



**FLORIDA
BUILDING
COMMISSION**

"STRONGER CODES THROUGH SCIENCE AND CONSENSUS"

Florida Department of
Business &
Professional
Regulation

**FACILITATOR'S SUMMARY REPORT OF THE
JANUARY 30, 2015
CODE COORDINATION AND IMPLEMENTATION
WORKGROUP MEETING
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA**

PROCESS DESIGN, CONSENSUS-BUILDING AND FACILITATION BY



CONSENSUS CENTER

**REPORT BY JEFF A. BLAIR
FCRC CONSENSUS CENTER
FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY**



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

*This document is available in alternate formats upon request to DBPR, Codes & Standards,
1940 North Monroe Street, Tallahassee, FL 32399-0772, (850) 487-1824.*

FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION
CODE COORDINATION AND IMPLEMENTATION WORKGROUP
JANUARY 30, 2015 FACILITATOR’S MEETING SUMMARY REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS 1
TABLE OF ATTACHMENTS 1

I. PROJECT OVERVIEW 2
II. WORKGROUP SCOPE AND PURPOSE 3
III. MEETING SUMMARY OVERVIEW..... 4
IV. WELCOME AND ATTENDANCE 4
V. MEETING OBJECTIVES 5
VI. REVIEW OF PROCEDURAL ISSUES 6
VII. KEY MILESTONES OF THE FLORIDA BUILDING CODE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS..... 6
VIII. KEY ISSUES FOR EVALUATION 7
IX. PUBLIC COMMENT..... 9
X. WORKGROUP MEMBER COMMENTS AND ISSUES 10
XI. NEXT MEETING OVERVIEW AND ISSUES..... 10

ATTACHMENTS..... 11 - 15

1. MEETING EVALUATION RESULTS 11
2. WORKGROUP MEMBERSHIP..... 13
3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION..... 14
4. WORKGROUP MEETING AGENDA (JANUARY 30, 2015) 15

FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION
CODE COORDINATION AND IMPLEMENTATION WORKGROUP
JANUARY 30, 2015 FACILITATOR'S SUMMARY REPORT



FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION

"STRONGER CODES THROUGH SCIENCE AND CONSENSUS"

OVERVIEW OF WORKGROUP'S KEY ACTIONS AND DECISIONS

FRIDAY, JANUARY 30, 2015

I. PROJECT OVERVIEW

At the October 2014 Commission meeting Chairman Browdy explained that as a result of the delays experienced in adopting the *Florida Building Code Fifth Edition (2014)* it was apparent that there are regulatory requirements that constrain the Commission in being able to complete a code update in the most efficacious manner possible. Some of the statutory constraints include the requirement to coordinate with the adoption of the updated version of the *Florida Fire Prevention Code*, and the requirement to have the Florida Building Code published for 6 months after publication before it becomes effective. Other constraints include duplicative procedural requirements between the rulemaking requirements of Chapter 120, F.S. and the code development requirements mandated by Section 553.73, F.S. Other considerations are the schedule for the IBC code updates, the NEC code schedule, and the schedule for other important reference documents that must be finalized before incorporation by reference into the Florida Building Code Rule. There are also other built-in time constraints that serve to delay the implementation of a code update cycle. The Commission should review all of the critical path milestones in the code development process and determine what should be done to make the process as efficient as possible.

In order to address the issue the Chair recommended that the Commission convene a *Code Coordination and Implementation Workgroup* to review and evaluate all of the regulatory requirements currently impacting the code development process (code update process), and to propose a legislative path for a more efficacious process and timetable for the implementation of the Florida Building Code update process. At the October 2014 meeting the Commission voted unanimously to convene a *Code Coordination and Implementation Workgroup* to review and evaluate all of the regulatory requirements currently impacting the code development process (code update process), and to propose a legislative path to a more efficacious timetable for the implementation of the Florida Building Code update process.

