

FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION

FACILITATOR'S SUMMARY REPORT OF THE MAY 10 - 11, 2005 COMMISSION PLENARY SESSION

SUPPLEMENT TO THE MAY 10 - 11, 2005 MINUTES

ORLANDO, FLORIDA

Meeting Design & Facilitation By



Report By Jeff A. Blair
Florida State University

jblair@fsu.edu
<http://consensus.fsu.edu>

This document is available in alternate formats upon request to Dept. of Community Affairs,
Codes & Standards, 2555 Shumard Oak Blvd., Tallahassee, FL 32399, (850) 487-1824.

FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION

SUPPLEMENT TO THE MAY 10 - 11, 2005 MINUTES

OVERVIEW OF COMMISSION'S KEY DECISIONS

TUESDAY, MAY 10, 2005

Agenda Review and Approval

The Commission voted unanimously, 16 - 0 in favor, to approve the agenda as presented. Following are the key agenda items approved for consideration:

- To Consider Regular Procedural Issues: Approval of March 15 – 16, 2005 Minutes
- To Consider/Decide on Chair's Discussion Issues/Recommendations
- To Consider/Decide on Accessibility Waiver Applications
- To Consider/Decide on Requests for Declaratory Statements
- To Consider/Decide on Approval of Products and Product Approval Entities
- To Consider/Decide on Education, Special Occupancy TAC, and Structural TAC Reports/Recommendations
- To Consider/Decide on Product Approval/Prototype Buildings/Manufactured Buildings Program Oversight Committee (POC) Report/Recommendations
- To Hear General Public Comment
- To Discuss Commissioner Issues and Identify Agenda Items

Review and Approval of the March 15 – 16, 2005, Meeting Minutes

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 16 - 0 in favor, to approve the March 15 - 16, 2005 minutes as presented.

Chair's Discussion Issues/Recommendations

Chairman Rodriguez indicated that Commissioner Parrino's Commission term had been allowed to expire since there was not a confirmation vote from the Senate. The Chair expressed that in recognition of Craig Parrino's important contributions to the development of the Florida Building Code and the Product Approval System, he was appointing him as an adjunct member of the Commission. He will also remain as a member of the Structural TAC and all of the workgroups he has been appointed to. In addition, the Chair expressed the hope that Craig, as a member of the public, would continue to provide his input with the Product Approval POC, where again he has been a significant contributor to developing consensus on the system.

TAC Appointments

Chairman Rodriguez made the following appointments:
Do Kim is appointed as Chair of the Structural TAC,

Al Bragg

The Chair read a letter he had sent to Al Bragg's family, expressing on behalf of the Commission, condolences and appreciation for his years of outstanding public service.

ICC Participation

Chairman Rodriguez informed the Commission that, in March the Commission voted in support of a concept regarding ICC participation which is reflected in the Workgroup Report found in their CD's. The Chair expressed that in general, the concept for ICC participation is that the Commission will provide a coordinating forum where existing Florida ICC members such as BOAF, South Florida, and the Commission's TAC members who volunteer, will propose code changes to the Commission based on their monitoring and participation in the ICC code development process. BOAF will serve as the main coordinating body to implement the concept, and will communicate to the TAC's through BOAF's Code Development Committees regarding code changes. The Chair indicated that staff will work with BOAF and other partners to coordinate efforts and report back to the Commission with any new developments.

Consideration of Accessibility Waiver Applications

The Commission reviewed and decided on the Waiver applications submitted for their consideration.

Petitions For Declaratory Statements

Following are the actions taken by the Commission on petitions for declaratory statements. Richard Shine served as legal counsel for the Commission.

Second Hearings

DCA05-DEC-031 by John I. Johnson, AIA of Gresham, Smith and Partners

Motion—The Commission voted 19 – 0 in favor, to approve their previous action on the petition.

DCA05-DEC-032 by James P. Stephan of Stephan Manufacturing

Motion—The Commission voted 19 – 0 in favor, to approve option 2 and striking from 4. the following: “~~the Code prohibits the use of the Petitioner's product in the subject project absent~~”.

DCA05-DEC-034 by G. David Rogers of Florida Propane Gas Association

Motion—The Commission voted 19 – 0 in favor, to approve their previous action on the petition.

First Hearings

DCA04-DEC-038 by A. Mark Scala, PE, Broward County Board of Rules & Appeals

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 19 – 0 in favor, to approve the TAC/POC's recommendations on the petition as presented.

DCA04-DEC-042 by John Alford, PE, TLC

The petition was withdrawn.

DCA04-DEC-047 by William C. Hill, Fortifiber Building Systems Group

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 19 – 0 in favor, to approve the TAC/POC’s recommendations on the petition as presented.

DCA04-DEC-053 by Thomas Rodgers, Arrowhead Point Property Corp.

The petition was withdrawn.

DCA04-DEC-054 by Warren W. Schaefer, PE, W.W. Schaefer Engineering Consulting PA

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 19 – 0 in favor, to approve the TAC/POC’s recommendations on the petition as presented.

DCA04-DEC-066 by Warren W. Schaefer, PE, W.W. Schaefer Engineering & Consulting PA

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 19 – 0 in favor, to approve the TAC/POC’s recommendations on the petition as presented.

DCA04-DEC-068 by Warren W. Schaefer, PE, W.W. Schaefer Engineering & Consulting PA

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 20 – 0 in favor, to approve the TAC/POC’s recommendations on the petition as presented.

DCA05-DEC-072 by Bemie Eustace, Interplan LLC

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 20 – 0 in favor, to defer action on the petition.

DCA04-DEC-073 by Warren W. Schaefer, PE, W.W. Schaefer Engineering Consulting PA

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 20 – 0 in favor, to approve the TAC/POC’s recommendations on the petition as presented.

DCA04-DEC-074 by Alan Bookspan, Allied Building Products

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 20 – 0 in favor, to approve the TAC/POC’s recommendations on the petition as presented.

DCA04-DEC-075 by Robert Amoruso, PE, Florida Extruders International Inc.

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 19 – 0 in favor, to approve the TAC/POC’s recommendations on the petition as presented.

DCA04-DEC-076 by Robert Amoruso, PE, Florida Extruders International Inc.

The petition was withdrawn by the applicant during the Commission meeting.

DCA04-DEC-077 by John I. Johnson, AIA, Gresham Smith & Partners

The petition was withdrawn.

Consideration of Applications for Product and Entity Approval

Commissioner Carson presented the committee's recommendations for entities and Jeff Blair presented the committee's recommendations for product approval. The results of product and entity applications are found in the Product Approval POC report included as an attachment to the minutes.

Committee Reports and Recommendations

Education TAC

Commissioner Browdy presented the Committee's report, which was accepted unanimously, 20 – 0 in favor.

Commission Actions:

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 20 – 0 in favor, to approve the following brochures: Florida Construction Lien Law: Consumer Information, and Florida Construction Lien Law: Industry Information.

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 20 – 0 in favor, to approve the on-line presentation format for the previously approved course titled: "Indoor Environmental Quality Overview".

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 20 – 0 in favor, to approve Med Kopczynski as an approved accreditor for all categories.

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 20 – 0 in favor, to approve Sharon Mignardi as an approved accreditor for all categories.

(See Commission Minutes for Committee report)

Special Occupancy TAC

Commissioner Hamrick presented the Committee's report, which was accepted unanimously, 20 – 0 in favor. (See Commission Minutes for Committee report)

Structural TAC

Commissioner Kim presented the Committee's report, which was accepted unanimously, 20 – 0 in favor. (See Commission Minutes for Committee report)

Product Approval/Prototype Building/Manufactured Buildings Programs Oversight Committee (POC)

Commissioner Carson presented the Committee's report, which was accepted unanimously, 20 – 0 in favor.

Commission Actions:

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 20 – 0 in favor, to award the contract for the Prototype Buildings Program Administrator to "Applied Research Associates, Inc".

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 20 – 0 in favor, to instruct staff to add language to Rule 9B-72 stating that manufacturers using the certification method must attach to his or her application a valid Notice of Certification for their specific product from an approved certification agency.

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 20 – 0 in favor, to have staff look into the feasibility of adding a "Withdrawn" field to the BCIS.

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 20 – 0 in favor, to continue reviewing products that are recommended for approval, conditional approval, deferral and denial.

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 20 – 0 in favor, to approve Architectural Testing Inc, Washington, Architectural Testing Inc., Florida, Construction Research Laboratory, & Testing Evaluation Laboratories, Inc as a Product Testing Laboratory.

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 20 – 0 in favor, to approve Testing Evaluation Laboratories, Inc as Product Validation Entity, if approved as a Product Testing Laboratory.

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 20 – 0 in favor, to have the Structural TAC review the code requirements (referenced standards AAMA 1402-86 and ASCE 7-98 & 02) for Soffit testing.
(See Commission Minutes for Committee report)

General Public Comment

Chairman Rodriguez invited members of the public to address the Commission on any issues under the Commission’s purview.

Commission Member Comment/Issues

Chairman Rodriguez invited members of the Commission to address the Commission.

Commissioner Comments:

There needs to be an effort to ensure that building officials are contacted and aware of pending accessibility waivers so their views may be considered in the review process.

If applicants withdraw their petitions for a declaratory statement after the TAC/POC has already rendered a recommendation, what happens to the recommendation, and does that not remain a matter of public record.

Commission Member Agenda Items

Chairman Rodriguez invited Commission members to propose issues for the Commission’s next (June 2005) meeting. No Commission members offered any agenda items.

Recess

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 20 - 0 in favor, to recess the plenary session until 8:30 AM on May 11, 2005.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 11, 2005

Agenda Review and Approval

The Commission voted unanimously, 15 - 0 in favor, to approve the agenda as presented.

