

**BUILDING CODE SYSTEM UNIFORM
IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION WORKGROUP**

**REPORT TO THE FLORIDA BUILDING
COMMISSION**



MEETING II—DECEMBER 4, 2012

GAINESVILLE, 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
BUILDING CODE SYSTEM
UNIFORM IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION WORKGROUP REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>TABLE OF CONTENTS</i>	1
<i>TABLE OF ATTACHMENTS</i>	1
PROJECT OVERVIEW	2
MEETING PARTICIPATION	3
MEETING OBJECTIVES	3
REVIEW OF PROJECT SCOPE	4
IDENTIFICATION OF KEY ISSUES	4
SUMMARY OF KEY PRIORITY PROJECT ISSUES	8
NEXT STEPS	9
<hr/>	
<i>TABLE OF ATTACHMENTS</i>	10 - 16
I. MEETING EVALUATION RESULTS	10
II. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION	12
III. MEETING AGENDA (DECEMBER 4, 2012)	13
IV. PROJECT OPTIONS FOR EVALUATION	14

PROJECT OVERVIEW

BUILDING CODE SYSTEM UNIFORM IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION WORKGROUP

Chairman Browdy recommended to the Florida Building Commission the convening of a *Workgroup* to evaluate the uniform implementation of the Florida Building Code System. The Chair explained to the Commission that the Commission's statutory authority is currently limited to Code issues, updates, code administration, interpretations, energy efficiency, accessibility, product approval and building code education. Through an expertly managed consensus building process, the Commission has created an exemplary work product that is to be applied uniformly throughout the State. However, the uniform application of the Commission's work product has yet to be achieved. There are significant disparities within the State in code enforcement, permitting requirements and associated fees that are detrimental to the aims and objectives articulated in the 1996 Building Codes Study Commission report and Governor Scott's objectives to encourage the creation of construction in these most difficult economic times. With the Commission's move to DBPR the Commission has an opportunity to initiate a discussion regarding the uniformity of the implementation of our statewide code. The Chair expressed that a good first step would be to convene a stakeholder workgroup to identify and evaluate key issues and possible agency solutions, as well as a possible strategies for implementing a more uniform interpretation and administration of the Code. The initial scope of the *Building Code System Uniform Implementation Evaluation Workgroup* will be to evaluate how well the Commission's efforts to create a unified building code have been implemented throughout the State. The Chair explained that his preference before appointing a workgroup on an issue of this importance is to determine whether the Commission concurs with the proposed strategy and supports convening a workgroup to evaluate the uniformity of the implementation of the Florida Building Code System. At the January 31, 2012 meeting the Commission voted unanimously to convene the *Building Code System Uniform Implementation Evaluation Workgroup*. Following are the *Workgroup* appointments:

WORKGROUP MEMBERSHIP	
MEMBER	AFFILIATION
Dick Browdy (FBC Chair)	Florida Building Commission (FBC)
Tom Allen	Building Officials Central Florida (BOAF)
Steve Bassett	Florida Engineering Society (FES)
Rusty Carrol	Building Officials S.E. Florida (BOAF)
Wayne Fernandez	General/Commercial Contractors
Jack Glenn	Florida Home Builders Association (FHBA)
Rick Logan	American Institute of Architects Florida Chapter (AIA Florida)
Danny Weeden	Building Officials N.W. Florida (BOAF)
Louie Wise	Mechanical Contractors and Subcontractors
Mark Zehnal	Florida Roofing and Sheet Metal Association (FRSA)

REPORT OF THE DECEMBER 4, 2012 MEETING—MEETING II

OPENING AND MEETING ATTENDANCE

The meeting started at 11:40 AM, and the following seven *Workgroup* members were present: Dick Browdy (FBC Chair), Tom Allen, Steve Bassett, Rusty Carrol, Jack Glenn, Rick Logan, and Mark Zehnal.

Commission Members Present (Non-Workgroup Members)

Bob Boyer, Kevin Flanagan, Ken Gregory, Dale Greiner, Jon Hamrick, Brad Schiffer, Jim Schock, Jeff Stone, and Brian Swope.