II. WORKGROUP SCOPE AND PURPOSE

Chairman Browdy indicated that again he wanted to welcome participants to Tallahassee for this extremely important effort by the Florida Building Commission to review and evaluate the numerous factors that determine the timely delivery of the Florida Building Code Updates to the construction industry and to the citizens of the state. The Chair noted that members were selected to be a part of the Workgroup because they and their constituencies realized that since the production of the 1st Edition of the Florida Building Code, the *2001 Florida Building Code* with an effective date of March 1st 2002, many things have changed. The Commission has updated the Code according to their statutory responsibilities but has yet to evaluate and update the process that timely delivers the Code to the citizens of the State of Florida.

The Chair expressed that he thought it was only fitting that the Workgroup was convening at the Capitol because their work product ultimately will need to be vetted in Tallahassee through the state regulatory processes—similar to the Commission’s triennial code updates. The Chair expressed a special welcome to members of the Department of Business & Professional Regulation who attended including: Deputy Secretary, Tim Vaccarro, Division of Professions Director, G.W. Harrell, and Deputy Division of Professions Director, Drew Winters.

Chairman Browdy explained that he recommended the convening of a Workgroup because the delays experienced in adopting the *Florida Building Code Fifth Edition (2014)*—which will go into effect July 1st, 2015—made it abundantly clear that there are perhaps outdated or even unnecessary regulatory requirements that constrain the Commission in being able to complete a code update in the most effective manner possible. Some of those statutory constraints include the requirement to coordinate with the adoption of the updated version of the *Florida Fire Prevention Code*, and the requirement to have the Florida Building Code published for 6 months before it becomes effective and enforceable.

Other considerations are the schedule for the IBC code updates, the NEC code schedule, and the schedule for other important reference documents that must be finalized before incorporation by reference into the Florida Building Code Rule. There are also other built-in time constraints that serve to delay the implementation of a code update cycle.

The Chair noted that while the main focus of the Workgroup is on the timing process previously referred to, he understands that the Workgroup cannot discuss that process without a frank and honest discussion about the direction of the Code itself, and the code development requirements mandated by Section 553.73, F.S. requiring a re-adoption of previous Florida specific amendments with the exception of statutorily provided exemptions.

The Chair observed that there were stakeholders who would choose to permanently imprint all the Florida specific provisions into the Code without the requisite statutory review of those provisions; while there are others stakeholders, the proponents of that code development requirement, who would not burden the process any longer with the triennial vetting, and would rather move the Commission toward the straight adoption of the ICC model codes, thereby eliminating much process and consequently much time.

The Chair indicated he was certain that as Jeff Blair takes participants through the exercise of identifying key issues and the prioritization of those issues, these topics would find their proper place in the Workgroup’s agenda for discussion.

The Chair stated that the Workgroup would attempt to review all of the critical path milestones in the code development process and determine what should be done to make the process as efficient as possible for the practitioners and ultimately the users – the citizens of the state.

Chairman Browdy noted that in summary the scope of the Workgroup is to evaluate all of the regulatory requirements currently impacting the code development process (code update process), and to propose a legislative path for a more efficacious process and timetable for the implementation of the Florida Building Code update process. It is expected that any recommendations for statutory changes, once approved by the full Commission, will be delivered to the 2016 Florida Legislature.

III. PLENARY SESSION SUMMARY AND OVERVIEW

At the January 30, 2015 meeting the Workgroup received an overview and briefing on the Workgroup’s scope and purpose; a review of the Commission’s decision-making procedures and polices including applicability of the Sunshine Law; and a review of the key components and milestones of the Florida Building Code development process. In addition, the Workgroup reviewed and agreed on a list of key topics and associated issues and sub-issues for Workgroup evaluation. Specific actions included: agreeing on the list of key topics and issues for evaluation by the Workgroup. The overarching key topics for Workgroup evaluation are as follows: code printing and publication, errata, the Code amendment process, Florida specific amendments, statutory timeline requirements, adoption of standards and codes by reference, and Commission participation with the ICC code development process.

(Attachment 1—Meeting Evaluation Results)

IV. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Chairman Browdy welcomed Workgroup members, staff and the public to the inaugural meeting of the *Code Coordination and Implementation Workgroup*. The Chair noted that in attendance were DPBR Deputy Secretary, Tim Vaccarro, Division of Professions Director, G.W. Harrell, and Deputy Division of Professions Director, Drew Winters.