Following are the key agenda items approved for consideration:

- To Review and Update the Commission's Workplan
- To Discuss Building Code/Fire Code Duplicate Provisions and Overlapping Responsibilities Assessment Recommendations
- To Hear a Report on the Miniature Golf Course Charette
- To Hear an Update and Discuss Legislative Issues
- To Hear a Report and Discuss the Recommendations of the Hurricane Research Advisory Group
- To Hear a Report and Discuss the Recommendations of the Product Approval Workgroup, and Conduct a Supplementary Rule Hearing on Rule 9B-72, Product Approval
- To Hear Public Comment on Quality of Construction
- To Review Committee Assignments and Issues for the Next Commission meeting—June 27 – 29, 2005

Review and Update of Commission's Workplan

Commission Actions:

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 17 - 0 in favor, to approve the updated workplan and meeting schedule/locations as presented to reflect the Commission's priorities.

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 17 - 0 in favor, to change the glitch amendment submittal date to December 1, 2005, if SB 442 becomes law.

(Included as Attachment 2—Commission's Updated Workplan)

Building Code/Fire Code Duplicate Provisions and Overlapping Responsibilities Assessment Report Recommendations

Jeff Blair reported that he had completed the assessment on Building Code/Fire Code Duplicate Provisions and Overlapping Responsibilities and prepared a recommendation for Commission consideration. Chairman Rodriguez provided an opportunity for public comment and then provides an opportunity for the Commission to discuss the recommendations. Following comments and discussion, the Commission took the following action:

Commission Actions:

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 21 - 0 in favor, to approve the recommendations contained within the "Building Code/Fire Code Duplicate Provisions and Overlapping Responsibilities Assessment Report". The approved recommendations are as follows:

Convene Joint Building Fire TAC. The Commission and State Fire Marshal convene the Joint Building Fire TAC to work with stakeholders within a facilitated consensus-building process to identify the issues, evaluate alternatives, and develop recommendations for:

- Resolving existing conflicts between the Florida Building Code and Florida Fire Prevention Code.
- Review and decide whether any additional partitioning of the codes is warranted.
- Review and decide whether to provide further lines of demarcation for the authorities and duties of the building and fire officials regarding fire prevention and life-safety enforcement.
- In conjunction with the building officials and fire officials associations, consider developing or refining a process for fostering the identification and ongoing discussion and resolution of issues that consistently create confusion and inconsistent interpretations, and make it available to local jurisdictions throughout the State.
- Make recommendations on training and education topics and issues that will foster closer cooperation and coordination, as well as enhance consistency within and between the disciplines charged with the enforcement and interpretation of the fire prevention and life-safety provisions of the Florida Building Code and the Florida Fire Prevention Code.
- Communicate with the respective licensing boards and building and fire official associations, regarding the development and coordination of training and educational opportunities for cross-training between the building and fire disciplines to enhance and clarify the existing fire protection and life-safety system.

The complete Report may be found at the following link:

<http://consensus.fsu.edu/FBC/index.html>

(Included as Attachment 3—Building/Fire Assessment Report)

Attic Ventilation Workgroup Report

Commissioner D'Andrea reported that the Committee met on March 16, 2005 and identified the issues that should be addressed prior to making recommendations to the Commission on whether the Florida Building Code should allow the use of ventless attic spaces. He informed the Commission that the Workgroup would meet immediately following the Commission's plenary session to finalize their recommendations to the Commission for their consideration at the June 2005 Commission meeting.

(Included as Attachment 4—Attic Ventilation Workshop Report)

Report on the Miniature Golf Design Charette

Commissioner Browdy reported that a design charette on miniature golf was held on Monday, May 10, 2005 and two design teams, working with participants, prepared two versions of accessible miniature golf courses. The designs were displayed on the wall during the Commission meeting.

Legislative Issues Report

Jim Richmond informed the Commission that SB 442 had been passed by the Legislature and pending approval by the Governor would become law. There are many building code related provisions in this bill and Jim invited Commission members to ask questions or make comments.

Commission Actions:

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 21 - 0 in favor, to authorize Chairman Rodriguez to send a letter on the Commission's behalf, indicating the Commission's concern that specific building code and product approval system provisions, not recommended by the Commission, are in law.

In addition, the Commission wanted a letter sent thanking DCA's legislative staff for their support during the legislative process.

Recommendations of the Hurricane Research Advisory Committee

Chairman Rodriguez reported that the Committee had met and developed a list of preliminary recommendations. The Committee was asked to review a list of the recommendations compiled from the various reports, as well as proposed at the meeting, and make two determinations. First, do they support the recommendation, and second should the recommendation be recommended for early implementation (as a part of the legislative authorization for expedited code amendment implementation for hurricane related provisions) or should it be reviewed and considered through the regular Commission code amendment process. The Chair reported the Committee would meet again in June and finalize their recommendations for Commission consideration.

(Included as Attachment 5—Hurricane Research Committee Report)

Product Approval Work Group Report and Recommendations and Supplementary Rule Hearing on Rule 9B-72, Product Approval

Chairman Rodriguez informed the Commission that the purpose of the supplemental rule hearings was to keep the Rule open while providing time for the Product Approval Workgroup (PAWG) to complete their final package of recommendations for refinements to the Rule. The PAWG met on April 20, 2005 and unanimously agreed on a package of recommendations as well as language for a draft rule.

Jim Richmond, the Commission's council, formally opened the hearing.

Jeff Blair reviewed the PAWG's recommendations and clarified that staff would review and incorporate any legislative refinements into the rule draft, and the Commission would be asked to adopt and notice the amendments to the rule at the June meeting.

Chairman Rodriguez asked for public comment. Several members of the public provided comments on the recommendations.

Mr. Richmond closed the hearing and the Chair opened discussion to the Commission.

Following Commission discussion, the Commission took the following actions:

Commission Actions:

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 21 - 0 in favor, to proceed with rule adoption for Rule 9B-72—Product Approval Rule, by conducting a rule adoption hearing at the June 29, 2005 Commission meeting with the intention of adopting proposed changes to the Rule

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 21 - 0 in favor, to make the implementation date for the \$300.00 revision fee, twenty-one (21) days from May 11, 2005.

The complete Product Approval Workgroup Recommendations Report may be found at the following link: <http://consensus.fsu.edu/LPAWG/index.html>

Public Comment on Quality of Construction

Chairman Rodriguez noted that at the January 26, 2005 Commission meeting the Commission unanimously adopted the primary recommendation outlined in the Construction Practices/Quality Assessment Report regarding convening a stakeholder workgroup process, similar to the product approval and private provider workgroups, to work with stakeholders to identify the issues, evaluate alternatives, and develop recommendations for enhancing coordination between the various entities charged with the education, licensing, enforcement, and code and standards development functions related to the construction and inspection of residential homes. At the Orlando and Miami meetings the Commission heard from the public on issues related to construction quality and that the Commission was now seeking more input. Prior to convening the stakeholder process the Commission will solicit additional public input, at least through their June Commission meeting in St. Petersburg. The Chair concluded that this strategy will provide for public input from different regions of the State prior to convening the Workgroup. There was one comment on this issue.

Adjourn

The Commission voted unanimously, 21 – 0 in favor, to adjourn the meeting at approximately 11:30 PM.

Staff Assignments

- Continue to research implementation issues related to ICC participation.
- Letter to Governor regarding building code provisions being in law.
- Letter thanking DCA legislative staff for their support on behalf of the Commission's agenda.

Committee's Meeting at the June meeting

(Additional TAC's may meet depending on whether there are requests for Declaratory statements)

- Accessibility Advisory Council
- Accessibility TAC
- Education TAC
- Fire TAC
- Structural TAC
- Product Approval POC

ATTACHMENT 1

FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION March 15 - 16, 2005—Miami, Florida

Meeting Evaluation Results

A 0 To 10 Rating Scale Where A 0 Means Totally Disagree And A 10 Means Totally Agree Was Utilized.

1. Please assess the overall meeting.

- 9.7 ___ The background information was very useful.
- 9.7 ___ The agenda packet was very useful.
- 9.8 ___ The objectives for the meeting were stated at the outset.
- 9.7 ___ Overall, the objectives of the meeting were fully achieved.
- 9.8 ___ Accessibility Waiver Applications.
- 9.6 ___ Requests for Declaratory Statements.
- 9.6 ___ Approval of Products and Product Approval Entities.
- 9.9 ___ Chairs Issues and Recommendations.
- 9.9 ___ Update of the Commission's Workplan.
- 9.8 ___ TAC and POC Reports and Recommendations.
- 9.8 ___ Package of Recommendations from the Product Approval Workgroup (PAWG).
- 9.6 ___ Supplementary Rule Adoption Hearing on Rule 9B-72—Product Approval.
- 9.5 ___ Legislative Issues Update/Report.
- 9.9 ___ Miniature Golf Course Accessible Design Charrette Report.
- 9.9 ___ Building/Fire Code Duplicate Provisions/Overlapping Functions Assessment Rec's.
- 9.5 ___ Hurricane Research Advisory Group Preliminary Recommendations.

2. Please tell us how well the facilitator helped the participants engage in the meeting.

- 9.9 ___ The participants followed the direction of the facilitator.
- 9.9 ___ The facilitator made sure the concerns of all participants were heard.
- 9.8 ___ The facilitator helped us arrange our time well.

3. What is your level of satisfaction with the meeting?

- 9.4 ___ Overall, I am very satisfied with the meeting.
- 9.9 ___ I was very satisfied with the services provided by the facilitator.
- 9.6 ___ I am satisfied with the outcome of the meeting.

4. What progress did you make?

- 9.8 ___ I know what the next steps following this meeting will be.
- 9.8 ___ I know who is responsible for the next steps.