DBPR Staff Present

Jim Hammers, April Hammonds, Ila Jones, Mo Madani, Marlita Peters, and Jim Richmond.

(Attachment II—Public Participants)

Meeting Notes

Meeting notes were taken by Marlita Peters, DBPR technical staff.

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 project, including agenda packets, meeting reports and related project background documents are available at the project webpage. URL follows:

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

AGENDA REVIEW AND APPROVAL

The *Workgroup* voted unanimously, 7 - 0 in favor, to approve the agenda as presented/posted including the following objectives:

- To Approve Regular Procedural Topics (Agenda and Procedural Guidelines)
- To Hear an Overview of Workgroup Charge and Scope
- To Identify Issues and Options Regarding Uniform Implementation of Building Code System
- 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

(Attachment III—Meeting Agenda)

REVIEW OF WORKGROUP PROJECT SCOPE

Dick Browdy (Commission Chair) reminded members and participants that the scope of inquiry for the *Building Code System Uniform Implementation Evaluation Workgroup* is to evaluate how well the Commission's efforts to create a unified building code have been implemented throughout the State relative to the interpretation and administration of the Florida Building Code. Additional details on the Project Scope, as outlined by Chairman Browdy, are provided in the "Project Overview" section located on page 2 of this Report. At the December 4, 2012 meeting the Chair explained that although the Workgroup previously identified a range of options* for evaluation, his preference was for the Workgroup to spend an additional meeting more narrowly defining the scope of the project with the goal of ensuring the Workgroup has identified key priority issues relative to enhancing the uniform interpretation and enforcement (administration) of the Florida Building Code.

* (*Attachment IV—Project Relevant Options for Evaluation*)

IDENTIFICATION OF KEY ISSUES FOR WORKGROUP EVALUATION

Jeff Blair, Workgroup Facilitator, invited *Workgroup* members to offer one key issue from their stakeholders' perspective essential to enhancing the uniform interpretation and enforcement (administration) of the Florida Building Code. Subsequently Commissioners and members of the public were offered the same opportunity. The goal of the discussion, as explained by Chairman Browdy, was to more narrowly define the scope of the project by focusing on critical project relevant issues. A summary of the participants' perspectives is provided below.

Summary of Meeting Comments:

Threshold Question: "*From your stakeholders' perspective what is the single most critical issue that should be evaluated related to the project goal of enhancing the uniform interpretation and enforcement (administration) of the Florida Building Code?*"

Workgroup Members' Responses:

- Browdy: a priority issue from my perspective as a homebuilder is enhancing the consistency of the plans review process across the State. There should be consistency, at a minimum, for the baseline requirements for submittal, including the forms and checklists used throughout the building permit application process from submittal to plans review to issuance of a building permit. Another related issue is that of fees for building permits. I understand that different jurisdictions have different needs, but on balance there should be some level of consistency in pricing for similar levels of service for a similar project scope.
- Allen: there is currently inconsistency regarding paperwork requirements for building permit application submittals. We should have uniform paperwork submittal requirements.
- Bassett: an issue is the lack of consistency between jurisdictions regarding the proper siting of cooling towers. The requirements should be the same in all jurisdictions and should comply with the health, safety and technical requirements of the Code. Where the towers discharge is an important issue and some locations allow towers to discharge into public and/or condo/hotel swimming pools.
- Carroll: there should be standardized plans review sheets (checklists) for residential and commercial permits.
- Glenn: an issue homebuilders are having is that some jurisdictions are citing code violations but not citing a reference to the violation in the Code. If an inspector fails an inspection they are

required to identify the violation (with a Code citation), and not because they have a pet peeve on some code issue (with the explanation of: “just because they say so”). Although building officials are required to identify the code violation, builders are often reluctant to challenge this because of the fear of retaliation on future projects.