WORKGROUP MEMBER ATTENDANCE

The following Workgroup members attended the Friday, January 30, 2015 meeting:

Dick Browdy (Chair), Tom Allen (ex-officio), Steve Bassett, Jay Carlson, David Compton, Kevin Flanagan, Charles Frank, Darrell Phillips, Brad Schiffer, Jim Schock, Steve Strawn, Brian Swope, and George Wiggins. *(13 of 14 Workgroup members attended)*

(Attachment 2—Workgroup Membership)

Absent Members:

Drew Smith.

Other Commissioners in Attendance:

Bob Boyer.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

A list of public participants is included as “Attachment 3” of this Report.
(Attachment 3—Public Participation)

DBPR STAFF PRESENT

Chris Burgwald, Jim Hammers, April Hammonds, Mo Madani, and Jim Richmond.

Also in attendance were DPBR Deputy Secretary, Tim Vaccarro, Division of Professions Director, G.W. Harrell, and Deputy Division of Professions Director, Drew Winters

MEETING FACILITATION

The meeting was facilitated by Jeff Blair from the FCRC Consensus Center at Florida State University. Information at: <http://consensus.fsu.edu/>



CONSENSUS CENTER

PROJECT WEBPAGE

Information on the Florida Building Commission project, including agenda packets, meeting reports, and related documents may be found at the Commission Webpage. Located at the following URL: <http://floridabuilding.org/c/default.aspx>

V. AGENDA REVIEW AND APPROVAL

The Workgroup voted unanimously, 13 - 0 in favor, to approve the agenda for the January 30, 2015 meeting as presented/posted. Following are the key agenda items approved for consideration:

- To Approve Regular Procedural Topics (Agenda and Procedural Guidelines)
- To Hear an Overview of Workgroup Charge and Scope
- To Hear a Presentation on the Florida Building Code Development Process
- To Identify Issues and Options Regarding the Florida Building Code Development Process
- To Discuss and Evaluate Level of Acceptability of Proposed Options
- To Consider Public Comment
- To Identify Needed Next Steps: Information, Assignments, and Agenda Items for Next Meeting

Amendments to the Posted Agenda:

There were no amendments to the posted/presented Agenda.

(Attachment 4—January 30, 2015 Workgroup Agenda)

VI. REVIEW OF PROCEDURAL ISSUES

Jeff Blair reviewed the Workgroup's decision-making and procedural policies and procedures noting they are the same as the Commission's, including the applicability of the Sunshine Law, and answered member's questions. Jeff noted that the Commission's workgroups and committees function using a consensus based decision-making process. General consensus is a participatory process whereby, on matters of substance, the members strive for agreements which all of the members can accept, support, live with or agree not to oppose. *In instances where, after vigorously exploring possible ways to enhance the members' support for the final decision on a recommendation, and the Workgroup finds that 100% acceptance or support is not achievable, final decisions will require at least 75% favorable vote of all members present and voting.* This super majority decision rule underscores the importance of actively developing consensus throughout the process on substantive issues with the participation of all members and which all can live with. In instances where the Workgroup finds that even 75% acceptance or support is not achievable, publication of recommendations will include documentation of the differences and the options that were considered for which there is more than 50% support from the Workgroup.

Sunshine Law Requirements Applicability to Workgroup Members

Jeff Blair explained that Workgroup members are subject to the requirements of Florida's Government in the Sunshine Law, commonly referred to as the Sunshine Law (Section 286.011 F.S.), and may not discuss with each other, outside of properly noticed meetings, issues that may foreseeably come before the Workgroup for discussion.

VII. KEY MILESTONES OF THE FLORIDA BUILDING CODE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

Mo Madani, DBPR, presented a PowerPoint presentation titled, *Florida Building Code Development Process*, and answered member's questions. Mo provided an update on the following topics:

Part 1: Florida Statute (Section 553.73, F.S.) and Building Code Rule (Rule 61G20-1.001, F.A.C.)

