction building inspectors are responsible to the Florida Building Code.

1st Comment Period History 08/09/2012 - 09/23/2012

SP5801-G11

Proponent Stacey Miller **Submitted** 9/21/2012 **Attachments** No

Comment:

I am a Certfied Operator for a Pest Control company here in Jacksonville Florida. I am looking in a homeowners perspective about the modification that should NOT go through. This code is to protect the consumer if you change the building code to accomodate bait station users this will NOT protect the consumers. My Opinion is bait stations should not be a stand alone pretreatment method since termites forage randomly and there is no residual left in the soil (under the slab) there are only stations on the exterior. The code should STAND THE SAME and NOT be changed since there is no residual left under the slab at the time of pretreatment with baiting stations. Florida is an excessive moisture state and should require liquid pretreatment for ALL there slabs in my opinion which in turn will protect the homeowner.

1st Comment Period History 08/09/2012 - 09/23/2012

SP5801-G12

Proponent Joe Hughes **Submitted** 9/22/2012 **Attachments** No

Comment:

I have been a certified pest control operator in Florida for approximately 45 years and I oppose the modification to section 1816.1.7. I would never offer a bait system on new construction. As a respected pest professional I understand that some consumers may not be able to afford a termite warranty but I don't think they should be left without protection when other treatments would remain effective.. If this change is allowed it will cause many homeowners to lose their termite protection just because they cannot pay for the warranty. Under the current code they are protected for at least 5 years. I would prefer to provide soil or wood treatment so that the homeowner would have continued protection even if they cannot afford the warranty.

1st Comment Period History 08/09/2012 - 09/23/2012

Proponent Suzanne Graham **Submitted** 9/23/2012 **Attachments** No

SP5801-G13

Comment:

I support this modification.

This modification has been overlooked during the last 2 code cycles.
This modification is merely codifying what the Florida Building Commission approved back in 2003.

In 2003 this issue came before the Florida Building Commission. I was the original Petitioner of the Declaratory Statement DCA03-DEC-222.

As Petitioner I was seeking clarification regarding the provisions of Section 1816.1, Florida Building Code - Building Volume (2001 as amended 6/30/2003), regarding termite protection.

Petitioner seeks to determine: 1) Whether Section 1816.1, Florida Building Code, requires new construction builders and homeowners choosing termite baiting systems using termiticides registered in Florida and labeled for use as new construction termite control, to be required to contract for five
years of service to comply with the Code; and

2) whether Section 1816.1, Florida Building Code, requires that the standard contract wording required by the Department of Agriculture and Consumer
Services, Chapter 482, Florida Statutes (2002), providing for one year of service and guaranteeing the property owner the option to renew service for no less than an additional four years complies with the Code.

Conclusions of Law:

1) builders choosing termite baiting systems using termiticides registered in Florida and labeled for use as new construction termite control are required to contract for five years of service to comply with the Florida Building Code, however, the Code does not require prepayment;

2) the Florida Building Code Commission has no authority to interpret Chapter 482, Florida Statutes. Contracts for the prevention of subterranean termites in new construction must meet the requirements in Chapter 482, Florida Statutes, and Chapter 5E-14, Florida Administrative Code.

1st Comment Period History 08/09/2012 - 09/23/2012

Proponent Suzanne Graham **Submitted** 9/23/2012 **Attachments** No

SP5801-G14

Comment:

I support this modification.

This modification has been overlooked during the last 2 code cycles.
This modification is merely codifying what the Florida Building Commission approved back in 2003.

In 2003 this issue came before the Florida Building Commission. I was the original Petitioner of the Declaratory Statement DCA03-DEC-222.

As Petitioner I was seeking clarification regarding the provisions of Section 1816.1, Florida Building Code - Building Volume (2001 as amended 6/30/2003), regarding termite protection.

Petitioner seeks to determine: 1) Whether Section 1816.1, Florida Building Code, requires new construction builders and homeowners choosing termite baiting systems using termiticides registered in Florida and labeled for use as new construction termite control, to be required to contract for five
years of service to comply with the Code; and

2) whether Section 1816.1, Florida Building Code, requires that the standard contract wording required by the Department of Agriculture and Consumer
Services, Chapter 482, Florida Statutes (2002), providing for one year of service and guaranteeing the property owner the option to renew service for no less than an additional four years complies with the Code.

Conclusions of Law:

1) builders choosing termite baiting systems using termiticides registered in Florida and labeled for use as new construction termite control are required to contract for five years of service to comply with the Florida Building Code, however, the Code does not require prepayment;

2) the Florida Building Code Commission has no authority to interpret Chapter 482, Florida Statutes. Contracts for the prevention of subterranean termites in new construction must meet the requirements in Chapter 482, Florida Statutes, and Chapter 5E-14, Florida Administrative Code.

1st Comment Period History 08/09/2012 - 09/23/2012

SP5801-G15

Proponent Priscilla Wenner **Submitted** 9/23/2012 **Attachments** No

Comment:

I am opposed to the proposed modification to section 1816.1.7. I am a homeowner that is retired and living on social security. While I know it is important to maintain a termite warranty on my home sometimes finances prevent people from maintaining their warranty. When I bought my new home I had no idea what type of termite treatment was performed. If it had been a bait system I would not had known that it would be necessary to continue a maintenance program to keep my home protected from termites. I would have been especially upset to find out that the pest company could remove the stations and leave my home totally unprotected against termites if I could not pay for the warranty. I would be forced to continue the coverage or lose all protection for termites on my home. I would probably have to either have no protection on my house or I would have to eliminate one of my prescription medications or lower my grocery expense. At least with a soil or wood treatment my home would be protected even if I could not afford the warranty. When you buy a home you expect it to have some type of protection for termites that cannot be removed. If you allow this change it will have devastating effects on senior citizens in Florida.

1st Comment Period History 08/09/2012 - 09/23/2012

SP5801-G16

Proponent Marcie Downing **Submitted** 9/23/2012 **Attachments** No

Comment:

I support this modification.

The proposed building code modification will create a consistent interpretation of the requirements for all termite treatments used for new construction termite protection. Florida State Statute Ch 482/ FAC 5E-14.105.3 requires that pest control licensees provide a contract to property owners for all new construction termite treatments. This contract must include a warranty for retreatment and/or retreatment and damage repair for one year with the option for automatic renewal for up to four additional years upon payment of an annual renewal fee. At this time, there is an inequitable condition stipulated for a subset of products that already comply with Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (FDACS) Statute (Chapter 482). This modification will also redirect disputed termite contract language to the FDACS whose function it is to regulate all pest control contracts. Lastly, the proposed modification would codify the Declaratory Statement DCA03-DEC-222 which was passed in 2003.