5. Commissioner's Evaluation Comments.

- Jeff Blair continues to provide a very high quality of work product, in spite of the voluminous work load and complexity of issues.
- Excellent meeting!
- It was a great idea for the Chair to write a letter to the Governor expressing our (the Commission's) concerns regarding SB 442, and also including the positive aspects of the Bill.
- I appreciated the Chair's comments regarding Craig Parrino, the Commission is losing a selflessly dedicated, hard working, experienced, and valued member, not only of the Commission, but also of the TAC's and workgroups he is a member of.
- Need to anticipate and plan sufficient time to adequately consider the Product and Entity approval process.
- The Product Approval system must be improved. There must be a way to speed up the process, perhaps a printed copy distributed and approved by each member in writing. Those (approvals) needing discussion could be held for a more detailed instruction and comments. Generally, this is a rubber stamp process and the way we are doing it now is a colossal waste of time for everyone. We need to think "out of the box". A verbal transcript of the approvals or denials could be done by staff at another time. 45 minutes x 23 Commissioners and 8 staff and facilitator = 24 man hours, not to mention another 30 hours of reasonably wasted audience time. I just think we could find a more efficient way to vote and announce product approvals, denials, and deferrals. Let's be realistic, 99.9% of the time if the POC recommends approval, products get approval, slam dunk! What we are doing is functional, I'm just not convinced we are being efficient.

ATTACHMENT 2

COMMISSION'S UPDATED WORKPLAN

MEETING DATES

2004

January 11, 12 & 13	Orlando	Adams Mark Hotel
February 28 & March 1 & 2	Orlando	Rosen Plaza Hotel
April 18, 19 & 20	Orlando	Rosen Centre Hotel
June 13, 14 & 15	Panama City	Marriot Baypoint Hotel
August 29, 30 & 31	Miami	Fountainbleau Hotel
October 17, 18 & 19	Orlando	Rosen Plaza Hotel
December 5, 6, 7 & 8	Orlando	Rosen Centre Hotel

2005

January 24, 25 & 26	Orlando	Rosen Plaza Hotel
March 14,15 & 16	Miami	Radisson Mart Hotel
May 9, 10 & 11	Orlando	Rosen Centre Hotel
June 27, 28 & 29	St Petersburg	St. Petersburg Hilton
August 22, 23 & 24	Miami	Don Shula Hotel
October 10, 11 & 12	Orlando	Rosen Centre Hotel
December 5,6 & 7	Orlando	

2006

January 23, 24 & 25	Orlando
March 13,14 & 15	Tampa
May 8, 9 & 10	Orlando
June 26, 27 & 28	St. Augustine
August 21, 22 & 23	Miami
October 9, 10 & 11	Orlando
December 4, 5 & 6	Orlando

FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION 2005 WORKPLAN

(A. – H. Ranked by Commission Survey; 1 - Other Tasks)

Ranked Tasks:

- A. Amend Product Approval Rule 9B-72, 2004**
- | | |
|--|--|
| POC Planning Workshop | 2/11/04 |
| DEC statement and rule amendment plan approved | 3/ 2/04 |
| Rule development workshop | 4/8/04 |
| Local Product Approval Work Group approved | 6/15/04 |
| Rule adoption hearing | 7/23/04 |
| Rule amendment plan revised (roll 2 stage process into single stage process) | 8/2/04 |
| And Product Approval Work Group (expanded scope) approved | |
| Local Product Approval Work Group meeting | 8/11/04 |
| Local Product Approval Work Group report to Commission | 8/31/04 |
| Supplemental Rule Hearing | 1/25/05 |
| Consider Work Group Recommendations for Statutory Changes | 3/15/05 |
| Product Approval Work Group meetings | 10/20/04, 1/11-12/05, 2/8-9/05, 3/28-29/05 |
| | 4/25-26/05 |
| Supplementary Rule hearing | 5/10/05 |
| Rule adoption hearing | 6/28/05 |
| Rule effective | 8/05 |
- B. Review Wind Loads Design Criteria (ASCE 7)**
- | | | |
|--|------------------------------|----------|
| Workshop | (Canceled due to hurricanes) | 9/29/04 |
| Commission considers recommendation to Legislature | | 10/19/04 |
| Finalize report to Legislature | | 12/ 8/04 |
- C. Review Duplicate Provisions of Florida Building Code and Florida Fire Code
Delayed until completion of the 2004 FBC**
- | | |
|---|--------------|
| Joint Fire TAC/Fire Code Advisory Council begin identifying overlap | 2/10/05 |
| Stakeholder assessment and process recommendation complete | Feb-Apr 05 |
| Recommendations reviewed and public input (Commission meetings) | May & Jun 05 |
| Convene workgroup (if appropriate) | Aug 05 |
- D. Construction Practices/Quality Assessment**
- | | |
|--|-------------------|
| Conflict Resolution Consortium conducts assessment | Sep-Dec 2004 |
| Report on CRC assessment and recommendation to form Ad Hoc committee adopted by Commission | 1/25/05 |
| Public input hearings (at Commission meetings) | Mar, May & Jun 05 |
| Convene Commission Ad Hoc committee | Aug 05 |

- E. Review the implementation of s.553.891, F.S., Alternative Plans Review and Inspections, and report to the Legislature on or before January 1, 2004:

Schedule:

Contractor hired to collect data on system operation	Jul 2003
Contractor report due	Sep 2003
Fact finding public workshop	Oct 2003
Review report to the Legislature	Nov 2003
Report submitted to Legislature by Jan 1 (recommend further study)	Jan 2004
Plan for continued study approved	1/13/04
Task Group Formed	Jan 2004
First public workshop	2/18/04
Additional recommendations to Legislature (if any)	3/ 2/04
Additional workshops and task group meetings	Apr- Jun 2004
Recommendations to Commission	8/31/04
Finalize recommendations for report to Legislature	10/19/04
Finalize Report to Legislature	12/ 8/04
Recommendations (modified) addressed in to bills	Apr-May 2005

F. Review Attic Ventilation Criteria

Hire contractor to conduct literature search and provide consulting services	12/04
Conduct issue assessment/consensus development workshop	3/14/05
Conduct second consensus workshop	5/9/05
Report to TACs and Commission	6/29/05

G. Update Florida Energy Code Compliance Software and Develop Training Materials

Obtain match funding from US Department of Energy	FY 05/06
Software Updated for 2004 FBC	1/05
Training materials developed	FY 05/06

Other Tasks:

1. Hurricane Damage Investigations/Code Actions

Hurricane Researchers Workshop co-sponsor with IBHS	12/6/04
Hurricane Research Advisory Committee appointed	1/26/05
Hurricane Symposium	2/11-12/05
Hurricane Research Advisory Committee meetings	3/14, 5/9, 2005
Preliminary Report to the Commission	5/10/05
Final Report to the Commission	6/29/05
Amendments posted to Web	7/3/05

2. Conduct a Design Options Workshop (Charette) on Miniature Golf Courses

Conduct Charette	5/10/05
Report to Commission	6/05

3. Recommendations for Report to 2006 Legislature	
Consider preliminary recommendations to Legislature	10/12/05
Consider recommendations to Legislature	12/ 7/05
Finalize report to Legislature	1/06
4. ICC Codes Development Participation	
Work Group Appointed	10/04
First Work Group Meeting	12/7/04
Second Work Group Meeting	3/15/05
Workgroup Preliminary Recommendations to Commission	3/16/05
Final Report to Commission	5/11/05
5. 2004 Update of the Florida Building Code:	
Phase I, Approval of Florida specific statewide and local amendments:	
Amendment submittal cutoff (independent submittals)	4/18/03
Post on website (independent/base code updates/local amends)	4/23/03
TACs review and develop recommendations	6/16-18/03
TACs complete review and recommendations	7/14/03
Post TAC recommendations on website	7/25/03
Commission considers TACs recommendations and approves amends	10/13-14/03
Phase II, Consider model code changes together with all approved statewide and local amendments, draft rule changes and adopt by rule:	
Administration, Fire and Structural TACs review and consult with staff on where to integrate Florida specific amendments into the IBC and IRC	12/03 to 1/04
Plumbing and Mechanical TACs review and consult with staff on where to integrate Florida specific amendments into the IRC plumbing, mechanical and fuel gas chapters	12/03 to 1/04
Rule development workshop	3/1-2/04
Rule adoption hearing	4/19-20/04
Approve change per JAPC comments but delay filing rule till 7/19 meeting	6/15/04
Authorize additional rule hearing for 8/31 meeting	7/19/04
Rule adoption hearing	8/31/04
Rule hearing on NOPC	12/7/04
Rule filed, effective date	
Code implemented	7/1/05
<i>Possible delay by the Legislature (SB 442)</i>	10/01/05
5.1 Adopt Revised Chapter 34 for Existing Buildings	
Schedule:	
Draft code amendments Completed	Dec 2002
Report to the Legislature recommended expedited adoption (<i>no bill</i>)	Dec 2002
Adopt via the 2004 FBC Update Process (see schedule above)	
Code effective	7/1/05

<i>Possible delay by the Legislature (SB 442)</i>	<i>10/01/05</i>
---	-----------------

5.2 Appeals Procedures [98-287, LOF/ss.553.73 & .77 & 2000-141, LOF/s.120.80,FS]

Schedule: (Adopting through 2004 FBC update, see schedule above)

Effective date	7/1/05
----------------	--------

<i>Possible delay by the Legislature (SB 442)</i>	<i>10/01/05</i>
---	-----------------

5.3 Establish standards and criteria for foundation permits and other “specialty permits”:
(CS/CS/SB 336 & 180, 2001)

Schedule:

Develop recommendations for criteria	Feb 2003
--------------------------------------	----------

Adopting through 2004 FBC update (see schedule above)

Effective (2004 edition of FBC)	7/1/05
---------------------------------	--------

<i>Possible delay by the Legislature (SB 442)</i>	<i>10/01/05</i>
---	-----------------

6. 2004 FBC Glitch Amendments/2006 Annual Interim Amendments:

	Current	SB 442*
Amendment submittal cutoff	8/1/05	12/1/05
Post on website (45 days minimum)	8/15/05	12/8/05
TAC’s consider/Commission approves for draft amendments	10/10-11/05	1/23-24/06
Post TAC recommendations on website (45 days minimum)	10/19/05	2/5/06
Commission considers in rule development workshop	1/24-25/06	5/9-10/06
Rule adoption hearing and filing with DOS authorized	3/14-15/06	6/27-28/06
Rule filed	3/21/06	7/14/06
Effective date of glitch amendments (min 3 months after adoption)	7/1/06	10/1/06

* Senate Bill 442 delays implementation of the 2004 FBC to October 1, 2005. The amendment deadline is 1 month after the 2004 FBC effective date for the current plan but 2 months after the SB 442 effective date due to the Commission meeting schedule and the requirement to post amendments to the website for 45 days before TAC consideration.