- Logan: design professionals desire predictability. A designer should be able to design in any jurisdiction and not have to contend with local technical code amendments hidden in land development regulations (i.e., local amendment to the fire code requiring commercial building over 5000 square feet to be sprinkled even though the FBC provides for certain exceptions).
- Zehnal: for roofing contractors and sub-contractors uniformity of permit application submittals is important. There should be a consistent form to use as well as uniformity of inspections and procedures to go with it.
- Glenn: another issue is that state agency regulations should be developed consistent with all other code modifications, modifications should be submitted through the Code update process.

Commissioners’ Responses:

- Hamrick: educational programs should be consistent across licensing categories so all construction training is consistent and uniform (cross-training). This will help with the uniform interpretation and enforcement of the Code.
- Gregory: there should be consistent timeframes for receiving a building permit across jurisdictions. The process should be streamlined and consistent statewide.
- Schock: there is confusion and inconsistent interpretation and enforcement of the various accessibility requirements between the FACBC, SAD and Fair Housing requirements.
- The FACBC, SAD, and fair housing requirements are complicated and building officials need to understand how to consistently interpret and enforce the requirements, especially more complicated aspects such as removable barriers. We need better education and training on the nuances of state and Federal accessibility requirements to ensure consistency of interpretation and enforcement.
- Schiffer: predictability is important for design professionals. BOAF created a guideline that is helpful, but we need to standardize the review process, and the level of detail required in plans submittals (what is required in plans should be the same in all jurisdictions and that is not the case currently).
- Greiner: I agree with the uniformity of forms, plans submittal documents and timelines for approval recommendations. The unwritten law of enforcement is that building officials (BO) can ask for anything they want (i.e., requiring an NOA for a garage door). I would like to see a comprehensive central repository at the Commission level for answers and input on correctly interpreting and enforcing the Code to assist BOs in making an educated decision (e.g., binding and non-binding opinions, code interpretations, declaratory statements, code amendments, FAQs). Not all BOs utilize what BOAF has available. Making this information readily available and then encouraging BOs to use it. BOs have a lot of authority and obtaining uniformity in how they utilize this authority (interpretation and enforcement) is key.
- Bassett: the Commission should provide this type information on the BCIS (i.e., FAQs).
- Madani: there is already a central location for all interpretations (binding, non-binding and declaratory statements) on the BCIS.
- Zehnal: there needs to be real protection from political interference with the duties of a BO, this would help with consistency of enforcement and interpretations. Also building departments should be able to keep their permitting fees to run their programs and not have funds

distributed to other activities. This would provide needed resources for education and sufficient staffing.

- Swope: uniformity and consistency in both performance and procedures is needed. A uniform checklist for permit submittals throughout all municipalities would be helpful for procedures. We also should be able to depend on consistent and uniform application of the Code by building department personnel (performance). A standard of professionalism and education on the consistent and uniform interpretation and enforcement of the Code statewide should be required.
- Flanagan: education is needed to get to uniformity. We need all building departments and personnel following the same set of rules. (i.e., we have an NEC as the consistent standard, but an inspector can require more than the minimum codes).
- Schock: civil service regulations get in the way of achieving consistency in performance by building department personnel. Sometimes they are protected from removal for incompetence by the requirements to protect their jobs.
- Browdy: an example of an effort to assist with consistency was the prototype building program. The concept was that once a plan was approved by the State the contractor would be able to take the state approved plans to any jurisdiction and receive a building permit with little additional review and time. The reality was approval often took longer than submitting for a new permit, and in some cases approval costs increased to meet local requirements. This discouraged contractors from using the program.
- Schock: it's important to understand that in many cases the delays in receiving a building permit are not due to the building departments' plans review process, but as a result of other required reviews such as environmental, zoning and fire. Much of the total time for plans review is a result of non-building code related reviews.