1816.1.7 If a registered termiticide formulated and registered as a bait system is used for subterranean termite prevention, Sections 1816.1.1 through 1816.1.6 do not apply; however, a signed contract assuring the installation, maintenance and monitoring of the baiting system that is in compliance with the requirements of Chapter 482, F.S. ~~for a minimum of five years from the issue of the certificate of occupancy~~ shall be provided to the building official prior to the pouring of the slab, and the system must be installed prior to final building approval. If the baiting system directions for use require a monitoring phase prior to installation of the pesticide active ingredient, the installation of the monitoring phase components shall be deemed to constitute installation of the system.

Date Submitted	7/26/2012	**Section**	M301.13	**Proponent**	Rebecca Quinn obo DEM
Chapter	3	**Affects HVHZ**	No	**Attachments**	No

TAC Recommendation Approved as Submitted
Commission Action Pending Review

Comments

General Comments Yes **Alternate Language** No

Related Modifications

5271

Summary of Modification

Achieves terminology consistency between the building code, the residential code and ASCE 24. Approved as Submitted for the 2015 IBC (S103-12).

Rationale

S103-12, Approved as Submitted by FEMA for the foundation IBC, IMC and IPC. Makes changes everywhere the term "flood hazard areas subject to high velocity wave action" appears, replace with "coastal high hazard area." The two terms are exactly the same. This change will mean consistency of terms between the Building code, ASCE 24, the Residential Code, and the NFIP.

Fiscal Impact Statement

Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code

No impact due to change in terminology to use Coastal High Hazard Area.

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

No impact due to change in terminology to use Coastal High Hazard Area.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

No impact due to change in terminology to use Coastal High Hazard Area.

Requirements

Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public

No impact due to change in terminology to use Coastal High Hazard Area.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

No impact due to change in terminology to use Coastal High Hazard Area.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Doesn't affect material specifications.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

No impact due to change in terminology to use Coastal High Hazard Area.

Is the proposed code modification part of a prior code version? No

2nd Comment Period 10/31/2012 - 12/14/2012

Proponent Joy Duperault **Submitted** 12/10/2012 **Attachments** No

SP5682-G2

Comment:

This proposal combines with SP5679. The resulting title to the section should appear as follows: "M301.13.1 Coastal high hazard areas and coastal A zones."

1st Comment Period History 08/09/2012 - 09/23/2012

Proponent BOAF CDC **Submitted** 9/23/2012 **Attachments** No

SP5682-G1

Comment:

This change was submitted to the ICC process.

This change is editorial in nature and is unnecessary, if this is needed it will be approved in Portland for inclusion into the 2015 IPC.

This code change is unnecessary as the provisions contained in the proposed amendment are adequately addressed in the applicable international code. Per FS 553.73 (7) (g)

The amendment does not demonstrate by evidence or data that the geographical jurisdiction of Florida exhibits a need to strengthen the foundation code beyond the needs or regional variations addressed by the foundation code. Per FS 553.73 (7) (g)

M301.13.1 ~~High-velocity wave action~~Coastal high hazard areas. In ~~flood hazard areas subject to high-velocity wave action~~ coastal high hazard areas and coastal A zones mechanical systems and equipment shall not be mounted on or penetrate walls intended to break away under flood loads.

Date Submitted	7/26/2012	**Section**	M309.3	**Proponent**	Rebecca Quinn obo DEM
Chapter	3	**Affects HVHZ**	No	**Attachments**	No

TAC Recommendation Approved as Submitted
Commission Action Pending Review

Comments

General Comments Yes

Alternate Language No

Related Modifications

5138, 5271, 5679

Summary of Modification

Limits application of Coastal A Zone requirements only if the CAZ is delineated on a map or designated by the community. Submitted as public comment at suggestion of IBC Structural Committee (S102-12).

Rationale

Consistency with same changes in FBC, Building. The IBC Structural Committee viewed S102-12 favorably, but requested modification of language in the definitions of "Coastal A Zone" and "Limit of Moderate Wave Action." Those changes have been approved by a ballot by the ASCE 24 committee.

Currently the FBC, Building, by reference to ASCE 24-05, requires the designer to determine if Coastal A Zone conditions are present. And ASCE 24 already requires buildings in Coastal A Zones to meet the same requirements as Coastal High Hazard Areas (Zone V). The next edition of ASCE 24 is nearing its final draft; the next edition will specify that the Coastal A Zone is recognized only if the Limit of Moderate Wave Action is shown on the map, or if the CAZ is otherwise designated by the community (a small number of Florida communities do this). Thus, designers and communities will no longer that to do site-by-site evaluations to determine wave conditions in areas outside of the Zone V.

Fiscal Impact Statement

Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code

Facilitates enforcement and compliance by clarifying where the CAZ requirements apply.

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

Facilitates enforcement and compliance by clarifying where the CAZ requirements apply.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

Facilitates enforcement and compliance by clarifying where the CAZ requirements apply.

Requirements

Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public

Recognizes moderate wave conditions only where such conditions are identified on a map or otherwise designated.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Recognizes moderate wave conditions only where such conditions are identified on a map or otherwise designated.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Doesn't affect material specifications.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Recognizes moderate wave conditions only where such conditions are identified on a map or otherwise designated.

Is the proposed code modification part of a prior code version? No

2nd Comment Period 10/31/2012 - 12/14/2012

Proponent Joy Duperault **Submitted** 12/10/2012 **Attachments** No

SP5684-G2

Comment:

This proposal combines with SP5683. The resulting section should appear as follows:
"P309.3 Coastal High hazard areas and coastal A Zones. Structures located in coastal high hazard areas and coastal A zones shall meet the requirements of Section 309.2. The plumbing systems pipes and fixtures shall not be mounted on or penetrate through walls intended to break away under flood loads."

SP5684-G1

Proponent	BOAF CDC	Submitted	9/23/2012	Attachments	No

Comment:

This change is premature, Coastal A Zones are designated by the community and are not part of ASCE 24 2005, the next edition of ASCE 24 has the requirements in it.

The coastal A Zone will not be in the 2015 I-Codes unless the standard is completed before the final action hearing, and then it will come in in the next cycle as the base code.

The amendment does not demonstrate by evidence or data that the geographical jurisdiction of Florida exhibits a need to strengthen the foundation code beyond the needs or regional variations addressed by the foundation code. Per FS 553.73 (7) (g)

This change was submitted to the I-Code process

P309.3 Flood hazard areas subject to high-velocity wave action and coastal A zones. Structures located in flood hazard areas subject to high-velocity wave action and coastal A zones shall meet the requirements of Section 309.2. The plumbing systems, pipes and fixtures shall not be mounted on or penetrate through walls intended to break away under flood loads.