7. Update Rule Chapter 9B-3 Sections .048, .049 and .050

Rule development workshop	4/20/04
---------------------------	---------

Rule adoption hearing	3/15/05
-----------------------	---------

Rule effective	5/05
----------------	------

8. Develop Code Commentaries:

Plan:

Amend Rule 9B-3 to require submittal of “rationale” for proposed amendments (See task above). Capture rationales for proposed amendments, declaratory statements and advisory opinions in BCIS to provide “commentary”.

- 9. ISO Ratings Program for Building Departments** [s.553.77(1)(n),F.S.]
Ongoing: Addressed by establishment of policy on updating the FBC. ISO ratings dependent upon building codes being kept current with national standards.
- 10. Florida Building Code System Review and Triennial Report to the Legislature**
- | | |
|--|----------------|
| Conflict Resolution Consortium Assessment | May & Jun 2005 |
| Public input hearings (at Commission meetings) | Jun & Aug 2005 |
| AdHoc/Workgroup meetings | Sep & Oct 2005 |
| AdHoc/Workgroup recommendations to Commission | Oct 2005 |
| Commission recommendations to Legislature (first triennial report) | Dec 2005 |
- 11. Revise Rule 9B-3.004 to Allow Alternates for Committee Members**
- | | |
|---------------------------|---------|
| Rule development workshop | 6/28/05 |
| Rule adoption hearing | 8/24/05 |
| Rule effective | 10/05 |

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

TASK 12 SCHEDULE NOT YET APPROVED

Note: The schedule is consistent with timing criteria proposed by SB 442 and assumes TAC review of changes to the base/foundation codes is conducted before the decision points identified in the schedule. It must be understood, NO! decisions on TAC recommendations can be made until the identified decision points in order to comply with what would be law.

12. 2007 Update to the Florida Building Code

2006 International Codes published and available to the public	1/1/06
2006 International Codes with currently adopted Florida amendments available to public on website	4/1/06
Joint Fire TAC/Fire Code Advisory Council review of I Codes changes to FFPC conducted	4/06-7/06
Proposed amendments to the 2006 I Codes with Florida amendments due date	7/1/06
Proposed amendments posted to the Web by (45 day min before TAC review)	7/1/06
Commission selects 2006 I Codes as foundation for 2007 FBC	6/28/06
<i>(Note: 2006 I Codes must be available to public for 6 months prior to selection)</i>	
TACs review proposed Florida amendments, current Florida amendments and current Local amendments and make recommendations at Commission August meeting	8/21-23/06
TAC recommendations posted to web (45 day min before Commission review)	9/8/06
Commission considers TAC recommendations on proposed amendments via a Rule Development Workshop at its December meeting	12/4-6/06
Rule Adoption Hearing at the Commission's January 2007 meeting	1/24/07
File Rule adopting the 2007 FBC	3/1/07
Printed Codes available to the public	6/1/07
Code implemented	1/1/08

(Note: SB 442 requires Code documents to be made available to the public 6 months before implementation. To save time final publishing of documents must begin at least when the rule is filed and before the official rule challenge period expires. Initiation of publishing to begin prior to filing of the rule. Experience with development of the 2004 FBC was the publishing of codebooks took more than six months. The time frame allotted in this plan is three months which is roughly consistent with the time required for the ICC to develop its on code books after final adoption.)

Note: The proposed schedule is more optimistic than experience suggest is practical. It assumes review work for development of the 2007 FBC can begin before time limits that would be established by law and assumes only one chapter 120 Rule Development Workshop and one Rule Adoption Hearing is required. (Development of the 2004 FBC involved one Rule Development Workshop and 3 Rule Adoption Hearings.)

ATTACHMENT 3

BUILDING/FIRE ASSESSMENT REPORT

FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION

**FLORIDA BUILDING CODE AND
FLORIDA FIRE PREVENTION CODE
DUPLICATE PROVISIONS AND OVERLAPPING
RESPONSIBILITIES**

ASSESSMENT REPORT

MAY 11, 2005



**Report By Jeff A. Blair
Florida State University**



**jblair@fsu.edu
[http:// consensus.fsu.edu](http://consensus.fsu.edu)**

This document is available in alternate formats upon request to Dept. of Community Affairs,
Codes & Standards, 2555 Shumard Oak Blvd., Tallahassee, FL 32399, (850) 487-1824.

I. INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

The Florida Building Code and the Florida Fire Prevention Code, by design, contain overlapping technical provisions in order to ensure that buildings are designed and constructed with life-safety considerations as an integral part of both. In order to design buildings of certain size and occupancies both codes must be used together and one code may trigger the use of the other. In some instances the same provisions are in both codes, this is referred to as duplicate provisions. In other instances one code may reference the other, and in a few cases the two codes have conflicting requirements. In addition, the enforcement of the two codes, from plans review through final inspection, involve building and fire officials at the local, and in the case of fire, sometimes at the State level.

The development and implementation of the 2001 Florida Building Code required that the Florida Building Commission and the Division of State Fire Marshal work together to harmonize the codes. This was accomplished through the creation of a Joint Building Fire Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) comprised of the Commission's Fire TAC and the State Fire Marshal's Florida Fire Code Advisory Council. In regards to the technical provisions, to a large degree the TAC was successful in correlating the two codes and eliminating most conflicts.

The issue of enforcement and interpretation, is addressed in statute and requires the coordination and cooperation of the State Fire Marshal and the Florida Building Commission {F.S. 633.01 (5), F.S. 553.72 (5), and)}, and that conflicts are resolved in "favor of the requirement that offers the greatest degree of lifesafety or alternatives that would provide an equivalent degree of lifesafety and an equivalent method of construction" {F.S. 553.73 (1)(d)}.

To the extent that there are still conflicting requirements within the codes, and there remains some level of confusion regarding the authority and enforcement between building and fire officials, this assessment will address issues and recommendations related to the duplicate provisions and overlapping responsibilities between the codes, and between building and fire officials respectively.

At the April 19, 2004 meeting of the Florida Building Commission, the Commission was petitioned to issue a declaratory statement (DCA04-DEC-046) regarding jurisdictional and enforcement issues related to a building official's interpretation of authority related to enforcing certain provisions common to both codes. The Commission dismissed the petition and referred the matter back to the local administrative process for resolution. At the same meeting the Commission voted to conduct a joint project between the Florida Building Commission and Division of State Fire Marshal to identify and develop recommendations regarding duplicate provisions and overlapping responsibilities related to the Florida Building and Florida Fire Prevention Codes.

At the January 26, 2005 meeting of the Florida Building Commission, Chairman Rodriguez informed the Commission that an assessment project would commence with the goal of developing recommendations on how this issue should best be addressed.

This report presents the results of the assessment conducted on behalf of the Florida Building Commission and the Division of State Fire Marshal. It is based on interviews with the affected interests and a review of documentation. In addition, the assessment interviewer attended a Joint Building Fire TAC meeting and facilitated an issues identification session with the members.

There are no views attributed to specific individuals and findings represent a compilation of views representing a general level of agreement between interviewees. However, opinions run the gambit from the system is working fine to creating clearer lines of demarcation for authority and jurisdictional matters, to bifurcating and segregating the two codes entirely to removing some sections and referencing the other code by subject matter.

A central finding of the assessment is that, in regards to the code documents all conflicts should be resolved and a discussion should take place on whether to further partition the codes. In regards to enforcement issues, there is little support for further regulation, however there is support for reviewing authority and determining whether to more clearly delineate lines of demarcation for triggering either the building or fire official's review. Most agree that conflicts at the local enforcement level are to a large degree issue of coordination, cooperation, and policy for local jurisdictions. Finally, all agree that education and training are central to dealing with both code and enforcement issues and joint training between building and fire officials should be encouraged and supported.

II. THE ASSESSMENT PROCESS

The purpose of the assessment was to consider the various issues related to the Florida Building Code and Florida Fire Prevention Code in regards to duplicate code provisions and the overlapping authorities of the building and fire officials charged with duties ranging from permitting to plans review, through inspections and approving buildings for occupancy. Interviewees were asked to identify what they consider to be the key issues related to the technical and jurisdictional aspects from the design, review, and enforcement of the codes, what were some acceptable options from their perspectives, and what role they felt the Commission and State Fire Marshal should play in any process convened to consider these issues.

This assessment was conducted by Jeff Blair of the Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium, a center based at Florida State University. Additional information on the assessment interviewer can be found in Appendix II of this report.