Public Participants' Responses:

- Doug Harvey (BOAF): requested that BOAF's written comments from the last meeting be part of the standing record. Would like to help the Commission to get information out to building officials. BOAF has recommended that their membership watch the streaming video of Commission and related meetings to stay involved, especially with economic constraints preventing attending meetings in person. Recommended setting up a comment post for the project to receive outside comments from those who can not attend in person. In regards to the information repository recommendation: BOAF does provide much of this information with a link to all informal interpretations, and it is part of a searchable database.
- Joe Hetzel (DASMA): regarding the requirement for an NOA for a garage door, uniformity of product approvals throughout all municipalities is paramount for manufacturers. As background information: manufacturer's associations have no jurisdiction over their members. Members who have gone through the state product approval process should not be required to also get an NOA for approval of their products. An NOA is required in some parts of Florida and not in others, there is a lack of consistency. Our desire is to remove inconsistencies and maximize the ability for all manufacturers' to sell in all parts of Florida using a consistent, predictable process.
- Gascon (Miami-Dade County): recommend enhancements to the manufactured buildings program database. Would like to see a searchable database that allows one to find specific conditions or materials that are approved in a specific area (e.g., to easily find specific materials approved for use in the HVHZ). Also, product approvals requiring NOA's outside of Miami-

Dade are often required by insurance companies and/or homeowners seeking discounts on their insurance rates and not the building departments.

- Linda Patrick (City of Gainesville Plans Examiner): enforcement and education are big issues. We need education beyond the 14 hours required for licensure. Would like to see building officials receive management training so they can effectively manage. Indicated support for the uniform checklist concept, and repository of information on the FBC website ideas, but stated that education statewide would assist in obtaining uniformity. Additional training is difficult to get funded through local government beyond the minimum requirements for licensure status.
- Jim Bell (ASA Doors): agrees with Greiner regarding lack of uniformity in inspections (i.e., door opening requirements variations between jurisdictions). Would like to see a best practices guide included in the information repository recommendation.
- Dwight Wilkes (AAMA): education is the key to developing consistent knowledge and enforcement of the Code. 14 hours every two years is not enough education for licensure requirements. In regards to product approval (ISO inspections), there is consistency in the product approval system or the NOA system, but not in the implementation (enforcement) of those systems. Again we need to increase the number of education hours to correct problems with consistent implementation.
- Larry Schneider (AIA FL): the challenge is working toward professionalism on all sides of the building construction industry (e.g., BOs, designers, inspectors, contractors, subcontractor, etc.). The fear of retribution from BOs is a concern for design professionals and contractors, and until we eliminate this concern it will be difficult to challenge bad decisions and work toward uniformity.

Additional Workgroup Members' Comments:

- Browdy: all of the ideas we heard here today are important comments and staff will work to develop a list of prioritized issues and related recommendations for enhancing the uniform application of the FBC. The Florida Building Code is a minimum Code, and it should be determined and clarified on what basis BOs are allowed to require and enforce requirements beyond the baseline requirements. There should be a clear rationale for requirements beyond the Code.
- Allen: the minimum code is the baseline, and there is the local technical amendment process for jurisdictions that decide to require something beyond this. All code requirements should be properly adopted and available for review in writing. If a BO wants to alter the minimums, the proper procedures should be followed, and approved local technical amendments should be submitted to the Commission's website (BCIS) as required. Another issue is that some contractors do not want to meet even the minimum requirements of the Code.
- Zehnal: sometimes it is not the BO's decision regarding additional requirements beyond the Code, and the BO takes responsibility for those requirements while it's actually a local amendment that he is required to enforce. An example is Coral Gables not allowing shingle roofs, and requiring additional submittal materials for approval.
- Schock: agrees with Zehnal that the enforcement of some requirements is not always the BO's fault.
- Zehnal: when members call with a Code questions he asks if they have a current Code book. Often the contractor does not have a current edition of the Code or has an old one. In addition, the Building Department may have only one set of codes to share among inspectors, plans examiners and the BO. This is a problem regarding understanding the requirements of the Code.

Another issue is the lack of weekend enforcement. Unlicensed activity often occurs on the weekend, and even licensed contractor's can conduct work without inspections on weekends.