Total Mods for **Special Occupancy** in **No Affirmative Recommendation with a Second: 5**

Total Mods for report: 9

Sub Code: Building

Date Submitted	7/19/2012	**Section**	453	**Proponent**	Paul Coats
Chapter	4	**Affects HVHZ**	No	**Attachments**	Yes

TAC Recommendation No Affirmative Recommendation with a Second
Commission Action Pending Review

Comments

General Comments Yes

Alternate Language No

Related Modifications

Summary of Modification

This modification eliminates the Florida-specific construction type restrictions for public schools in Special Occupancy Section 453 in favor of using the construction type provisions for schools in Chapters 5 and 6 of the Florida Building Code, which are based on the IBC.

Rationale

Reason: see uploaded support file

Fiscal Impact Statement

Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code

None

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

This will reduce the cost of construction.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

This will reduce the cost of construction.

Requirements

Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public

Contruction type considerations are integral to the health, safety, and welfare of the general public.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

This strengthens and improves the code by permitting national accepted model code provisions for the use of materials and elimininating unnecessary Florida-specific restrictions on materials.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

This modification eliminates existing discriminatory restrictions on materials that are in conflict with the model building codes.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

This modification is in complete agreement with nationally accepted model codes for school construction. It will not degrade the effectiveness of the code for matters of safety or durability, but instead introduces flexibility that increases the effectiveness of the code.

Is the proposed code modification part of a prior code version? No

2nd Comment Period 10/31/2012 - 12/14/2012

Proponent Paul Coats **Submitted** 12/13/2012 **Attachments** No

SP5326-G10

Comment:

SP5326 seeks to retain the International Code Council (ICC) model code provisions allowing schools of Types III and V construction. At the TAC meeting, public testimony against SP5326, the subsequent TAC discussion prior to voting, and the reasons recorded for the action taken, centered on the relative merits of wood's performance as a structural building material and its fire safety compared to other materials. This was surprising, given that the Florida Building Commission has consistently adopted the widely-accepted ICC model code criteria for non-public schools in Florida without controversy.

Building codes should prohibit certain building materials only when there are incontrovertible reasons for doing so. The content of widely used national standards developed by dynamic and active national organizations who concern themselves solely with the structural, fire, and life safety of buildings—ICC and the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA)—deserves thorough consideration. Anecdotal evidence contradicting these national standards, and based on experiences with existing school facilities that do not conform to these modern codes, should be given little consideration.

Furthermore, although perceived disadvantages regarding maintenance or life cycle costs may have a role in investigation for the sake of policy decisions, it is quite a different matter to prohibit a material in the building code based on them. Building codes do not require the use of any material, but should permit the full range of possibilities for designers and owners who make the decisions.

We request that the TAC revisit the material submitted in support of SP5326, and also revisit its decision on SP5326. Furthermore, we request that SP5326 be sent to the Structural and Fire TACs for their consideration also, as completely germane to their expertise, since the Special Occupancy TAC expressed that structural and fire issues were their main concerns with the modification.

1st Comment Period History 08/09/2012 - 09/23/2012

SP5326-G1

Proponent	David Lewis	Submitted	8/20/2012	Attachments	No

Comment:

I strongly aggree with this proposed change because the current code language is unfair to wood products and adds cost to school construction. I am interested to hear how DOE has maintained the current code for so long.

1st Comment Period History 08/09/2012 - 09/23/2012

SP5326-G2

Proponent	Joseph Holland	Submitted	8/20/2012	Attachments	No

Comment:

The change proposes to eliminate a Florida specific requirement. The requirement should have been purged along with the rest of the Florida specific requirements. The proposal is correct the base code is designed to provide for the life safety, health and welfare of the citizens of the State.

The current provision cannot meet the thresholds established for new provisions. It is discriminatory.

1st Comment Period History 08/09/2012 - 09/23/2012

SP5326-G3

Proponent	Borjen Yeh	Submitted	9/15/2012	Attachments	No

Comment:

APA – The Engineered Wood Association would like to submit the following comments to support the proposed modification SP5326.

Wood schools have been constructed not only in the US, but in Canada, Europe, Japan, and numerous countries around the world. Wood construction is cost-effective, green, and operational efficient. It also creates an improved learning and healing environment for students. In today's technology and engineering, wood structures can be readily designed to meet the stringent fire and structural safety requirements mandated by the code. Therefore, the restriction on wood construction in Florida public schools, as imposed by the current Florida Building Code, is not sustainable, nor justifiable. The Florida Building Code needs to be updated at this code cycle to reflect the reality and to take advantage of wood construction for cost, environmental friendliness, and building safety.

1st Comment Period History 08/09/2012 - 09/23/2012

SP5326-G4

Proponent	Donald Gustavson	Submitted	9/19/2012	Attachments	No

Comment:

The option to use wood construction will allow Florida to be competitive with other States.

1st Comment Period History 08/09/2012 - 09/23/2012

SP5326-G5

Proponent Damon Roby **Submitted** 9/19/2012 **Attachments** No

Comment:

Damon Roby - Architectural Designer with True Design Studios, a premier Design Studio in Northeast Florida.

As a statement of design, limiting the materials used in the construction of educational facilities is doing a great disservice to the form and function of the structure. Wood is an element, that when used properly, can create a sense of warmth and awe in the people interacting with the built environment. Along with safety, it seems that fostering creative thought would be a primary concern when designing and building a structure used for learning. Since the safety issue can be squarely addressed using wood, then it remains that limiting the use of materials used to construct a school is simply limiting the potential of the built environment to have an impact on that creative thought, and nothing more.

Add to this the fact that wood is inherently much more environmentally friendly than concrete and steel, and the structure becomes sustainable as well. The embodied energy used to manufacture wood products is not even half of that used to manufacture the building materials currently used. Wood is also a renewable resource, whereas the materials that make up concrete and steel are limited and dwindling. Wood is readily available and can be obtained from well maintained local & regional sources, whereas most of the steel used in the US must be obtained from overseas in order to be cost efficient. Often these products are inferior in quality and do not in any way assist the local community & economy.

Therefor it seems in the light of overwhelming evidence, that a modification to the current Code is the next logical conclusion.

1st Comment Period History 08/09/2012 - 09/23/2012

SP5326-G6

Proponent Michael Kozlowski **Submitted** 9/21/2012 **Attachments** No

Comment:

I am a professional engineer and president of ApexTechnology, a firm specializing in structural and mechanical engineering of light frame structures. This is a fantastic modification that comes at a time when our community needs it. Wood frame construction is proven and should be allowed to fairly compete with other building systems in the construction of our schools.