A. Conduct of the Assessment

The assessment interviewer met initially with Chairman Raul L. Rodriguez, AIA and DCA staff to discuss the parameters of the assessment and to identify potential interviewees. Subsequently, the assessment interviewer met with Chief Jim Goodloe of the Division of State Fire Marshal to get the Division's perspective. Additional interviewees were suggested by those interviewed during the course of the project. Most interviews were conducted by phone and a meeting was held with the Joint Building Fire TAC. In addition, the assessment

interviewer reviewed relevant documents, including legislation. A list of persons interviewed is provided in Appendix I of this report.

B. Interview Questions

- Are you aware of the purpose behind this Building Fire Code assessment?
- How does this issue affect and/or impact your interests?
- From your perspective what are the key issues that should be considered in any review/process regarding Duplicate Code Provisions and Overlapping Authority/Responsibilities?
- Where are the problems?
- *Should there be any duplication between the codes? (does this provide flexibility to local jurisdictions); or, should the issues be separated and enforced along strict divisions of authority?*
- What should the trigger be?
- Any suggestions for enhancing the current system (code duplications and roles/enforcement)?
- What would be the best format to review the issues and make recommendation?
- Should the Issues be Separated between Code and Authority?
- What do you see as the role of the Florida Building Commission?
- What do you see as the role of the State Fire Marshal?
- Who else should I talk to in order to get a complete picture of the situation?

III. FINDINGS OF THE ASSESSMENT BY ISSUES

Statutory Considerations

Interviewees agreed that the laws regarding conflicts between the Florida Building Code (FBC) and the Florida Fire Prevention Code (FFPC) are clear, and the process for resolving conflicts is now in place with the formation of the Joint Building Fire Technical Advisory Committee, constituted between the Florida Building Commission and Division of State Fire Marshal during the development of the 2001 Florida Building Code.

In addition, the authority to enforce the Codes is a function of the scopes of either the FBC or the FFPC and the technical provisions therein. In general the resolution of the technical and jurisdictional aspects of the two codes can be reviewed and resolved within the existing structure and would likely not require additional statutory considerations.

Below are cited the statutory references from Chapter 633—Fire Prevention and Control, and Chapter 553—Building Construction Standards, that relate to resolving conflicts between the FBC and the FFPC:

633.01 (5) It is the intent of the Legislature that there are to be no conflicting requirements between the Florida Fire Prevention Code and the Life Safety Code authorized by this chapter and the provisions of the Florida Building Code or conflicts in

their enforcement and interpretation. Potential conflicts shall be resolved through coordination and cooperation of the State Fire Marshal and the Florida Building Commission as provided by this chapter and part IV of chapter 553.

553.72 (5) It is the intent of the Legislature that there be no conflicting requirements between the Florida Fire Prevention Code and the Life Safety Code of the state and other provisions of the Florida Building Code or conflicts in their enforcement and interpretation. Potential conflicts shall be resolved through coordination and cooperation of the State Fire Marshal and the Florida Building Commission as provided by this part and chapter 633.

553.73 (1)(d) Conflicting requirements between the Florida Building Code and the Florida Fire Prevention Code and Life Safety Code of the state established pursuant to ss. 633.022 and 633.025 shall be resolved by agreement between the commission and the State Fire Marshal in favor of the requirement that offers the greatest degree of lifesafety or alternatives that would provide an equivalent degree of lifesafety and an equivalent method of construction. If the commission and State Fire Marshal are unable to agree on a resolution, the question shall be referred to a mediator, mutually agreeable to both parties, to resolve the conflict in favor of the provision that offers the greatest lifesafety, or alternatives that would provide an equivalent degree of lifesafety and an equivalent method of construction.

Duplicate Technical Code Provisions

The issue of duplicate technical code provisions has three main components: whether there should be any overlap, resolving conflicts where there is overlap, and whether to further partition the codes by removing provisions from one and referencing the other.

In general, interviewees agreed that there is a need to maintain some level of duplication between the Codes in order to ensure that both documents are used in conjunction with each other for the design, permitting, inspection, and enforcement of the appropriate codes in order to provide safe and structurally sound buildings. At a minimum each codes should reference the other where appropriate to ensure they are used together. However, beyond this general level of agreement there is a broad range of divergent views expressed by the interviewees representing the various interest groups affected by this issue.

All agree that conflicts where they exist should be resolved, and this should be a priority for the Commission and State Fire Marshal. Some maintain this is all that should be done and others prefer a thorough review of the two documents with consideration given to further partitioning of the FBC and FFPC.

On the issue of partitioning, or further segregation of the codes by replacing the requirements of one code in favor of the requirements of the other code, there is only agreement that a review should be made and the issue considered. The views range from no further partitioning, to additional partitioning, to a total partitioning with only references to the other code. As an example there is support, especially among design professionals, for partitioning the codes in

favor of occupancy issues being handled exclusively by the Florida Building Code and life-safety provisions—such as those found in Chapter 10 “Means of Egress”—being handled exclusively by the Florida Fire Prevention Code. Again, each code would reference the other within the appropriate sections of each.

Authority/Jurisdictional Overlap

There is some general level of agreement, although not universal, that the powers of the building and fire officials are clearly outlined within the scopes of the FBC and FFPC, and authorized by statute. How these duties and authorities are sorted out at the local level is another issue, and varies greatly by jurisdiction.

In general, most jurisdictions have developed lines of communication between their building and fire officials with clear guidance on how permitting, plans review, inspections, and enforcement functions are handled. In fact, building and fire officials have worked together to develop and implement cooperative agreements on how to more efficiently conduct their respective responsibilities. This varies by jurisdiction and is a function of having sufficient resources to hire or contract with the appropriately licensed personnel for building and fire functions, and the organizational and political commitment necessary to implement an efficient process.

Nevertheless, since there are many areas of potential overlap ranging from permitting, plans review, fee collection, inspections, enforcement, to final approval of the building for occupancy, there is certainly room for confusion within and between jurisdictions. These overlaps affect many elements of the life-safety components of buildings and include the review and inspection of electrical, mechanical, plumbing, and fire.

Industry members complain of inconsistent interpretations, technical requirements, and inspection and enforcement between jurisdictions, even within the same county. In addition, many believe that in the cases where the system is not working, this is largely a function of personality conflicts, concern over turf and power, and a general lack of cooperation and collaboration that must be corrected by the affected local jurisdictions.

Irrespective of the above considerations, and acknowledging that local jurisdictions remain largely responsible for the efficacy of their local coordination efforts and functions, there is still a perceived desire and a sufficient level of support for reviewing the two codes and developing clearer lines of demarcation, by providing guidance on which aspects are handled by the building or fire official. Again, most believe that in the final analysis, this remains an issue of coordination and cooperation best resolved at the local level. Additionally, many expressed a concern that any further defining of authority could restrict and prevent local jurisdictions from making the most efficient use of limited personnel.

It should be noted that many, including building and fire officials, believe that having “two sets of eyes”, with overlapping responsibilities is a positive thing and offers a greater level of protection to the public. Fire officials note that they remain responsible for the safety of buildings after they has been constructed and occupied, and have a vested interest in ensuring buildings are constructed with the proper life-safety requirements.

In general, any review and clarification of duties and authorities would need to pay close attention to the needs of local government to ensure that maximum flexibility for the utilization of personnel is maintained within any proposed refinements to the existing system.

Training and Education

This is the one area that enjoyed universal agreement from all interviewees, representing all interest groups. The level of support for additional trainings and education regarding interpreting and enforcing the FBC and the FFPC ranged from, this is all that should be done to this should be a component of a more comprehensive review of the existing system.

Interviewees expressed a desire to see more co-training with building and fire officials participating together. Trainings could be developed that highlight those elements of both codes where there is the greatest level of confusion. The suggested goal is to provide an educational venue where conflicts are highlighted and consistent interpretation and enforcement across disciplines is encouraged.

Licensing Boards

Many stated that an effort should be undertaken to work with the various licensing boards and regulating agencies to coordinate training and education needs, and to ensure that the appropriate building and fire disciplines have the requisite knowledge regarding their authorities and duties related to enforcing the fire protection and life-safety requirements of the FBC and FFPC.

Role of the Florida Building Commission and Division of State Fire Marshal

Interviewees generally agreed that any project to review duplicate code provisions and issues related to overlapping responsibilities between building and fire officials should be a joint project with the Florida Building Commission and the Division of State Fire Marshal.

Joint Building Fire TAC

There is an existing Committee—The Joint Building Fire TAC—constituted within the Florida Building Commission and the Division of State Fire Marshal. This Committee is comprised of the Florida Building Commission’s Fire Technical Advisory Committee and the State Fire Marshal’s Florida Fire Code Advisory Council, and was organized to harmonize the Building and Fire Codes during the development of the Florida Building Code. This group continues to meet on an ongoing basis to discuss issues related to the two codes and enjoys support from the building and fire perspectives. Interviewees agreed that this group, with its broad stakeholder representation, is the logical body to consider recommendations related to the review of duplicate code provisions and issues related to overlapping responsibilities between building and fire officials.

IV. ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

There is a spectrum of views, on a range of issues related to the enforcement and interpretation of the fire prevention and life-safety requirements of the Florida Building Code and the Florida Fire Prevention Code. This manifests in two key areas: the duplication of the technical code requirements within the two codes, and the overlapping authority and responsibilities inherent in the review and inspection requirements necessary to ensure compliance with the life-safety and fire prevention provisions of the codes.

There is agreement on the need to maintain some level of overlapping technical provisions within the codes, at a minimum to ensure they are both used together for the design, permitting, inspection, and final approval of buildings prior to occupancy. In addition, consideration has to be given to the ongoing life-safety requirements of buildings once they are occupied. In short, how will the public best be served in this regard.