- Schock: agrees with the suggestion that it's easier to pay a \$250 fine than to pull a permit on 8-9 individual jobs.
- Browdy: requested that participants make an effort to notify stakeholders that these meetings are taking place (Building Code System Uniform Interpretation Enforcement). Interested stakeholders can attend the meetings or provide their input through their stakeholder member representative.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Commissioners and members of the public in attendance were provided an opportunity to respond to the same threshold question posed to Workgroup members, and their comments are included in the "Identification of Key Issues" section of this Report.

SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES

Following is a summary of key issues suggested as priority issues for *Workgroup* evaluation based on a synthesis of meeting participants' comments:

Consistency in Submittal Requirements, Fees and Timeframes:

- Consistency in the baseline requirements for building permit application submittals, including the related forms and checklists used throughout the building permit application process, from submittal documents to requirements on the plans to plans review to issuance of building permits.
- Consistency in timeframes from submittal to receiving a building permit (across jurisdictions).
- Consistent fees for building permits, and requiring the use of building permit fees for building department functions and not for supporting other general revenue functions.

Consistency in Code Interpretations and Local Technical Amendments:

- Consistency in interpretation and enforcement of the Code based on the adopted Code, and not based on personal preference.
- Elimination of local technical code amendments not adopted as a local technical amendment and submitted to the Commission as required.

Central Repository for Code Requirements and Interpretations:

- Create (or enhance the existing BSCIS database) a comprehensive central repository at the Commission level for answers and input on correctly interpreting and enforcing the Florida Building Code to assist BOs in making an educated decision (e.g., binding and non-binding opinions, code interpretations, declaratory statements, code amendments, etc.).
- Development of a FAQ regarding code interpretations for inclusion on the repository (website).
- Development of Best Practices Guidelines for code requirements and interpretations to assist with consistency. Include on the central repository.

Education and Training on the Code:

- Education and training on the code, across licensure categories to ensure consistency.

NEXT STEPS

Jeff Blair, Commission Facilitator, explained that an Options Evaluation Worksheet was compiled consisting of referred options (from the Commission and from the *Building Code System Assessment Triennial Process*) as well as those suggested by members during meetings. Jeff will work with the Chair and Staff to synthesize the key issues identified by participants during the December 2012 meeting into a discrete list of prioritized issues for evaluation by the *Workgroup*, with the end game of developing recommendations for enhancing the consistent interpretation and enforcement of the Florida Building Code.

Jeff Blair explained that the strategy for the process going forward is to work with an “Options Evaluation Worksheet” in order to track issues and options identified by the Committee for evaluation regarding enhancing the uniform interpretation and administration (enforcement) of the Florida Building Code. The Worksheet is organized, by key topical issue areas {five components/foundations of the Building Code System: the “Code”, the “Commission”, “local administration” of the Code (enforcement), “strengthening compliance and enforcement” (education), and “product approval”} with relevant options for each, to address key issues regarding uniform interpretation and administration and of the Code. A preliminary list of options was drafted from those offered to date, and *Workgroup* members may add any additional project relevant options they deem appropriate. Members should request any information they feel necessary for evaluating an issue, option or range of options. Options with 75% or greater number of 4s and 3s in proportion to 2s and 1s shall be considered consensus recommendations for submittal to the Commission.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Browdy requested a motion to adjourn, and the *Workgroup* voted unanimously, 7 – 0 in favor, to adjourn at 12:40 PM.

ATTACHMENT I
MEETING EVALUATION RESULTS

October 9, 2012—Daytona Beach, Florida

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

1. Please assess the overall meeting.

- 8.3 The background information was very useful.
- 8.4 The agenda packet was very useful.
- 9.0 The objectives for the meeting were stated at the outset.
- 9.1 Overall, the objectives of the meeting were fully achieved.

2. Do you agree that each of the following meeting objectives was achieved?

- 9.1 Identification of Any Additional Options Regarding Uniform Implementation of Building Code System.
- 7.0 Discussion and Acceptability Ranking of Proposed Options.
- 8.6 Identification of Needed Next Steps.

3. Please tell us how well the Facilitator helped the participants engage in the meeting.

- 9.3 The members followed the direction of the Facilitator.
- 9.6 The Facilitator made sure the concerns of all members were heard.
- 9.0 The Facilitator helped us arrange our time well.
- 9.3 Participant input was documented accurately in Meeting Notes and Facilitator's Report.