At Apex, we study the science of building systems. Instead of focusing on one aspect of the design, we work with integrated partners in architectural design and manufacturing to truly understand the overall benefits of an optimized system. Wood frame construction has a significantly lower carbon footprint than other materials, can handily meet hurricane wind loads due to increased design standards and engineered lumber, and provide significant energy performance over alternate materials - all while providing material and labor cost savings. Wood frame construction and elements also allow for more appealing architectural design. Studies have shown the "warmth" of wood frame construction to positively affect children versus the cold, industrial feel of the typical concrete or masonry construction. All of these positive aspects are clearly important in today's community.

Finally, to address the longstanding rebuttals to wood frame construction of termites and fire resistance, I offer up the technology and regulation of the 21st century. In addition to no-burn applicant technology, sprinkler requirements and the ever advancing termite strategies have made these rebuttals non-issues.

I urge the committee to approve the code modification as submitted.

1st Comment Period History 08/09/2012 - 09/23/2012

SP5326-G7

Proponent David Lewis **Submitted** 9/21/2012 **Attachments** No

Comment:

My name is David Lewis and I represent Norbord Ind a manufacturer of OSB also I have lived in Florida all my life and pay taxes. I think it is important that the current ban on using wood in the construction of public schools be changed as proposed. The slection of a building material should be based on what works best for the proposed project without unfounded bias.

1st Comment Period History 08/09/2012 - 09/23/2012

SP5326-G8

Proponent Catherine Kaake **Submitted** 9/21/2012 **Attachments** No

Comment:

I support this code change. The change will allow for more cost-effective construction and provide a level playing field for all building materials.

SP5326-G9

Proponent Jim Pattillo **Submitted** 9/23/2012 **Attachments** No

Comment:

We are a plywood manufacturer located in Havana, Florida employing 300 people at this location. We strongly support the use of wood in Florida public schools. Wood has a significant cost savings compared to steel/concrete products while meeting all the necessary code requirements for high winds and fire safety. It is the only major building material that is renewable and sustainable. Florida is the only state where the ban of wood-frame in public schools exists. We strongly support code modification #5326 which will remove this restriction.
Jim Pattillo
President
Coastal Plywood Company

Revise as follows:

453.8.3 Construction type. School board and Florida college buildings including auxiliary, ancillary and vocational facilities shall comply with the construction type provisions of the Florida Building Code. ~~following:~~

~~**453.8.3.1 Noncombustible Type I, II or IV.** The minimum construction type for one- and two-story public educational facilities shall be noncombustible Type I, II or IV construction or better.~~

~~**453.8.3.1.1** Interior nonload-bearing wood studs or partitions shall not be used in permanent educational and auxiliary facilities or relocatable buildings.~~

~~**Exception:** Historic buildings to maintain the fabric of the historic character of the building.~~

~~**453.8.3.2 Type I.** Facilities three stories or more shall be Type I construction.~~

~~**453.8.3.3 Type IV.** When Type IV construction is used, wood shall be exposed and not covered by ceilings or other construction.~~

~~**453.8.3.4 Exceptions to types of construction:**~~

~~1. Covered walkways open on all sides may be Type V construction.~~

~~2. Single-story dugouts, press boxes, concession stands, related public toilet rooms, detached covered play areas, and nonflammable storage buildings that are detached from the main educational facility by at least 60 feet (1829 mm), may be Type V construction.~~

Revise as follows:

453.8.3 Construction type. School board and Florida college buildings including auxiliary, ancillary and vocational facilities shall comply with the construction type provisions of the Florida Building Code. ~~following:~~

~~**453.8.3.1 Noncombustible Type I, II or IV.** The minimum construction type for one- and two-story public educational facilities shall be noncombustible Type I, II or IV construction or better.~~

~~**453.8.3.1.1** Interior nonload-bearing wood studs or partitions shall not be used in permanent educational and auxiliary facilities or relocatable buildings.~~

~~**Exception:** Historic buildings to maintain the fabric of the historic character of the building.~~

~~**453.8.3.2 Type I.** Facilities three stories or more shall be Type I construction.~~

~~**453.8.3.3 Type IV.** When Type IV construction is used, wood shall be exposed and not covered by ceilings or other construction.~~

~~**453.8.3.4 Exceptions to types of construction:**~~

~~1. Covered walkways open on all sides may be Type V construction.~~

~~2. Single story dugouts, press boxes, concession stands, related public toilet rooms, detached covered play areas, and nonflammable storage buildings that are detached from the main educational facility by at least 60 feet (1829 mm), may be Type V construction.~~

Reason:

Currently, the special occupancy provisions for schools in the Florida Building Code prohibit wood-frame construction, regardless of building size, except for heavy timber. We believe these restrictions are not necessary.

Whereas at one time special construction type restrictions may have served a purpose, both the International Building Code (IBC) and the NFPA Building Construction and Safety Code (NFPA 5000) have time-tested criteria for schools of Types 3 and 5 construction. These national model codes contain criteria for school size (according to construction type), fire resistance, fire sprinklers, fire alarm systems, means of egress, interior finishes, and many other safety features specific to schools. These systems and features work together to provide a safe environment for students. As a result, safety considerations associated with the framing material have become inconsequential, given model code requirements as a whole. Furthermore, the design standards for wood in high wind regions are well-established.

The IBC model code provisions are contained in other sections of the Florida Building Code, but are superseded by Section 453, causing confusion for designers. There has been a concerted effort to eliminate conflicts between the Florida Building Code and the International Building Code. It should be incumbent on those desiring to retain the restrictions to demonstrate the current need for them. Remarkably, there now exists a double standard in Florida for school construction: public schools must abide by the additional construction type restrictions in Section 453, whereas private schools have no such limitation.

Neither are there such limitations for schools in other states, where wood framing is commonly utilized. Only a handful of states retain construction type restrictions beyond the IBC and NFPA 5000, and they are also making changes. Arkansas and South Carolina have recently chosen to

remove construction type restrictions from their school facility manuals. A dramatic increase of smaller charter and community schools in recent years has heightened the need for design flexibility.

Recent state legislation directly addresses this issue, at least in principle. These statutes 1) require that departure from the IBC must demonstrate a specific need of the state; 2) prohibit the Florida Building Code from discriminating against materials, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capability; and 3) require the aggressive elimination of obsolete, excessively restrictive, or unnecessary regulations for schools without sacrificing safety or quality of construction.

By retaining outdated materials restrictions for schools, Florida gains nothing in school safety or longevity while losing significant advantages for cost effectiveness, energy efficiency, sustainability, design and construction efficiency, and desirable learning environments.[1] One recent study estimated savings of between two and six dollars per square foot over post and beam steel structures,[2] and significant speed of construction, life cycle, and energy savings. Studies have also shown that the "warm" environment and pleasing aesthetics of wood enhances learning.