In regards to the technical provisions, a review should be undertaken to eliminate existing conflicts, and consider whether further partitioning of the code—that is replacing the requirements of one code in favor of the other and referencing the applicable sections—would serve to clarify the requirements of the codes as well as the authorities and duties invoked within the scope of the respective codes.

The issue of further defining duties, authorities, and responsibilities, should be reviewed but must be considered in the context of maintaining flexibility and authority for local governments to manage their personnel in an efficacious manner consistent with their local policies.

Education and training will be the key to the success of any effort designed to enhance the coordination and consistency of code requirements and interpretations between building and fire officials in the various jurisdictions around the State. In general, the laws and code are reasonably clear and most changes should focus on education and training with an emphasis on conducting co-trainings with and between building and fire officials. Attention should be given to areas of ongoing conflicts, misunderstandings, and inconsistent interpretations with a focus on providing clear guidance with the support of the building and fire officials and their respective associations.

Finally, the issue of venue will have to be addressed. The Florida Building Commission's and Division of State Fire Marshal's Joint Building Fire Technical Advisory Committee is an existing forum with broad stakeholder representation in the building and fire arenas, and a proven commitment to consensus-building on important policy issues of impact to the entire State of Florida regarding fire prevention and life-safety. To this end, the Commission and Division of State Fire Marshal could convene a facilitated process to fully air the issues and options, and develop a package of recommendations for consideration by the Commission and State Fire Marshall to enhance the review, enforcement, and interpretation of the codes, as well as enhancements to the education and training system required to educate the building and fire officials charged with the implementation of the entire system related to fire prevention and life-safety, and necessary to protect the safety and welfare of the citizens and property within the state of Florida.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

Convene Joint Building Fire TAC. The Commission and State Fire Marshal convene the Joint Building Fire TAC to work with stakeholders within a facilitated consensus-building process to identify the issues, evaluate alternatives, and develop recommendations for:

- Resolving existing conflicts between the Florida Building Code and Florida Fire Prevention Code.
- Review and decide whether any additional partitioning of the codes is warranted.
- Review and decide whether to provide further lines of demarcation for the authorities and duties of the building and fire officials regarding fire prevention and life-safety enforcement.
- In conjunction with the building officials and fire officials associations, consider developing or refining a process for fostering the identification and ongoing discussion and resolution of issues that consistently create confusion and inconsistent interpretations, and make it available to local jurisdictions throughout the State.
- Make recommendations on training and education topics and issues that will foster closer cooperation and coordination, as well as enhance consistency within and between the disciplines charged with the enforcement and interpretation of the fire prevention and life-safety provisions of the Florida Building Code and the Florida Fire Prevention Code.
- Communicate with the respective licensing boards and building and fire official associations, regarding the development and coordination of training and educational opportunities for cross-training between the building and fire disciplines to enhance and clarify the existing fire protection and life-safety system.

APPENDIX I

Interview Participants

In conducting the assessment, the interviewer sought individual and group interviews with those stakeholder/interest groups who are affected by issues related to the overlapping technical provisions and/or issues of authority and jurisdictions regarding the Florida Building Code and Florida Fire Prevention Code. Below is a list of persons participating in the interview process and their affiliations. Many of the interviewees represent multiple stakeholder/interest groups but are listed under only one of their affiliations. If an interviewee is listed twice it is because they were interviewed as part of a group and again individually.

1. FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION

Raul L. Rodriguez, AIA
Richard Dixon
Mo Madani
Jim Richmond

2. DIVISION OF STATE FIRE MARSHAL

Jim Goodloe, Chief
John Calpini

3. FIRE TAC (Florida Building Commission)

John Calpini
Hamid Bahadori
Nick D'Andrea
Dale Greiner
Jeff Gross

4. FLORIDA FIRE CODE ADVISORY COUNCIL (State Fire Marshal)

Tony Apfelbeck
Ray Cicero
Jeff Collins
Jon Hamrick
Brad Schiffer
Richard Seidel
Andrew Valente

5. DESIGN PROFESSIONALS

Architects

Raul L. Rodriguez, AIA

Luis Vila

Fire Protection Engineers

Hamid Bahadori

Andrew Valente

6. EDUCATION FACILITIES

Tom Deckert

Jon Hamrick

7. LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Herminio Gonzalez

George Wiggins

8. BUILDING OFFICIALS

Joe Crum

Nick D'Andrea

Dale Greiner

Med Kopczynski

9. FIRE OFFICIALS

Dennis Marshall

Kevin Carrier

10. FIRE PROTECTION INDUSTRY

Buddy DeWar

Pete Schwab

Bob Neely

Roy Pollack

Bob Worthy

David Kinchla

11. HOME BUILDERS

Jack Glen

APPENDIX II

Feasibility Assessment Interviewer



"The purpose of the Consortium is to serve as a neutral resource to assist citizens and public and private interests in Florida to seek cost-effective solutions to public disputes and problems through the use of alternative dispute resolution and consensus building." --F.S. 240.702

Our mission is to bring Floridians together to learn to transform unproductive conflict into cost-effective, sustainable solutions. The Consortium serves as a catalyst to create supportive policies and to help educate statewide on the appropriate use of mediation, facilitation and other collaborative problem-solving approaches to resolve a wide range of public policy issues.

With the support of Florida State University and the Florida Legislature, the Consortium provides dispute resolution service, education, training and research to build a broader understanding of the value of collaborative approaches and create a cadre of citizens, leaders, professionals and students skilled in using collaborative consensus building and conflict resolution processes.

The Consortium offers neutral technical assistance to a wide range of professionals, agency staff and private citizens and organizations engaged in public problems throughout Florida. We help to design and implement efforts for intergovernmental collaboration, community and public problem-solving, and land-use and environmental dispute resolution. We also provide referral services connecting stakeholders and potential users with trained dispute resolution professionals.

Jeff Blair is faculty at Florida State University, and serves as Associate Director for the Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium. His work for the Consortium has included facilitation, process design, strategic planning, and consensus-building on multiple public policy initiatives. He has worked with state and local government representatives to design and implement collaborative approaches to planning, rule making, and dispute resolution with an emphasis on public participation in the design and implementation of policy. He has facilitated hundreds of rule development workshops and conducted negotiated rulemakings for various state agencies. In addition, he teaches numerous classes and conducts trainings in various dispute resolution topics for FAU, FIU, MDCCC, and various local governments. During the past seven years he has served as the Consortium's project director for the Florida Building Commission, a 23 member Governor appointed stakeholder group who successfully created, implemented, and maintains the new statewide Florida Building Code. Other ongoing projects include serving as facilitator and conflict resolution consultant for state agency stakeholder advisory boards such as the Pest Control Enforcement Advisory Council and the Florida Coordinating Council on Mosquito Control. Mr. Blair has provided facilitation, planning, and process design for numerous non-profit organizations since 1977.

APPENDIX III

**Meeting of the Joint Building Fire Technical Advisory Committee
and the Florida Fire Code Advisory Council
Prime Osborn Convention Center – Room 204/205
Time: 1-3 p.m.
1000 Water Street, Jacksonville, Florida
February 10, 2005**

Committee members present from the Joint Building/Fire TAC:

Jeff Gross, Dale Greiner, Tony Apfelbeck, Jon Calpini, Hamid Bahadori, and Nick D'Andrea.

Agenda. Review and discuss the overlap of authority within the Florida Fire Prevention Code & the Florida Building Code:

The Joint Committee discussed the issue at hand by first reviewing the staff analysis delineating the technical overlap between the two Codes and then provided the following issues and concerns with regard to overlap of authority within the two codes:

- Code application problem.
- Lack of education necessary to clarify authorities and fringing issues.
- Ch. 553, FS is followed all the time and we see no problem.
- Conflicts occur when parties are not working together.
- Conflicts within the codes have been resolved. The problem is redundancy (two people doing the same thing). The issue is a business perspective.
- It would be good to have all the requirements in one Code.
- The problem at hand is common when the authority is divided between two jurisdictions. Single jurisdictions deemed to have no problem.
- The problem is two people doing the same thing in the field.
- FFPC must be enforced by the Fire Marshal.
- The technical provisions of the codes are not the problem. We should focus on resolving the request for Dec. Statements.
- The Law is very clear with regard to license requirements and responsibilities.
- You need to have two sets of eyes to inspect and review projects.
- You need the two authorities because each entity is looking at different parts of the project.
- You need to get rid of redundancy so that only one person doing one thing.
- Removing and stripping requirements for codes is a difficult task.
- Recommend not dealing with the technical issues at this time and should first focus on training and resolving requests for Dec. Statements.
- The issue is to define the line of responsibilities between the two authorities.
- We need to work together. Redundancy is not a bad thing. Working together is what serves the people best.
- At the end (after CO), the building is the responsibility of the Fire Marshal.

ATTACHMENT 4

ATTIC VENTILATION WORKGROUP REPORT

MINUTES ATTIC VENTILATION WORKSHOP II Florida Building Commission Orlando, Florida May 11, 2005

The meeting was called to order by Chair Nick D'Andrea at 1:05 p.m. with a quorum of eight voting members: Steve Bassett, Ron Bailey, Philip Fairey, Richard Reynolds, Do Kim, Chris Schulte, Nick D'Andrea and Craig Parrino.

The Agenda was moved and approved unanimously.

The Matrix of questions/issues derived from the March 16, 2005, issues was approved unanimously.

Rick Dixon, Executive Director of the Florida Building Commission, provided a Legislative report. Initial review of SB 442 indicates that the International Residential Code (IRC) provisions for unvented attics would be required to be included in the Florida Building Code by November 1, 2005, if it becomes law(see below). This would require a special expedited code adoption process, with rule development workshop in August and a rule adoption hearing at the October Commission meeting.

