

# FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION



## COMMISSION EFFECTIVENESS ASSESSMENT SURVEY RESULTS 2013

PROCESS DESIGN, CONSENSUS-BUILDING AND FACILITATION BY



CONSENSUS CENTER

COMPILED BY JEFF A. BLAIR  
FCRC CONSENSUS CENTER  
FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY



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

### EFFECTIVENESS ASSESSMENT SURVEY RESULTS 2013 (APRIL 9, 2013)

**RESPONDENTS (14 OF 20):** Dick Browdy (Chair), Bob Boyer, Nan Dean, Herminio Gonzalez, Ken Gregory, Dale Greiner, Jeffery Gross, Jon Hamrick, Rafael Palacios, Brad Schiffer, James Schock, Drew Smith, Jeff Stone, and Tim Tolbert.

*Commissioners were asked to circle the number that best describes how the Commission functions on each of the following scales:      Scale Range 10 - 1 (10 highest rating to 1 lowest rating)*

| RANKING SCALE CRITERIA |              |      |            |      |         |                     |      |              |                   |
|------------------------|--------------|------|------------|------|---------|---------------------|------|--------------|-------------------|
| 10                     | 9            | 8    | 7          | 6    | 5       | 4                   | 3    | 2            | 1                 |
| Excellent<br>Superior  | Very<br>Good | Good | Acceptable | Fair | Average | Mediocre<br>Sub-Par | Poor | Very<br>Poor | Extremely<br>Poor |

#### DECISION MAKING PROCESS

Commission uses process to effectively build a broad-based consensus.

#### AVERAGE RANKING: 9.4

Commission uses process to make a majority decision without a consensus of members.

| 10 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8  | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

#### COMMENTS:

- I think the consensus of 75% is good for the Commission, but for the TACs I think 66% would be better because they are small groups.

#### PARTICIPATION AND COMMUNICATION

Communications are respectful, balanced and points are clearly understood.

#### AVERAGE RANKING: 9.6

Some members dominate. Limited listening and understanding.

| 10 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

#### COMMENTS:

- Everyone is always given the time to give their input!

**COMMISSION RELATIONSHIP TO AGENCY AVERAGE RANKING: 7.7**

Commission has developed effective working relationship and communication with Agency (DBPR).

Commission has not developed effective working relationship and communication with Agency (DBPR).

| 10 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3  | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

**COMMENTS:**

- Do not really know, appears to be good.
- I think it is a little early to tell how DBPR will assist the Commission with the relationship to the other licensing boards under DBPR. Particularly in the area of Building Department effectiveness and continuing education.
- I have no new found love for DBPR. I was opposed to the Commission being placed in the DBPR bureaucracy. For example, reimbursement request forms have neurotic requirements such as signing in blue ink. If you fail to adhere to one of those requirements, your request stops in their finance department with no notification to you or commission staff of the hold-up.
- What comes to mind is the rulemaking process for the glitch amendment that has yet to be completed by DBPR.

**COMMISSION RELATIONSHIP TO STAFF AVERAGE RANKING: 9.7**

Commission has developed effective working relationship and communication with staff.

Commission has not developed effective working relationship and communication with staff.

| 10 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**COMMENTS:**

- Staff is wonderful. All are hard working and happy to help in any way.
- Jeff Blair may or may not be considered staff but in my opinion he is invaluable and irreplaceable.
- My experience has always been positive.

**TIME FOR CONSIDERATION AVERAGE RANKING: 8.9**

Adequate time for presentation, generating options, analysis and decision making.

Snap decisions are made or decisions are deferred because of lack of time.

| 10 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4  | 7 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**COMMENTS:**

- In general I think this is very good but on occasion particularly on complex issues I could use a little more time to contemplate unintended consequences.
- Sometimes, the time constraints of the meeting schedule impairs discussion, analysis and decision-making. For example, floor debate of code change proposals.

**INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS****AVERAGE RANKING: 8.5**

Critical background and assessment of options yield politically and practically feasible decisions.

Too little or too much, or hard to use information on the situation, options & impacts yield hard to implement decisions.

| 10 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4  | 2 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**COMMENTS:**

- Political and practical are mutually exclusive.
- Again, in general I believe this is very good but occasionally political decisions by the legislature can lead to bad public policy.

**PROCESS/MEETING FACILITATION****AVERAGE RANKING: 9.7**

Facilitation provides a positive impact on meeting efficiency, and consensus-building for the Commission and its committees.

Facilitation obstructs the efficiency of the meeting process, and negatively impacts consensus-building for the Commission and its committees.

| 10 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**COMMENTS:**

- I think the facilitation process used by the Commission is excellent and keeps discussions on track and focused.
- Jeff Blair is a must at every meeting to get the job done in a professional and orderly manner.
- Jeff is invaluable to this process. As chairman of the roofing TAC it would have taken at least twice the amount of time to tackle all the code modifications for the 2013 FBC without him.
- Sometimes, the time constraints of the meeting schedule impairs facilitation.

## **KEY TASKS AND/OR UNRESOLVED SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES THAT NEED TO BE ADDRESSED BY THE COMMISSION DURING 2013**

### **Code Development and Code Provisions**

- Appropriate processing of proposed modifications.
- ADA issues as they pertain to commercial swimming pools and spas.
- Difference in Wind Load requirement between Mechanical & Structural. I understand it will disappear in the 2013 Code as the Mechanical ICC code modification was not presented.
- The path of future Florida Building Codes (ICC vs. Florida Code).
- The abolition of as many code items considered unique to Florida as possible thereby providing an avenue to adopt base code plus one supplement for all codes.
- The code update process with respect to identification of "Florida specific" conditions needs to be discussed.
- Florida specific amendments, better effort to encourage industry to submit changes to the national code level.

### **Code Enforcement/Implementation Issues**

- A report to the legislature in June that makes substantive recommendations to properly implement the Code to all jurisdictions within the State.
- The *Building Code System Uniform Interpretation Evaluation Workgroup* is an important component to uniform enforcement and interpretation.
- Provide the best possible support and database for Building Officials for unified enforcement and administration of the Florida Building Code.
- The Commission and staff are hampered with issues that could be handled at the local level.
- Building Officials these days seem to be reluctant to make a judgment call when the Florida Building Code doesn't specifically address a certain circumstance or issue. I believe it's a result of DBPR's history of heavy-handed investigation and enforcement.

### **Interagency Collaboration/Consolidation of Construction Regulations**

- Communication with other licensing boards could be better. Working with the Department of Health to get their construction regulations into the Florida Building Code.
- There should be a serious effort to place septic tank permitting under the local Building Inspection Departments. Service as a whole would be more efficient and cheaper. There has been some talk of this and plenty of opposition but I've not heard an argument from the opposition of why it's not a good idea.

### **Procedural/Logistical Issues**

- I am relatively new to the Commission and still getting my feet wet. One thing I've noticed is how important the TACs & POCs are and how great the system works when the items come before the Commission.

### **Legislative**

- There should a move to have a statute that requires indirect suction for all commercial pools and spas.

## **MEMBER'S PERSPECTIVES ON WHAT THEY WOULD LIKE THE COMMISSION TO ACCOMPLISH WITHIN THE NEXT FIVE TO TEN YEARS**

### **Code Development and Code Provisions**

- To try to get as close to the ICC process as possible and to have the 2016 code approved in 2016.
- Would like to see if the issue date of the Building Codes could be sooner.
- Have moved to the ICC as the base code with a Florida supplement for code issues truly unique to the State of Florida.
- Focus directed to making changes at the ICC level.
- The Florida Building Commission should be an active and vocal participant in the ICC code update process.
- Less modification of the International Codes.
- Minimal Florida specific code items.
- Working to get the Florida specific items submitted and approved into the base (national) code. Ending duplication.
- Change the code cycle to update every 6 years instead of every 3.
- Would like to add a method to have more Commissioners' input on wording of Florida Modifications.