4. Please tell us your level of satisfaction with the meeting?

- 8.6 Overall, I am very satisfied with the meeting.
- 8.9 I was very satisfied with the services provided by the Facilitator.
- 8.0 I am satisfied with the outcome of the meeting.

5. Please tell us how well the next steps were communicated?

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

6. What did you like best about the meeting?

- Scoping of Workgroup to achieve objectives.
- More engaged in information presented at last meeting.
- Time.

7. How could the meeting have been improved?

- Start after lunch.

8. Additional Comments.

- I thought we were going to deal with the issues already presented and vote on them.

**ATTACHMENT II
MEETING ATTENDANCE**

NAME	AFFILIATION
PUBLIC PARTICIPANTS	
1) Joe Belcher	JDB Code Services
2) Jim Bell	Product Manufacturer
3) Gary Brevoort	BOAF
4) Sal Delfino	PAC-CLAD
5) Joe Essre	FNGA
6) John Freeland	BOAF (Alachua County Building Department)
7) Doug Harvey	BOAF
8) Joe Hetzel	DASMA
9) Jaime Gascon	Miami-Dade County
10) Linda Patrick	BOAF (City of Gainesville)
11) Darrell Phillips	Department of Education
12) Larry Schneider	AIA-Florida
13) Dwight Wilkes	AAMA
FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSIONER PARTICIPANTS	
1) Dick Browdy (Workgroup member)	Governor's Chair
2) Kevin Flanagan	Electrical Contractors Representative
3) Ken Gregory	Swimming Pool Contractors Representative
4) Dale Greiner	Code Official Representative
5) Jon Hamrick	Public Education Representative
6) Brad Schiffer	Architects Representative
7) Jim Schock	Code Official Representative
8) Jeff Stone	Building Product Manufacturer Representative
9) Brian Swope	Roofing Sheet Metal & AC Contractors Representative

**ATTACHMENT III
MEETING AGENDA**

MEETING OBJECTIVES

- To Approve Regular Procedural Topics (Agenda and Meeting Summary Report)
- To Identify Any Additional Issues and Options Regarding Uniform Implementation of Building Code System
- To Discuss and Evaluate Acceptability of Proposed Options
- To Consider Public Comment
- To Identify Needed Next Steps: Information, Assignments, and Agenda Items for Next Meeting

MEETING AGENDA—TUESDAY, DECEMBER 4, 2012

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

11:00 AM*	A.)	Welcome and Opening	Browdy
	B.)	Agenda Review and Approval	Blair
	C.)	Review and Approval of Meeting I Summary Report (October 9)	Blair
	D.)	Identification of Additional Issues Regarding Uniform Implementation of the Florida Building Code System, If Any • Identification of Additional Issues by Workgroup members, in turn	Blair/WG
	E.)	Acceptability Ranking of Options in Turn Options Evaluation Worksheet (Starting on Page 5)	Blair/WG
	F.)	General Public Comment	Blair
	G.)	Next Steps: Agenda Items, Needed Information, Assignments, Date and Location	Blair
	H.)	<i>Adjourn</i>	

ATTACHMENT IV
OPTIONS PROPOSED FOR ACCEPTABILITY RANKING

ACCEPTABILITY RANKING EXERCISE OVERVIEW

During subsequent meeting(s) members will be asked to review existing proposed options and invited to propose any additional project relevant options for *Workgroup* evaluation. A preliminary list of options was proposed by members during Meeting I and other options were referred by the Commission from the *Florida Building Code System Triennial Assessment* process conducted in 2010-2012. 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 4s and 3s in proportion to 2s and 1s shall be considered consensus recommendations. The *Workgroup's* consensus recommendations will be submitted to the Commission for consideration.