SB 442, Section 33. Because of the water intrusion experienced during the recent hurricanes, the Florida Building Commission shall integrate standards pertaining to ventless attic spaces as adopted by the International Code Council into the Florida Building Code. Section 553.73, *Florida Statutes*, notwithstanding, the commission is authorized to adopt amendments to the Florida Building Code, 2004 edition, to integrate the provisions subject only to the rule adoption procedures contained in chapter 120, *Florida Statutes*. The commission must adopt the provisions into the code no later than November 1, 2005.

Discussion ensued as to whether there is any latitude in the law or whether the IRC language must be adopted verbatim. Some provisions of the R806.4 of the IRC do not pertain to Florida climatic conditions. There are also contradictions of terms in R806.4 when compared with like provisions in the Florida Building Code (FBC). The IRC provisions are somewhat out of context and should be considered in the context of the IRC. Dixon indicated he would ask the Commission's attorney for clarification.

The Commission's facilitator, Jeff Blair, had planned to use a ranking tool to determine which threshold issues needed to be addressed before the work group could achieve consensus on the issue of unvented attics. Rather, he asked for a straw poll of working group members as to whether they would recommend to the Florida Building Commission that criteria for unvented attics be added to the Florida Building Code. The vote went 7 to 1 in favor of that recommendation. The dissenting vote, Chris Schulte, indicated that he was not dead set against adding it to the code, he just wanted to work

through certain issues to resolve them first.

It was suggested that threshold issues of concern be listed as needing further consideration. Threshold issues of concern include:

1. Shingle manufacturer's warranties. Impact on roofing contractors.
2. Inability to see areas of bad wood because insulation covers the wood. Detection of leaks in roof system is a concern during re-roofing. If rotted, could become a safety hazard.
3. Water intrusion concerns based on hurricane water moisture report.
4. Determine whether it is conditioned or unconditioned space. Placement of insulation is an issue per the definition of "attic" in Chapter 13. Are supply and return ducts required?
5. The code should specify which types of insulation may be used.
6. Frequency of re-roof is a concern. Reynolds stated that this is not an issue because other factors are more important.

Discussion on the threshold issues of concern ensued. The literature review consultant pointed out that there is no additional data on re-roofing. When the roof temperature goes up, the life of the materials is affected (unvented attics, radiant barriers, desert heat). Color of shingles is a larger factor than whether the attic is vented. Sandwich options such as double decking with intermediate insulation were supported. The literature shows no degradation of the roof deck attributed to unvented attics. Some shingle manufacturers warrant their shingles for use in unvented attics. Bailey stated that his insulated unvented attic had major damage to the roof during last season's hurricanes; during repair, when the sheathing was pulled off, the deck stayed in place. There are other products and techniques for constructing unvented attics beyond those specified in the IRC. Unvented attics would be added as an option, not as a requirement.

Blair asked for a vote to determine whether the working group would support recommending to the Commission the addition of unvented attics to the Code, with the understanding that at least one of the members has threshold concerns. A list of the concern should be included with the recommendation. The vote was 8 – 0 in favor of the recommendation. In general, the groups supports allowing unvented attics in the Code, and listed threshold concerns to pass-on to the Commission. It should be noted, that a consensus of the members (7 of 8) identified no threshold concerns, and on balance support allowing unvented attics in the Code.

The meeting was adjourned by 2:00 p.m.

Report by Ann Stanton

ATTACHMENT 5

HURRICANE RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORT

FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION

HURRICANE RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORT

MAY 10, 2005

OVERVIEW

At the January 26, 2005 Commission meeting, Chairman Rodriguez appointed a small coordinating group consisting of Commissioners and other stakeholder representatives, charged with identifying what research is being conducted related to building failure issues resulting from the 2004 hurricanes, identifying any research gaps on key issues identified but not being researched, and finally, to ensure that the Commission is provided with all relevant research findings on each of the major issues, prior to the Commission considering code enhancements resulting from lessons learned.

Following is the chronology of events and subsequent Commission actions resulting from the 2004 hurricanes.

- ✓ Hurricane Charley hit on August 13, 2004 near Cayo Costa, Florida;
- ✓ Commission met in Miami on August 29 – 31, 2004 and staff presented early observations from the storm;
- ✓ Hurricane Francis hit on September 6, 2004 over Southern Hutchinson Island, Florida;
- ✓ Hurricane Ivan hit on September 16, 2004 between Gulf Shores, Alabama and Pensacola, Florida;
- ✓ Hurricane Jeanne hit on September 26, 2004 near Stuart, Florida;
- ✓ The Commission met on October 18 – 19, 2004, following three additional hurricanes and presented preliminary data collected from the four storms;
- ✓ The Commission met on December 6 – 8, 2004 and a hurricane researchers workshop co-sponsored by the Commission and the Institute for Business and Home Safety, was held on December 6, 2004;
- ✓ On January 12, 2005 the Florida Homebuilders Association released an assessment report concerning water intrusion during the 2004 hurricanes;
- ✓ At the Commission's January 2005 Commission meeting the Chair convened a workgroup to assist the Commission by ensuring they have all relevant research on each of the key issues identified during the hurricane assessments to assist the Commission with any needed code enhancements.
- ✓ At the Commission's January 2005 meeting, the Florida Home Builders Association presented findings and recommendations regarding water intrusion.
- ✓ On March 16, 2005 the Commission held a joint session with the Hurricane Research Advisory Committee and heard presentations and recommendations on studies related to water intrusion, building code performance, roof tiles, and the design of aluminum structures.

- ✓ At the May 10, 2005 meeting of the Hurricane Research Advisory Council the committee heard additional presentations and recommendations on water intrusion, and a window assessment failure study.
- ✓ At the May 10, 2005 meeting of the Hurricane Research Advisory Council the committee was asked to make the following preliminary determinations relative to the various recommendations: First, based on the studies and related recommendations, do members support the recommendation, and second should the recommendation be recommended for early implementation (as a part of the legislative authorization for expedited code amendment implementation for hurricane related provisions) or should it be reviewed and considered through the regular Commission code amendment process.

The Chair appointed the following members to the group and charged them with representing their respective interest groups during the course of their meetings:

MEMBERS AND REPRESENTATION

Raul Rodriguez, AIA, Chair	Architects
Chris Schulte	Roofing contractors
Do Kim, P.E.	Insurance industry
Nick D'Andrea, CBO	Building officials
George Wiggins, CBO	Local government
Craig Parrino, P.E.	Product manufacturers (concrete products)
Tim Reinhold, PhD, P.E.	Insurance industry/Researchers
Joe Crum, CBO (President, BOAF)	Building officials
Jack Glenn, CBO	Home builders
Dave Olmstead	Product manufacturers (windows)
John Ingargiola	Federal government (FEMA)

REPORT OF THE MAY 2005 MEETING

The committee heard presentations from the principle investigators and reviewed the Final reports from the different major studies. There are two major studies that reports were not available for the May meeting so the committee met to develop preliminary recommendations and will meet during the Commission's June meeting to develop draft final recommendations.

The Committee was asked to review a list of the recommendations compiled from the various reports, as well as proposed at the meeting, and make two determinations. First, do they support the recommendation, and second should the recommendation be recommended for early implementation (as a part of the legislative authorization for expedited code amendment implementation for hurricane related provisions) or should it be reviewed and considered through the regular Commission code amendment process.

Eight of thirty five recommendations from the reports received 75% or greater support of the 10 members present for contingent expedited code amendment. Several others received 70% or 60% support for expedited adoption.

The committee will meet again at the June Commission meeting to consider recommendations from the 2 remaining study reports and further consider those recommendations considered at the May meeting that received significant, but not 75%, support.

OVERVIEW OF PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee was asked to review a list of the recommendations compiled from the various reports, as well as proposed at the meeting, and make two determinations. First, do they support the recommendation, and second should the recommendation be recommended for early implementation (as a part of the legislative authorization for expedited code amendment implementation for hurricane related provisions) or should it be reviewed and considered through the regular Commission code amendment process.

There were 10 members present and voting on each of the recommendations. Following are the results of the ranking exercises:

Water Intrusion General:

FHBA/HBAMO (Florida Home Builders Association/Home Builders Association of Metro Orlando) **Rainwater Management Performance of Newly Constructed Residential Building Enclosures During August and September 2004**, Building Science Corporation

- The moisture storage capacity of mass walls be increased by providing a “seat” at the base of these assemblies.

10 – 0 in favor of the recommendation.

RECOMMEND - Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND - Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
7	3

- A bond break be provided between primary drainage planes and stucco renderings in drained assemblies. In simple terms this will require two layers of building paper or a layer of building paper over a plastic housewrap.

10 – 0 in favor of the recommendation.

RECOMMEND - Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND - Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
10	0

- The specification, rating and testing of WRB’s be consistent with their installed exposure – i.e. tested and rated as part of a stucco assembly. Appropriate performance specifications need to be developed for WRB’s used with stucco renderings and the Florida Building Code altered to require them.

10 – 0 in favor of the recommendation.

RECOMMEND - Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND - Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
7	3

- Code officials be instructed regarding the correct interpretation of ASTM C1063 and the Florida Building Code be explicitly altered to require drainage where drained assemblies intersect mass assemblies.

10 – 0 in favor of the recommendation.

RECOMMEND - Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND - Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
9	1

- Windows and doors be correctly rated and tested according to ANSI/AAMA 101. Muller window units, double windows or composite windows be tested and held to the same requirements as single units.

9 – 1 in favor of the recommendation.

RECOMMEND - Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND - Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
5	5

- Water managed window and door installation requirements be developed and the Florida Building Code altered to require them.