We urge the Commission to consider the relevant safety issues, and other issues, and improve the Florida Building Code by removing these conflicting provisions.

[1] The following are links to articles that document the advantages of wood school construction and associated studies:
http://www.woodworks.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/02/is-wood-schools1.pdf
http://www.woodworks.org/design-with-wood/school-construction/
http://www.structuremag.org/article.aspx?articleID=1110
http://www.lpainc.com/lpa/show/956/Wood_Scores_A_in_School_Construction

[2] Steel vs. Wood, A Cost Analysis of Superstructures, by Keith Kothmann, CPE, Construction Cost Management Co. (as cited in the articles linked above)

Reason:

Currently, the special occupancy provisions for schools in the Florida Building Code prohibit wood-frame construction, regardless of building size, except for heavy timber. We believe these restrictions are not necessary.

Whereas at one time special construction type restrictions may have served a purpose, both the International Building Code (IBC) and the NFPA Building Construction and Safety Code (NFPA 5000) have time-tested criteria for schools of Types 3 and 5 construction. These national model codes contain criteria for school size (according to construction type), fire resistance, fire sprinklers, fire alarm systems, means of egress, interior finishes, and many other safety features specific to schools. These systems and features work together to provide a safe environment for students. As a result, safety considerations associated with the framing material have become inconsequential, given model code requirements as a whole. Furthermore, the design standards for wood in high wind regions are well-established.

The IBC model code provisions are contained in other sections of the Florida Building Code, but are superseded by Section 453, causing confusion for designers. There has been a concerted effort to eliminate conflicts between the Florida Building Code and the International Building Code. It should be incumbent on those desiring to retain the restrictions to demonstrate the current need for them. Remarkably, there now exists a double standard in Florida for school construction: public schools must abide by the additional construction type restrictions in Section 453, whereas private schools have no such limitation.

Neither are there such limitations for schools in other states, where wood framing is commonly utilized. Only a handful of states retain construction type restrictions beyond the IBC and NFPA 5000, and they are also making changes. Arkansas and South Carolina have recently chosen to remove construction type restrictions from their school facility manuals. A dramatic increase of smaller charter and community schools in recent years has heightened the need for design flexibility.

Recent state legislation directly addresses this issue, at least in principle. These statutes 1) require that departure from the IBC must demonstrate a specific need of the state; 2) prohibit the Florida Building Code from discriminating against materials, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capability; and 3) require the aggressive elimination of obsolete, excessively restrictive, or unnecessary regulations for schools without sacrificing safety or quality of construction.

By retaining outdated materials restrictions for schools, Florida gains nothing in school safety or longevity while losing significant advantages for cost effectiveness, energy efficiency, sustainability, design and construction efficiency, and desirable learning environments.[1] One recent study estimated savings of between two and six dollars per square foot over post and beam steel structures,[2] and significant speed of construction, life cycle, and energy savings. Studies have also shown that the “warm” environment and pleasing aesthetics of wood enhances learning.

We urge the Commission to consider the relevant safety issues, and other issues, and improve the Florida Building Code by removing these conflicting provisions.

[1] The following are links to articles that document the advantages of wood school construction and associated studies:
http://www.woodworks.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/02/is-wood-schools1.pdf
http://www.woodworks.org/design-with-wood/school-construction/
http://www.structuremag.org/article.aspx?articleID=1110
http://www.lpainc.com/lpa/show/956/Wood_Scores_A_in_School_Construction

[2] Steel vs. Wood, A Cost Analysis of Superstructures, by Keith Kothmann, CPE, Construction Cost Management Co. (as cited in the articles linked above)

SP5271

Date Submitted	7/22/2012	**Section**	1612, 202, 1403.7, 1603.1.7	1804 **Proponent**	Rebecca Quinn obo DEM
Chapter	16	**Affects HVHZ**	No	**Attachments**	No

TAC Recommendation No Affirmative Recommendation with a Second
Commission Action Pending Review

Comments

General Comments Yes

Alternate Language No

Related Modifications

5138

Summary of Modification

Limits application of Coastal A Zone requirements only if the CAZ is delineated on a map or designated by the community. Submitted as public comment at suggestion of IBC Structural Committee (S102-12).

Rationale

The IBC Structural Committee viewed S102-12 favorably, but requested modification of language in the definitions of "Coastal A Zone" and "Limit of Moderate Wave Action." Those changes have been approved by a ballot by the ASCE 24 committee.

Currently the FBC, Building, by reference to ASCE 24-05, requires the designer to determine if Coastal A Zone conditions are present. And ASCE 24 already requires buildings in Coastal A Zones to meet the same requirements as Coastal High Hazard Areas (Zone V). The next edition of ASCE 24 is nearing its final draft; the next edition will specify that the Coastal A Zone is recognized only if the Limit of Moderate Wave Action is shown on the map, or if the CAZ is otherwise designated by the community (a small number of Florida communities do this). Thus, designers and communities will no longer that to do site-by-site evaluations to determine wave conditions in areas outside of the Zone V.

Fiscal Impact Statement

Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code

Facilitates enforcement and compliance by clarifying where the CAZ requirements apply.

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

Facilitates enforcement and compliance by clarifying where the CAZ requirements apply.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

Facilitates enforcement and compliance by clarifying where the CAZ requirements apply.

Requirements

Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public

Recognizes moderate wave conditions only where such conditions are identified on a map or otherwise designated.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Recognizes moderate wave conditions only where such conditions are identified on a map or otherwise designated.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Doesn't affect material specifications.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Recognizes moderate wave conditions only where such conditions are identified on a map or otherwise designated.

Is the proposed code modification part of a prior code version? No

2nd Comment Period 10/31/2012 - 12/14/2012

Proponent Joy Duperault **Submitted** 12/10/2012 **Attachments** No

SP5271-G1

Comment:

DEM requests the Commission approve this change that responds to concerns expressed by a number of Florida communities that do not yet have Limit of Moderate Wave Action lines shown on their Flood Insurance Rate Maps produced by FEMA. This change also will be shown in the upcoming revision of ASCE 24. The Special Occupancy TAC voted NAR with the reason statement "Denied to allow the ASCE committee to further consider and finalized the updated statement." DEM asked the ASCE 24 committee chair to provide a letter explaining the status of the standard (uploaded to SP5289 and SP5138). He will ask ASCE to provide the final draft of the standard to the Commission in January.