Part 2: Code Change Process

Part 3: Code Modification Process – Forms

Part 4: Florida Supplement to the I-Code Preliminary

Part 5: Code Modification Process – Steps

Part 6: Timeline

Part 7: FBC Editions to Date

Part 8: Issues for Evaluation

The complete presentation is available on the BCIS at the following URL:

<http://floridabuilding.org/c/default.aspx>.

VIII. KEY ISSUES FOR WORKGROUP EVALUATION

Jeff Blair reviewed a list of key topics and issues provided as page 11 of the Agenda Packet. Jeff reviewed the list of issues and asked members to determine whether any issues should be revised and/or added. Following a review of the provided list of issues, questions and answers, public comment, and a Workgroup discussion, the Workgroup agreed to the list of key topics and issues as follows:

I. Code Printing/Publication

Publishing a fully integrated Florida Building Code (Florida specific amendments integrated into the adopted I-Codes version), or publishing Florida specific amendments as a supplement.

II. Errata

Authority to issue errata and publication of the same.
A clear definition of what constitutes an errata.

III. Code Amendment Process

Triennial Update

 Including a review of the 3-year update cycle

Annual Amendments

Glitch Amendments

IV. Florida Specific Amendments

Statutory requirements for what is carried forward and how they are reviewed by TACs and Commission.

V. Statutory Timeline Requirements

- Selection of I-Codes version for FBC Update (timelines and requirements).
- Selection of NEC version for FBC Update (timelines and requirements).
- Incorporation of FFPC (timelines and requirements).
- TAC review and public comment (timelines and requirements).
- Glitch amendment (timelines and requirements).
- Chapter 120 rule adoption process (timelines and requirements).
- The Florida Building Code shall take effect no sooner than 6 months after publication of the updated code (timelines and requirements).

Recommendations from Commission Process Review Ad Hoc Committee (2009)

Committee recommended that the Commission recommend to the Florida Legislature eliminating the statutory requirement for the Commission to wait six months after publication of the latest I-Code Edition before selecting the same as the foundation code for the Florida Building Code for future Code Editions.

VI. Adoption of Standards and Codes by Reference

National Electrical Code (NEC)

Florida Fire Prevention Code (FCPC)

All other relevant standards and codes adopted by reference

VII. Commission Participation With the ICC Code Development Process

Referred to the Workgroup by the Commission at their December 12, 2014 meeting.

(Note: An *ICC Participation Workgroup* process was conducted by the Commission in 2004, and the Commission made a policy decision not to participate in the ICC, instead relying on BOAF participation) A discussion of whether the Commission should participate in the I-Code development process (FBC I-Code participation evaluation) was also considered during the *Building Code System Assessment Process* (BCSA) that delivered recommendations to the Commission in December of 2012.

OTHER RELATED TOPICS SUGGESTED BY MEMBERS WITH PREVIOUS COMMISSION ACTIONS ON THE ISSUES

Local Technical Amendments

The issue is that local technical amendments are sometimes adopted by local jurisdictions without a demonstrated need, and the resultant impact to the consistency of state-wide implementation of the Florida Building Code (including interpretation and enforcement of the Code).

Building Code System Uniform Implementation Evaluation Workgroup (2013)

The Commission recommended and the Legislature implemented statutory clarification that local technical amendments should be clearly defined in Chapter 553, F.S., and local technical amendments should only be enacted when they fully comply with the provisions in Section 553.73 (4)(b)(1.-10.), F.S. governing adoption of local technical amendments. A definition of the term “*local technical amendment*” was added by the Legislature as Chapter 553.71 (6), F.S., as follows: “Local Technical Amendment” means an action by a local governing authority that results in a technical change to the Florida Building Code and its local enforcement.

Consistency in Code Interpretation

The issue is the need for a consistent and uniform implementation (interpretation and enforcement) of the Florida Building Code state-wide.