8 – 2 in favor of the recommendation.

RECOMMEND - Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND - Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
1	9

- Pressure relieved/baffled soffit assemblies be developed for vented roof assemblies and the Florida Building Code altered to require them.

8 – 2 in favor of the recommendation.

RECOMMEND - Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND - Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
2	8

- The Florida Building Code be altered to come into compliance with the International Residential Code to explicitly allow for the construction of unvented roof assemblies.

9 – 1 in favor of the recommendation.

RECOMMEND - Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND - Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
5	5

- Water managed details for dryer vents, electrical panel boxes, electrical boxes, vent fan hoods be developed and the Florida Building Code Altered to require them.

10 – 0 in favor of the recommendation.

RECOMMEND - Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND - Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
1	9

- It is unlikely that a practical paint specification can be developed in the short term to address micro-cracking stucco issues as the relationships among water vapor permeability, mil thickness and elasticity are not known. It is recommended that these relationships be explored and that until these relationships are understood the Florida Building Code not be altered to require “elastomeric paints” on stucco renderings.

10 – 0 in favor of the recommendation.

RECOMMEND - Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND - Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
1	9

- Repeal of Section 1518.3 of the Florida Building Code requiring a mechanically attached anchor sheet between a self-adhering membrane and roof sheathing.

1 – 9 in favor of the recommendation.

RECOMMEND - Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND - Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
Second vote not taken- no support	

Central Florida BOAF Recommendations:

- Define within the code, weather resistant and weather protection.

10 – 0 in favor of the recommendation.

RECOMMEND - Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND - Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
5	5

- Require materials to be installed according to the appropriate standard(s) and manufacturer’s instructions.

9 – 1 in favor of the recommendation.

RECOMMEND - Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND - Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
1	9

Delete the exemption for these provisions from chapter 14 for concrete and masonry walls.

8 – 2 in favor of the recommendation.

RECOMMEND - Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND - Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
6	4

ROOFING:

FRSA/TRI Clay and Concrete Roof Tile Installation Supplement for Hip and Ridge Tile

Note: FRSA has advised there are amendments to the hip and ridge tile attachment document distributed prior to the committee meeting.

- Require wood, metal or other structural support “ridge board” for tile attachment methods 1, 2 and 4A

8 – 2 in favor of the recommendation.

RECOMMEND - Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND - Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
7	3

- Require FBC approved pre-bagged mortar to attach hip and ridge tiles attachment methods 3 and 4B (pre-bagged mortar requirement applies to systems where mortar is the attachment component not systems utilizing ridge board and mechanical or adhesive-set)

8 – 2 in favor of the recommendation.

RECOMMEND - Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND - Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
7	3

- Require testing of ridge attachment systems according to SSTD 11 to establish wind up-lift resistance.

10 – 0 in favor of the recommendation.

RECOMMEND - Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND - Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
8	2

- Utilize an additional tile factor of 2-1 above that specified in SSTD 11 or TAS 101 to determine the “allowable overturning moment” or “attachment resistance expressed as a moment (Mf)” conjoint systems

8 – 2 in favor of the recommendation.

RECOMMEND - Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND - Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
8	2

- Prohibit component substitution without proper laboratory testing and FBC Product Approval

9 – 1 in favor of the recommendation.

RECOMMEND - Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND - Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
9	1

- Allow hip and ridge attachment systems with demonstrated performance equal or superior to that required by the identified systems

10 – 0 in favor of the recommendation.

RECOMMEND - Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND - Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
8	2

FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Administration), Mitigation Assessment Teams reports, **Summary Report on Building Performance 2004 Hurricane Season; Mitigation Assessment Team Report Hurricane Charley in Florida, Final; Mitigation Assessment Team Report Hurricane Ivan in Florida, Draft Final**

- Require compliance with ANSI/SPRI ES-1 for edge flashings and copings.

8 – 2 in favor of the recommendation.

RECOMMEND - Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND - Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
6	4

- Develop and add criteria regarding uplift resistance of gutters.

6 – 4 in favor of the recommendation.

RECOMMEND - Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND - Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
1	9

- Require compliance with ASTM E-1592 for testing the uplift resistance of metal panel roof systems.

10 – 0 in favor of the recommendation.

RECOMMEND - Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND - Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
6	4

- Require removal of existing roof covering down to the deck and replacement of deteriorated sheathing in areas where basic wind speed is 110mph or greater. If existing sheathing attachment does not comply with loads derived from Chapter 16, require installation of additional fasteners to meet the loads.

8 – 2 in favor of the recommendation.

RECOMMEND - Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND - Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
7	3

- Require asphalt shingles to comply with UL 2390.

10 – 0 in favor of the recommendation.

RECOMMEND - Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND - Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
9	1

- Require six nails per shingle.

1 – 9 in favor of the recommendation.

RECOMMEND - Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND - Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
0	1

- Require use of asphalt roof cement at eaves, rakes, hips, and ridges where basic wind speed is 110 mph or greater.

6 – 4 in favor of the recommendation.

RECOMMEND - Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND - Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
5	5

- Provide alternative to the use of mortar to attach field tiles and hip/ridge tiles.

RECOMMEND - Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND - Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
Concept: already in the code, defer pending resolution whether in the code or not.	

- Add technically-based criteria regarding blow-off resistance of aggregate on built-up and sprayed polyurethane foam roofs (Roof Coverings for Roofs with Slopes Less than 2:12).

-

10 – 0 in favor of the recommendation.

RECOMMEND – Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND – Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
2	8

- Add criteria regarding wind and wind driven rain resistance of ridge vents. Attachment criteria require development but TAS 110 could be referenced for rain resistance.

10 – 0 in favor of the recommendation.

RECOMMEND - Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND - Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
3	7

- Criteria for wind resistance of soffits should be developed and added.

10 – 0 in favor of the recommendation.

RECOMMEND - Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND - Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
2	8

- Criteria for wind-driven rain resistance of soffits should be developed and added. TAS 110 may be a suitable test method, modified as necessary.

10 – 0 in favor of the recommendation.

RECOMMEND - Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND - Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
0	10

WINDOW, DOOR AND SHUTTER (STRUCTURAL)

FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Administration), Mitigation Assessment Teams reports, **Summary Report on Building Performance 2004 Hurricane Season; Mitigation Assessment Team Report Hurricane Charley in Florida, Final; Mitigation Assessment Team Report Hurricane Ivan in Florida, Draft Final**

- Add requirement to label shutters (other than wood) because without labels, building owner does not know if shutters are suitable.

7 – 3 in favor of the recommendation.

RECOMMEND - Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND - Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
5	5

- Revise the Florida panhandle criteria to match ASCE 7 wind borne debris region.

8 – 2 in favor of the recommendation.

RECOMMEND - Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND - Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
6	4

Windows and Doors Studies (Dave Olmstead):

- Develop standard for water intrusion appropriate to hurricane prone regions.

9 – 1 in favor of the recommendation.

RECOMMEND - Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND - Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
2	8

- Address installation instructions in relation to PAWG recommendations.

10 – 0 in favor of the recommendation.

RECOMMEND - Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND - Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
8	2

- Remove partially enclosed option during at the next residential code cycle.

8 – 2 in favor of the recommendation.

RECOMMEND – Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND – Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
2	8

Exterior Equipment

FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Administration), Mitigation Assessment Teams reports, **Summary Report on Building Performance 2004 Hurricane Season; Mitigation Assessment Team Report Hurricane Charley in Florida, Final; Mitigation Assessment Team Report Hurricane Ivan in Florida, Draft Final**

- Make the requirements of 2001 FBC Section 1522 (Rooftop Mounted Equipment) applicable throughout the state for all wind speeds. Include in Mechanical Volume also.

8 – 2 in favor of the recommendation.

RECOMMEND - Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND - Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
Not part of issues approved for early code adoption.	

- Develop criteria that pertain to attaching lightning protection systems. Include in the Electrical Volume also.

8 – 2 in favor of the recommendation.

RECOMMEND - Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND - Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
Not part of issues approved for early code adoption.	

Flood Hazard

FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Administration), Mitigation Assessment Teams reports, **Summary Report on Building Performance 2004 Hurricane Season; Mitigation Assessment Team Report Hurricane Charley in Florida, Final; Mitigation Assessment Team Report Hurricane Ivan in Florida, Draft Final**

- Adopt ASCE 24-05 for elevation requirements and flood resistant materials, equipment.

9 – 1 in favor of the recommendation.

RECOMMEND - Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND - Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
1	9

- Re-evaluate the hazard identification/mapping approaches in Coastal A/V Zones.

8 – 2 in favor of the recommendation.

RECOMMEND - Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND - Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
0	10

Critical and Essential Facilities

FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Administration), Mitigation Assessment Teams reports, **Summary Report on Building Performance 2004 Hurricane Season; Mitigation Assessment Team Report Hurricane Charley in Florida, Final; Mitigation Assessment Team Report Hurricane Ivan in Florida, Draft Final**

- For hurricane shelters and EHPA, adopt wind speed recommended by Florida DCA in the State Emergency Shelter Program and the ASCE 7-02/2001 FBC wind speed map design wind speed plus 40 mph using Performance Criteria 3.

10 – 0 in favor of the recommendation.

RECOMMEND - Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND - Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
4	6

- For all critical and essential facilities require minimum debris impact protection per ASTM E 1996 Category E, (9-pound 2x4 nominal missile traveling at 50 mph).

6 – 4 in favor of the recommendation.

RECOMMEND - Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND - Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
2	8

- Adopt the International Code Council’s High Wind Shelter Standard when available (estimated 2006/2007).

6 – 4 in favor of the recommendation.

RECOMMEND - Proceed with proposed code change	RECOMMEND - Defer for further evaluation before recommending code change
Not available for early code adoption.	