### **Code Format**

- I understand that by having the Florida Code changes as a supplement instead of an integration to the ICC can lead to it being dropped by the Legislature, I believe this is how it should be handled.

### **Code Enforcement/Implementation Issues**

- Developments of processes that create uniformity of implementation of the Florida Building Code.
- I think the Code process is pretty good and the Commission focus might need to shift more to consistent enforcement and Building Department procedures.
- To have the whole construction industry aware of the Florida Building Code and to acknowledge the uniformity of the Code State wide. It would be great not to hear "this is how we do it in this County", that since we are all in the State of Florida, it would get done by the FBC.

### **Interagency Collaboration/Consolidation of Construction Regulations**

- Agency consolidation. Work on moving septic tank requirements and AHCA requirements into the FBC therefore moving enforcement of those requirements to the local building departments.
- Have removed all construction related items from other agencies and placed in Florida Building Codes.
- A Fire code that is completely integrated with the building code.

## ANNUAL EFFECTIVENESS ASSESSMENT COMPILATION RESULTS 2000-2013

| FBC EFFECTIVENESS ASSESSMENT SURVEY RESULTS<br>ANNUAL COMPILATION 2000-2013  |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Annually, Commission members are asked to pick the number that best describes how the Commission functions in key topical issue area metrics: Scale Range 10 - 1 (10 highest rating to 1 lowest rating). |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |
| KEY TOPICAL ISSUE  | 2013       | 2012       | 2011       | 2010       | 2009       | 2008       | 2007       | 2006       | 2005       | 2004       | 2001       | 2000       |
| <b>Decision Making Process</b>   | 9.4        | 9.3        | 9.6        | 9.8        | 9.7        | 9.4        | 9.2        | 9.3        | 9.3        | 8.8        | 9.1        | 8.8        |
| <b>Participation and Communication</b>   | 9.6        | 9.2        | 9.4        | 9.3        | 9.4        | 9.0        | 8.9        | 9.2        | 9.1        | 8.4        | 7.5        | 8.2        |
| <b>Commission Relationship to Agency (DBPR)</b>  | 7.7        | 7.6        | 8.9        | 8.8        | 9.0        | 8.6        | 7.9        | 8.7        | 8.7        | 7.8        | ---        | ---        |
| <b>Commission Relationship to Staff</b>  | 9.7        | 9.7        | 9.8        | 9.5        | 9.6        | 9.1        | 8.7        | 8.9        | 9.1        | 8.8        | ---        | ---        |
| <b>Time for Consideration</b>  | 8.9        | 8.8        | 8.9        | 8.6        | 8.9        | 8.0        | 7.7        | 8.2        | 7.5        | 6.5        | 7.7        | 8.3        |
| <b>Information and Analysis</b>  | 8.5        | 9.1        | 9.1        | 8.7        | 9.1        | 8.1        | 8.1        | 8.7        | 8.1        | 7.5        | 7.8        | 7.6        |
| <b>Process/Meeting Facilitation</b>  | 9.7        | 9.2        | 9.4        | 9.5        | 9.8        | 9.7        | 9.7        | 9.5        | 9.5        | ---        | ---        | ---        |
| <b>Controversy or Planning Orientation</b>   | ---        | ---        | ---        | ---        | ---        | ---        | ---        | ---        | ---        | ---        | 7.8        | 7.8        |
| <b>Overall Average</b>   | <b>9.1</b> | <b>9.0</b> | <b>9.3</b> | <b>9.2</b> | <b>9.4</b> | <b>8.8</b> | <b>8.6</b> | <b>8.9</b> | <b>8.8</b> | <b>7.8</b> | <b>7.8</b> | <b>8.1</b> |