Building Code System Uniform Implementation Evaluation Workgroup (2013)

1) The Florida Building Commission developed the Florida Building Code to be implemented uniformly throughout the State with the exception of the HVHZ; (2) The Commission through its established processes continually addresses current relevant issues and model code updates; (3) The Florida Building Commission’s *Building Code System Uniform Implementation Evaluation Workgroup* has determined that there are significant disparities within the State in Code enforcement, permitting requirements and associated fees; (4) All regulatory agencies and licensees engaged in the process of implementing the Florida Building Code are required to implement the Florida Building Code and its associated processes; (5) Local technical amendments should be clearly defined in Chapter 553, F.S., and local technical amendments should only be enacted when they fully comply with the provisions in Section 553.73 (4)(b)(1.-10.), F.S. governing adoption of local technical amendments; (6) the Building Code System should be continuously monitored and evaluated for enhancements to the System relative to achieving the goal of uniform implementation and interpretation of the Code while preserving the Code’s foundations of local administration and enforcement.

ISO Ratings (ISO's Building Code Effectiveness Grading Schedule (BCEGS))

The issue is that some jurisdictions are not able to achieve the highest ISO ratings since the adopted edition of the Florida Building Code does not generally incorporate the latest I-Code edition as the foundation code for the FBC.

Building Code System Assessment Process (2011)

Recommended convening a workgroup/process to ensure that the ISO recognizes the Florida Building Code for equivalent points for BSEGS (provide equal credits to the I-codes).

Status: The recommendation was referred to the *Building Code System Uniform Implementation Evaluation Workgroup (2013)*. The Workgroup did not take formal action on the issue, lacking participation from the insurance industry.

IX. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Members of the public were offered an opportunity to provide comment during each of the Workgroup's substantive discussion agenda items. Following is a summary of the public comment.

Public Comments:

- Joe Belcher, JDB Code Consultants: asked the Workgroup to make sure all standards and codes adopted by reference are included in the analysis, and not just the FFPC and NEC.
- Jeff Blair, facilitator: explained that is the intention and the list of issues will be clarified to reflect this.
- Doug Buck, FHBA: reminded participants that the statutory constraints were put into statute at the request of stakeholders who felt the process needed the safeguards. Doug indicated that stakeholders are willing to evaluate the process and associated timelines and consider enhancements, but full stakeholder participation and access must be safeguarded. Doug indicated that it might make sense to skip a code cycle so industry can catch up with the code before it is updated again. Explained that homebuilders are not generally excited about code changes.
- Cam Fentriss, FRSA: indicated she also represents mechanical and plumbing contractors. Noted that FRSA provided a letter dated January 26, 2015 with comments including the recommendation that Florida specific amendments should not be purged with each code update. Indicated that FRSA would like to see important and needed Florida specific amendments carry forward and not have to be resubmitted for each code update cycle. Stated that the Florida Building Code should be the code for Florida, and Florida should not move toward a wholesale adoption of the I-Codes. Stated that code governance for Florida should remain in Florida and not with the ICC. FRSA prefers a fully integrated Florida Building Code, and not a separate published Florida supplement to the I-Codes. Indicated that voting at the ICC is restricted to government employees, and that on balance stakeholders do not receive the participation opportunities built into the Florida Building Code development process.
- Eric Stafford, IBHS: IBHS supports FRSA's letter and agrees with the substantive comments referenced in the same. IBHS prefers a fully integrated Florida Building Code, and not a separate published Florida supplement to the I-Codes. Noted that the biggest problem is with the IRC, and it is difficult to get ICC agreement on issues critical to Florida such as wind loads.
- Mark Zehnal, FRSA: noted that Mike Goolsby, Miami-Dade County stated his agreement with the FRSA position paper.

X. WORKGROUP MEMBER COMMENT AND ISSUES

Workgroup members were invited to offer any general comments to the Workgroup, or identify any issues or agenda items for the next Workgroup meeting.

Workgroup Member Comments:

- Kevin Flanagan: asked whether at the next meeting the Workgroup would begin the process of evaluating options to address the key issues.
- Jeff Blair: responded that yes, the Workgroup would be asked to propose a range of options for each of the key issues and then to evaluate each in turn utilizing the four-point acceptability ranking process.