The following scale will be utilized for the ranking exercises:

ACCEPTABILITY RANKING SCALE	4= <i>Acceptable, I agree</i>	3= <i>Acceptable, I agree with minor reservations</i>	2= <i>Not Acceptable, I don't agree unless major reservations addressed</i>	1= <i>Not Acceptable</i>
------------------------------------	-------------------------------	---	---	--------------------------

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING/RANKING PROPOSED OPTIONS		
Effective Options are SMART		
CRITERIA		EXPLANATION
S	SPECIFIC	It is detailed enough so that anyone reading the <i>Option</i> will know what is intended to be accomplished.
M	MEASURABLE	The end result can be identified in terms of quantity, quality, acceptable standards, etc. You know you have a measurable <i>Option</i> when it states in objective terms the end result or product.
A	ATTAINABLE	The <i>Option</i> is feasible. Are there resources available, or likely to become available for implementing the <i>Option</i> ?
R	RELEVANT	The <i>Option</i> is relevant to the Commission's mission, purpose and charge.
T	TIME-FRAMED	There are milestones with a specific date attached to the completion.

I. THE FLORIDA BUILDING CODE

- A.) Evaluate all exemptions/exceptions in the Florida Building Code. {BCSA}
- B.) Convene an *Interagency Coordination Workgroup* between state regulatory agencies and local jurisdictions. {BCSA}
- C.) Convene a workgroup to ensure that ISO recognizes the FBC (equal to IBC). {BCSA}
- D.) Convene a process to determine whether the Commission should participate in the I-Code development process (FBC I-Code participation evaluation). {BCSA}
(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)
- E.) Convene a Workgroup to determine whether to seek authority for non-binding opinions on the Florida Accessibility Code for Building Construction (FACBC). {BCSA}
- F.) Develop a cross-reference table (cross-walk) regarding state agency regulations. {BCSA}
- G.) Evaluate whether the International Fire Code should be adopted as the basis for The Florida Fire Prevention Code, versus NFPA 101 because it is better integrated with the International Code family. If so, then send a recommendation to the Legislature for needed statutory changes. {Workgroup}
- H.) In Lieu of adopting the IFC, develop a comprehensive comparison chart that fully outlines the conflicts/differences between the FFPC and the FBC (not just for the changes in the current code cycle). {Workgroup}
- **Note:** An option was offered as follows:
“*That all true Non-Florida specific changes to the Model codes be stricken in the next code cycle.*”
The option was not offered for ranking since Florida law {Section 553.73 (7)(c)-(g), F.S.} already addresses the issue, and specifies the allowable exceptions.

II. THE FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION

There were options evaluated related to the Florida Building Commission during the *Building Code System Assessment Triennial Process*, however none achieved a consensus level of support.

III. LOCAL ADMINISTRATION OF THE CODE (ENFORCEMENT)

- A.) Seek legislative authority for the Commission to challenge local technical amendments. {BCSA}
- B.) Require FBC approval of local technical amendments (would require Commission approval prior to implementation at the local level). {BCSA}
- C.) Recommend that the Florida Legislature enact legislation prohibiting municipalities and counties from adopting local technical amendments by ordinance. {Workgroup}
- D.) Commission should work with BOAF to ensure code interpretations are consistent. {BCSA}

- E.) Develop a uniform building permit application form for use by all jurisdictions statewide (Consider a two-part form where “Part A” is consistent statewide, and “Part B” provides for additional information required by local jurisdictions). *{Workgroup}*
- F.) Evaluate Building Inspector qualifications, and continuing education requirements. *{Workgroup}*

IV. STRENGTHENING COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT (EDUCATION)

- A.) Evaluate development of an AA program for building officials. *{BCSA}*
- B.) Evaluate development of a joint training process between building officials and construction industry licensees for licensure continuing education requirements (e.g., BOAF, AIA, FES, FHBA, ABC, FRSA, etc.). *{Workgroup}*
- C.) Evaluate the issue of FBC code books (bound volumes) not being available for use during DBPR licensure exams. {Referral from Commission on 10/9/12} *{FBC}*

V. PRODUCT EVALUATION AND APPROVAL

- A.) Develop statewide requirement for how and what product approval documentation should be submitted to building departments. *{BCSA}*