COASTAL A ZONE. Area within a special flood hazard area, landward of a coastal high hazard area or landward of an open coast without mapped coastal high hazard areas. In a Coastal A Zone, the principal source of flooding must be astronomical tides, storm surges, seiches, or tsunamis, not riverine flooding. During the base flood conditions, the potential for breaking wave heights shall be greater than or equal to 1.5 ft. The inland limit of the Coastal A Zone is (a) the Limit of Moderate Wave Action if delineated on a FIRM, or (b) designated by the authority having jurisdiction.

FLOOD HAZARD AREA SUBJECT TO HIGH-VELOCITY WAVE ACTION. Area within the special flood hazard area extending from offshore to the inland limit of a primary frontal dune along an open coast and any other area that is subject to high-velocity wave action from storms or seismic sources, and shown on a Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) or other flood hazard map as velocity zones Zone V, VO, VE or V1-30.

LIMIT OF MODERATE WAVE ACTION. Line shown on FIRMs to indicate the inland limit of the 1.5-foot breaking wave height during the base flood.

1403.7 Flood resistance for velocity wave action areas and coastal A zones. For buildings in flood hazard areas subject to high-velocity wave action and coastal A zones as established in Section 1612.3, electrical, mechanical and plumbing system components shall not be mounted on or penetrate through exterior walls that are designed to break away under flood loads.

1603.1.7 Flood design data. For buildings located in whole or in part in flood hazard areas as established in Section 1612.3, the documentation pertaining to design, if required in Section 1612.5, shall be included and the following information, referenced to the datum on the community's Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), shall be shown, regardless of whether flood loads govern the design of the building:

1. In flood hazard areas not subject to high-velocity wave action or coastal A zones, the elevation of the proposed lowest floor, including basement.

2. In flood hazard areas subject to high-velocity wave action and coastal A zones, the elevation to which any non-residential building will be dry floodproofed.

3. In flood hazard areas subject to high-velocity wave action and coastal A zones, the proposed elevation of the bottom of the lowest horizontal structural member of the lowest floor, including basement.

1612.4 Design and construction. The design and construction of buildings and structures located in flood hazard areas, including flood hazard areas subject to high-velocity wave action and coastal A zones, shall be in accordance with Chapter 5 of ASCE 7 and with ASCE 24.

1612.5 Flood hazard documentation. The following documentation shall be prepared and sealed by a registered design professional and submitted to the building official:

1. For construction in flood hazard areas not subject to high-velocity wave action or coastal A zones:

1.1. The elevation of the lowest floor, including the basement, as required by the lowest floor elevation inspection in Section 110.3.

1.2. For fully enclosed areas below the design flood elevation where provisions to allow for the automatic entry and exit of floodwaters do not meet the minimum requirements in Section 2.6.2.1, ASCE 24, construction documents shall include a statement that the design will provide for equalization of hydrostatic flood forces in accordance with Section 2.6.2.2 of ASCE 24.

1.3. For dry floodproofed nonresidential buildings, construction documents shall include a statement that the dry floodproofing is designed in accordance with ASCE 24.

2. For construction in flood hazard areas subject to high-velocity wave action and coastal A zones:

2.1. The elevation of the bottom of the lowest horizontal structural member as required by the lowest floor elevation inspection in Section 110.3.

2.2. Construction documents shall include a statement that the building is designed in accordance with ASCE 24, including that the pile or column foundation and building or structure to be attached thereto is designed to be anchored to resist flotation, collapse and lateral movement due to the effects of wind and flood loads acting simultaneously on all building components, and other load requirements of Chapter 16.

2.3. For breakaway walls designed to have a resistance of more than 20 psf (0.96 kN/m^2) determined using allowable stress design, construction documents shall include a statement that the breakaway wall is designed in accordance with ASCE 24.

1804.4 Grading and fill in flood hazard areas. In flood hazard areas established in Section 1612.3, grading and/or fill shall not be approved:

1. Unless such fill is placed, compacted and sloped to minimize shifting, slumping and erosion during the rise and fall of flood water and, as applicable, wave action.

2. In floodways, unless it has been demonstrated through hydrologic and hydraulic analyses performed by a registered design professional in accordance with standard engineering practice that the proposed grading or fill, or both, will not result in any increase in flood levels during the occurrence of the design flood.

3. In flood hazard areas subject to high-velocity wave action and coastal A zones, unless such fill is conducted and/or placed to avoid diversion of water and waves toward any building or structure.

4. Where design flood elevations are specified but floodways have not been designated, unless it has been demonstrated that the cumulative effect of the proposed flood hazard area encroachment, when combined with all other existing and anticipated flood hazard area encroachment, will not increase the design flood elevation more than 1 foot (305 mm) at any point.

M301.13.1 High-velocity wave action<u>and coastal A zones</u>. In flood hazard areas subject to high-velocity wave action <u>and coastal A zones</u> mechanical systems and *equipment* shall not be mounted on or penetrate walls intended to break away under flood loads.

Date Submitted	7/18/2012	**Section**	3012	**Proponent**	DOUG MELVIN
Chapter	38	**Affects HVHZ**	No	**Attachments**	No

TAC Recommendation No Affirmative Recommendation with a Second
Commission Action Pending Review

Comments

General Comments No

Alternate Language Yes

Related Modifications

Summary of Modification

ADD & REVISE Sections 3012.1.3, 3012.1.4 and 3012.1.7 in the 2010 Florida Building Code with additional text, to ADD to the Florida Supplement and to 2013 FBC regarding Bulletin Boards.

Rationale

The change reflects industry norms to utilize a larger messaging format within the cab enclosure and revises language in the 2010 Florida Building Code.

Fiscal Impact Statement

Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code

There will not be any cost related to this modification. This modification merges revisions into the Florida Building Code (FBC). The benefit will be to formalize the triennial code for equitable enforcement.

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

There will not be any cost related to this modification. The IBC code merge with the FBC will ensure equitable compliance and benefit the industry with new safety requirements in the triennial code.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

There will not be any cost related to this modification. This modification merges Florida Supplement code revisions and the FBC. The benefit will be to formalize the triennial code for equitable compliance.

Requirements

Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public

The migration of the 2010 FBC, Florida Supplement and the 2012 IBC code provides for the enhanced health, safety, and welfare of the general public consistent with the industry.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

This modification will harmonize the FBC 2010 to strengthen and improve the 2013 Florida Building Code, and provide equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

This code merge does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

This code merge does not degrade the effectiveness of the code.

Is the proposed code modification part of a prior code version? No

5272-A1

Proponent DOUG MELVIN **Submitted** 12/12/2012 **Attachments** Yes

Rationale

The change/deletion of Chapter 30, section 3012 text reflects the adoption of similar code language in the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) A17.1, Part 2.14.1.9 and to also include this language in the Florida Building Code would be duplicative.