XI. NEXT WORKGROUP MEETING OVERVIEW AND ISSUES

The next Workgroup meeting, to be scheduled for early March of 2015, will focus on the identification and evaluation of the full range of options to address each of the identified key issues. During the meeting members will be asked to review existing proposed options and invited to propose any additional project relevant options for *Workgroup* consideration. A preliminary list of options will be offered by participants between Meeting I and Meeting II and other options were referred by the Commission. Following discussion and refinement of options, members may be asked to do additional rankings of proposed options if requested by a *Workgroup* member. Members should be prepared to offer specific refinements to address their reservations. Once ranked, options with a 75% or greater number of 4's and 3's in proportion to 2's and 1's shall be considered consensus recommendations. The *Workgroup's* consensus recommendations will be submitted to the Commission for consideration.

ASSIGNMENTS

- Jeff Blair will draft a facilitator's summary report of the meeting.
- Jeff Blair will send participants a list of key issues with a request for participants to return to him a list of possible options for evaluation pertaining to each key issue. The possible options will be compiled without attribution and will serve as the starting point for an options evaluation worksheet. The discussions and ranking will only occur during Workgroup meetings and members should not discuss the options with other members in any format (verbal, written, electronic, etc.).
- Tom Allen will brief the Workgroup on why it takes 9 months for the ICC to provide DBPR staff with an integrated code document.
- DBPR staff will also brief the Workgroup on why it takes 9 months to develop an integrated code document.
- Staff will schedule the next Workgroup meeting date and location, and notify participants as soon in advance as possible.

ADJOURNMENT

The Chair thanked Workgroup members and the public for their attendance and participation, and adjourned the meeting at 12:55 P.M. on Friday, January 30, 2015.

ATTACHMENT 1
CODE COORDINATION AND IMPLEMENTATION WORKGROUP
MEETING EVALUATION RESULTS

JANUARY 30, 2015—TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA

Average rank using a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 means totally disagree and 10 means totally agree.

Number of Respondents: 20 of 24 Commissioners present completed meeting evaluations.

1. OVERALL MEETING ASSESSMENT.

- 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.
- 9.6 Overall, the objectives of the meeting were fully achieved.

2. MEMBERS LEVEL OF AGREEMENT THAT THE MEETING OBJECTIVES WERE ACHIEVED.

- 9.8 Overview of Workgroup Charge and Scope.
- 9.9 Presentation on the Florida Building Code Development Process.
- 9.8 Identification of Key Issues Regarding the Florida Building Code Development Process.
- 9.6 Identification and Discussion of Possible Options to Address Key Issues.

3. HOW WELL THE FACILITATOR HELPED THE MEMBERS ENGAGE IN THE MEETING.

- 9.7 The members followed the direction of the Facilitator.
- 9.9 The Facilitator made sure the concerns of all members were heard.
- 9.7 The Facilitator helped us arrange our time well.
- 9.9 Participant input was documented accurately in Facilitator's Report (previous meeting).

4. MEMBERS LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE MEETING.

- 9.6 Overall, I am very satisfied with the meeting.
- 9.7 I was very satisfied with the services provided by the Facilitator.
- 9.6 I am satisfied with the outcome of the meeting.

5. HOW WELL THE NEXT STEPS WERE COMMUNICATED.

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

6. WHAT MEMBERS LIKED BEST ABOUT THE MEETING.

- Meeting was kept on track.
- The structure of the meeting.
- Getting the issues on the table and hearing from the members of the public.
- The project overview, and the list of items to review.
- Meeting was face-to-face.
- Meeting was shorter than I thought.

7. COMMENTS REGARDING HOW THE MEETING COULD HAVE BEEN IMPROVED.

- Water in the meeting room.
- Coffee and water, please.
- Provide coffee, water, etc.

8. OTHER GENERAL COMMENTS.

- Overall, well coordinated.
- Good job Jeff.
- Thanks to Jeff.
- Water in the room.

COMMENTS ON SPECIFIC AGENDA ITEMS

None were offered.

PUBLIC-MEETING EVALUATION AND COMMENT RESULTS

None were offered.

ATTACHMENT 2
WORKGROUP MEMBERSHIP

WORKGROUP MEMBERSHIP	
MEMBER	AFFILIATION
Dick Browdy	Florida Building Commission (FBC)
Tom Allen (ex officio)	ICC Code Process
Steve Bassett	Building Professionals: Mechanical Contractors
Jay Carlson	Building Professionals: General Contractors
David Compton	Design Professionals: Engineers
Kevin Flanagan	Building Professionals: Electrical Contractors
Charles Frank	Division of State Fire Marshal
Darrell Phillips	Education Facility Professionals: Public Education
Brad Schiffer	Design Professionals: Architects
Jim Schock	Building Officials
Drew Smith	Building Professionals: Home Builders
Steve Strawn	Building Product Manufacturers
Brian Swope	Building Professionals: Roofing and Sheet Metal Contractors
George Wiggins	Building Officials of Florida (BOAF)
DBPR STAFF	
Chris Burgwald	Administrative
Jim Hammers	IT
April Hammonds	FBC Legal Counsel
Mo Madani	Technical Manager
Jim Richmond	Executive Director
FACILITATOR	
Jeff Blair	FCRC Consensus Center at Florida State University

ATTACHMENT 3
MEETING PARTICIPATION

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION	
NAME	AFFILIATION
Joe Belcher	JDB Code Consultants
Robert Boyer	BOAF
Doug Buck	FHBA
Neil Burdich	BOAF
Dale Calhoun	
Dean Decker	
William Dumbaugh	BOAF
Cam Fentriss	FRSA
Bryan Holland	NEMA
Jeffrey Sargent	NFPA
Gerry Smilen	BOAF
Eric Stafford	IBHS
Ann Stanton	Citizen
Dick Wilhelm	AAMA
Mark Zehnal	FRSA

ATTACHMENT 4
JANUARY 30, 2015 MEETING AGENDA

FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION
CODE COORDINATION AND IMPLEMENTATION WORKGROUP
JANUARY 30, 2015—MEETING I
BETTY EASLEY CONFERENCE CENTER, ROOM 180
4075 ESPLANADE WAY—TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32399

MEETING OBJECTIVES

- To Approve Regular Procedural Topics (Agenda and Procedural Guidelines)
- To Hear an Overview of Workgroup Charge and Scope
- To Hear a Presentation on the Florida Building Code Development Process
- To Identify Issues and Options Regarding the Florida Building Code Development Process
- To Discuss and Evaluate Level of Acceptability of Proposed Options
- To Consider Public Comment
- ✓ To Identify Needed Next Steps: Information, Assignments, and Agenda Items for Next Meeting

MEETING AGENDA—FRIDAY, JANUARY 30, 2015

All Agenda Times—including Adjournment—are Approximate and Subject to Change

10:00 AM	A.)	WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS	DB
	B.)	AGENDA REVIEW AND APPROVAL (January 30, 2015)	JB
	C.)	REVIEW OF COMMISSION’S WORKGROUP MEETING GUIDELINES, CONSENSUS-BUILDING AND DECISION-MAKING PROCESS, AND SUNSHINE REQUIREMENTS	JB
	D.)	REVIEW OF CODE COORDINATION AND IMPLEMENTATION WORKGROUP SCOPE AND PURPOSE	DB
	E.)	REVIEW OF KEY COMPONENTS AND MILESTONES OF THE FLORIDA BUILDING DEVELOPMENT PROCESS	MM
	F.)	IDENTIFICATION OF ISSUES FOR EVALUATION REGARDING THE FLORIDA BUILDING CODE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of Key Issues Identified • Identification & Agreement on List of Issues by Workgroup Members in Turn • Prioritization of Key Issues 	JB/ WG
	G.)	IDENTIFICATION, DISCUSSION AND EVALUATION OF OPTIONS IN TURN	JB/ WG
	H.)	GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT	JB
	I.)	NEXT STEPS: AGENDA ITEMS, NEEDED INFORMATION, ASSIGNMENTS, DATE AND LOCATION	JB
	J.)	ADJOURN	