Fiscal Impact Statement

Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code

There will not be any cost associated with this alternate language modification.

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

There will not be any cost associated with this alternate language modification.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

There will not be any cost associated with this alternate language modification.

Requirements

Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public

The use of the ASME code language and not the proposed FBC language provides for enhanced health, safety, and welfare of the general public consistent with the industry.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

The use of the ASME code language and not the proposed FBC language strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

The use of the ASME code language and not the proposed FBC language does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

The use of the ASME code language and not the proposed FBC language does not degrade the effectiveness of the code.

Is the proposed code modification part of a prior code version? No

REVISE SECTION 3012 TO READ AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 3012 BULLETIN BOARDS

3012.1 Bulletin boards.

3012.1.1 Bulletin boards and frames used in elevator cars shall not create any conditions which will be unsafe for users of the elevator car. Users shall include:

a. Disabled persons;

b. Persons confined to wheelchairs; and

c. All other persons who may operate the elevator car in its normal course of use.

3012.1.2 Bulletin boards shall not protrude more than 1 inch (25.4 mm) beyond the vertical line of the car wall. They shall not encroach on any clearances required to be maintained in the elevator by Chapter 399, Florida Statutes, and ASME A17.1.

3012.1.3

Bulletin boards shall be framed and all edges must be smooth and rounded. No sharp edges of any kind shall protrude. Direct to surface prints on a rigid substratemay be used in place of a framed enclosure.

3012.1.4 A glass or plastic cover shall be provided for all framed bulletin boards. Glass, if used, must meet the following requirements:a. Be laminated;

b. Meet the requirement for laminated glass as set forth in ANSI Z97.1;

c. The cover shall be securely held in place by the frame.

3012.1.5 The frame and bulletin board shall be permanently fastened to the car wall in such a manner so that all parts including the cover in place will withstand any and all tests required of the elevator.

3012.1.6 All materials used shall be fire resistive equal to the requirements of the cab enclosure.

~~**3012.1.7** The bottom of the bulletin boards shall not be less than 5 feet (1524 mm) above the cab floor, and the total area shall not exceed 4 square feet (0.37 m^2).~~

3012.1.7 The bottom of the bulletin board shall not be less than 12 inches (304.8mm) above a handrail and the total area shall not exceed 8 square feet (0.74m^2).

DELETE CHAPTER 30, SECTION 3012 IN ITS ENTIRETY INCLUDING THE PROPOSED MODIFICATION SP5272 TEXT AND THE FLORIDA SUPPLEMENT BASE DOCUMENT LANGUAGE FOR SECTION 3012

~~Summary of Modification~~
~~ADD & REVISE Sections 3012.1.3, 3012.1.4 and 3012.1.7 in the 2010 Florida Building Code with additional text, to ADD to the Florida Supplement and to 2013 FBC regarding Bulletin Boards.~~

~~**SECTION 3012 BULLETIN BOARDS**~~

~~**3012.1 Bulletin boards.**~~

~~**3012.1.1** Bulletin boards and frames used in elevator cars shall not create any conditions which will be unsafe for users of the elevator car. Users shall include:~~

~~a. Disabled persons;~~

~~b. Persons confined to wheelchairs; and~~

~~c. All other persons who may operate the elevator car in its normal course of use.~~

~~**3012.1.2** Bulletin boards shall not protrude more than 1 inch (25.4 mm) beyond the vertical line of the car wall. They shall not encroach on any clearances required to be maintained in the elevator by Chapter 399, *Florida Statutes*, and ASME A17.1.~~

~~**3012.1.3**~~

~~Bulletin boards shall be framed and all edges must be smooth and rounded. No sharp edges of any kind shall protrude.~~ Direct to surface prints on a rigid substratemay be used in place of a framed enclosure.

~~**3012.1.4** A glass or plastic cover shall be provided for all framed bulletin boards. Glass, if used, must meet the following requirements:a. Be laminated;~~

~~b. Meet the requirement for laminated glass as set forth in ANSI Z97.1;~~

~~c. The cover shall be securely held in place by the frame.~~

~~**3012.1.5** The frame and bulletin board shall be permanently fastened to the car wall in such a manner so that all parts including the cover in place will withstand any and all tests required of the elevator.~~

~~**3012.1.6** All materials used shall be fire resistive equal to the requirements of the cab enclosure.~~

~~**3012.1.7** The bottom of the bulletin boards shall not be less than 5 feet (1524 mm) above the cab floor, and the total area shall not exceed 4 square feet (0.37 m^2)~~

~~3012.1.7 The bottom of the bulletin board shall not be less than 12 inches (304.8mm) above a handrail and the total area shall not exceed 8 square feet (0.74m^2).~~

Date Submitted	7/22/2012	**Section**	3500	**Proponent**	Rebecca Quinn obo DEM
Chapter	35	**Affects HVHZ**	No	**Attachments**	No

TAC Recommendation No Affirmative Recommendation with a Second
Commission Action Pending Review

Comments

General Comments Yes **Alternate Language** No

Related Modifications

YES –the one with CAZ/LiMWA; and R43

Summary of Modification

Update reference to ASCE 24, Flood Resistant Design and Construction, to the upcoming 2012 edition. Approved as Submitted for 2015 IBC.

Rationale

The next edition of ASCE 24 is nearing its final draft (and copies will be provided before the October TAC meetings). Publication is expected either late 2012 or early 2013. Approved as Submitted by FEMA for the 2015 IBC.

Many changes have been approved by committee ballot that will clarify but not change the requirements. Three of the more significant changes to requirements that have either passed the ballot or are being balloted include:

Specify that Coastal A Zones are recognized only if the Limit of Moderate Wave Action is shown on the map or if the CAZ is otherwise designated by the AHJ (S102-12, public comments submitted for Approve as Modified in response to the IBC Structural committee suggestion). This eliminates the uncertainty as to whether moderate wave conditions are present, which currently has to be determined by designers on a case-by-case basis.

For buildings in Coastal High Hazard Areas (Zone V) and CAZ, eliminates elevation differences that were a function of orientation of the lowest horizontal structural members relative to the direction of wave approach.

Permits shallow foundations in Coastal A Zones; permits stem wall foundations in Coastal A Zone if backfilled with soil or gravel to the underside of the floor slab and if deep footings account for erosion and local scour.

Fiscal Impact Statement

Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code

Enforcement will be more straightforward if the CAZ requirements apply only where the LiMWA is delineated or the CAZ is otherwise designated by the community (which is done by a small number of Florida communities).

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

Determination of design factors will be more straightforward.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

Cost to determine design factors will go down because determination of CAZ wave conditions not required on site-by-site basis.

Requirements

Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public

Code will recognize moderate wave conditions where delineated or designated.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Doesn't affect products.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Doesn't affect material specifications.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Makes enforcement and compliance more straightforward.

Is the proposed code modification part of a prior code version? No

2nd Comment Period 10/31/2012 - 12/14/2012

Proponent Joy Duperault **Submitted** 12/10/2012 **Attachments** Yes

SP5138-G1

Comment:

DEM requests the Commission approve this proposal to reference the upcoming revision to ASCE 24, the standard referenced by the flood provisions of the FBC. A number of changes to the standard respond to concerns expressed by Florida communities (specifically the situation addressed by SP5271). The Special Occupancy TAC voted NAR with the reason statement "Denied to allow the ASCE committee to further consider and finalized the updated statement." DEM asked the ASCE 24 committee chair to provide a letter explaining the status of the standard (attached). He will ask ASCE to provide the final draft of the standard to the Commission in January.

ASCE/SEI

24—12 ~~24—05~~ Flood Resistant Design and Construction

Christopher P. Jones, P.E.

5525 Jomali Drive Durham, NC 27705
(919) 382-0130 (919) 382-8742 Fax

chris.jones@earthlink.net

December 4, 2012

Joy Duperault, CFM
Florida Div. Emergency Management
2555 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2100

RE: Status of ASCE 24 changes in support of Code Proposals

Dear Joy:

This is to update you regarding the status of the revision of ASCE 24 Flood Resistant Design and Construction.

In my letter of September 26, 2012, I advised that the revised standard is expected to be published in 2013. The third ballot closed on October 26, 2012 and, as expected, the committee passed the ballot items related to two proposals for the Florida Building Code (SP5295 and SP5271).

I am working now to resolve the third ballot and prepare the next ballot, but my time on this has been limited by Hurricane Sandy work since late October. However, work will continue and the fourth ballot will be issued soon, to be followed by a committee ballot for commentary language, and then the Public Ballot sometime early next year. The updated ASCE 24 Standard will be published in 2013.

To support the FBC proposals I will request that ASCE provide the draft of the standard to the Florida Building Commission in mid-January.

Please contact me if you have any questions or need additional information regarding the revision of ASCE 24-05.

Sincerely yours,

Christopher P. Jones, P.E.
CPJ/

Date Submitted	7/22/2012	**Section**	4500	**Proponent**	Rebecca Quinn obo DEM
Chapter	45	**Affects HVHZ**	No	**Attachments**	No

TAC Recommendation No Affirmative Recommendation with a Second
Commission Action Pending Review

Comments

General Comments Yes **Alternate Language** No

Related Modifications

5138

Summary of Modification

Update reference to ASCE 24, Flood Resistant Design and Construction, to the upcoming 2012 edition. FEMA will propose for the 2015 IRC to be consistent with Approved as Submitted for the 2015 IBC.

Rationale

The FBC, Residential references ASCE 24 as a requirement for dwellings in floodways and as an alternative in Zone V. It is also referenced for design of pools in Zone V and for engineered openings. The next edition of ASCE 24 is nearing its final draft (and copies will be provided before the October TAC meetings). Publication is expected either late 2012 or early 2013. FEMA will propose for 2015 IRC.

Many changes have been approved by committee ballot that will clarify but not change the requirements. The most significant change that do change requirements and that would affect dwellings if ASCE 24 is used as an alternative include:

Specify that Coastal A Zones are recognized only if the Limit of Moderate Wave Action is shown on the map or if the CAZ is otherwise designated by the AHJ (S102-12, public comments submitted for Approve as Modified in response to the IBC Structural committee suggestion). This eliminates the uncertainty as to whether moderate wave conditions are present, which currently has to be determined by designers on a case-by-case basis.

For buildings in Coastal High Hazard Areas (Zone V) and CAZ, eliminates elevation differences that were a function of orientation of the lowest horizontal structural members relative to the direction of wave approach.

Permits shallow foundations in Coastal A Zones; permits stem wall foundations in Coastal A Zone if backfilled with soil or gravel to the underside of the floor slab and if deep footings account for erosion and local scour.

Fiscal Impact Statement

Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code

2010 FBC requires use of ASCE 24 in floodways and permits use of ASCE 24 as alternative in Zone V, thus no change in impact.

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

Determination of design factors will be more straightforward.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

Cost to determine design factors will go down because determination of CAZ wave conditions not required on site-by-site basis.

Requirements

Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public

Code will recognize moderate wave conditions where delineated or designated.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Doesn't affect products.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Doesn't affect material specifications.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Consistency with FBC

Is the proposed code modification part of a prior code version? No

2nd Comment Period 10/31/2012 - 12/14/2012

Proponent Joy Duperault **Submitted** 12/10/2012 **Attachments** Yes

SP5289-G1

Comment:

DEM requests the Commission approve this proposal to reference the upcoming revision to ASCE 24, the standard referenced by the flood provisions of the FBC. A number of changes to the standard respond to concerns expressed by Florida communities (specifically the situation addressed by SP5271). The Special Occupancy TAC voted NAR with the reason statement "Denied to allow the ASCE committee to further consider and finalized the updated statement." DEM asked the ASCE 24 committee chair to provide a letter explaining the status of the standard (attached). He will ask ASCE to provide the final draft of the standard to the Commission in January.

ASCE/SEI

24—12 ~~24—05~~ Flood Resistant Design and Construction

Christopher P. Jones, P.E.

5525 Jomali Drive Durham, NC 27705
(919) 382-0130 (919) 382-8742 Fax

chris.jones@earthlink.net

December 4, 2012

Joy Duperault, CFM
Florida Div. Emergency Management
2555 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2100

RE: Status of ASCE 24 changes in support of Code Proposals

Dear Joy:

This is to update you regarding the status of the revision of ASCE 24 Flood Resistant Design and Construction.

In my letter of September 26, 2012, I advised that the revised standard is expected to be published in 2013. The third ballot closed on October 26, 2012 and, as expected, the committee passed the ballot items related to two proposals for the Florida Building Code (SP5295 and SP5271).

I am working now to resolve the third ballot and prepare the next ballot, but my time on this has been limited by Hurricane Sandy work since late October. However, work will continue and the fourth ballot will be issued soon, to be followed by a committee ballot for commentary language, and then the Public Ballot sometime early next year. The updated ASCE 24 Standard will be published in 2013.

To support the FBC proposals I will request that ASCE provide the draft of the standard to the Florida Building Commission in mid-January.

Please contact me if you have any questions or need additional information regarding the revision of ASCE 24-05.

Sincerely yours,

Christopher P. Jones, P.E.
CPJ/