

# FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION

## FACILITATOR'S SUMMARY REPORT OF THE MARCH 21 - 22, 2006

### COMMISSION PLENARY SESSION

#### SUPPLEMENT TO THE MARCH 21 - 22, 2006 MINUTES

*TAMPA, FLORIDA*

Meeting Design & Facilitation By



Report By Jeff A. Blair  
Florida State University

[jblair@fsu.edu](mailto: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 MARCH 21 - 22, 2006 MINUTES

### OVERVIEW OF COMMISSION'S KEY DECISIONS

#### TUESDAY, MARCH 21, 2006

##### **Agenda Review and Approval**

The Commission voted unanimously, 20 - 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 the February 6 – 7, 2006 Meeting Minutes and Facilitator's Summary Report.
- To Hear a Report on 2006 Code Purchases.
- To Consider/Decide on Accessibility Waiver Applications.
- To Consider/Decide on Approval of Products and Product Approval Entities.
- To Consider/Decide on Legal Issues and Petitions for Declaratory Statements.
- To Receive General Public Comment.
- To Discuss Commissioner Issues and Identify Proposed Agenda Items.
- To Hear an Accessibility Awareness Presentation.

##### **Review and Approval of the February 6 – 7, 2006 Minutes and Facilitator's Summary Reports**

**Motion**—The Commission voted unanimously, 20 - 0 in favor to approve the February 6 – 7, 2006 Minutes and Facilitator's Summary Report as amended.

##### *Amendments to the Minutes:*

Correct spelling of Bob McCormick (page 16).

Product FL 4021 should be listed as a denial and not a deferral (page 8).

##### **Consideration of Accessibility Waiver Applications**

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

##### **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 approvals. The results of product and entity applications are found in the Product Approval POC report included as an attachment to the minutes.

## **Report on 2004 FBC Purchases from ICC Service's Mark Johnson**

At the invitation of Ila Jones, Mark Johnson from ICC Services updated the Commission regarding the distribution of the Florida Building Code (Code) and answered member's questions.

### *Summary of Report*

- The Florida Building Code was number one in Code distribution nationally for 2005, and to date for 2006.
- The Code is available to the public on the web in a read only format.
- CD's of the Code are available and may be annotated and updated.
- Commentary on the Code is available and existing Buildings and Residential will be available soon.
- A Code application guide with FAQ's is coming.
- The 2006 complete family of I-Codes is available in CD or PDF format.
- The ICC provides support for code development including providing HTML for committees to work on-line.

## **Legal Issues**

### **Petitions For Declaratory Statements**

Following are the actions taken by the Commission on petitions for declaratory statements.

### **Supplemental Hearings**

#### **DCA05-DEC-173 by Thomas J. Baird, Attorney, Okeechobee County**

**Motion**—The Commission voted 12 – 6 in favor, to amend the final order to clarify the provision is governed by 2303 FBC, and to strike the word “~~not~~” in the relevant sections of the test.

### **Second Hearings**

#### **DCA05-DEC-216 by John O'Connor, Marion County Building Official**

**Motion**—The Commission voted 20 – 0 in favor, to approve their previous action on the petition.

#### **DCA05-DEC-235 by Joseph Herrmann, Arroyo Enterprises, Inc.**

**Motion**—The Commission voted 20 – 0 in favor, to approve their previous action on the petition.

#### **DCA05-DEC-245 by Joseph Hetzel, P.E., DASMA**

**Motion**—The Commission voted 20 – 0 in favor, to approve their previous action on the petition and to replace the word “~~absurd~~” with “incorrect” throughout the document.

**DCA05-DEC-282 by Joseph Hetzel, P.E., DASMA**

**Motion**—The Commission voted 20 – 0 in favor, to approve their previous action on the petition.

**DCA05-DEC-283 by Joaquim Medeiros, P.E., Madsen, Kneppers & Associates, Inc.**

**Motion**—The Commission voted 20 – 0 in favor, to approve their previous action on the petition.

**DCA05-DEC-284 by Andrew Croft, Fastnet International**

**Motion**—The Commission voted 20 – 0 in favor, to approve their previous action on the petition.

**First Hearings**

**DCA05-DEC-219 by Dr. Humayoun Farooq, PE, Al-Farooq Corporation**

**Motion**—The Commission voted unanimously, 18 – 0 in favor, to approve the TAC/POC's recommendations on the petition as presented.

**DCA06-DEC-003 by Martha A. Heller**

**Motion**—The Commission voted unanimously, 18 – 0 in favor, that the petition could not be considered due to the pre-empting Federal requirements.

**DCA06-DEC-008 by Gary Harrison, Contractor Sales, Inc.**

**Motion**—The Commission voted unanimously, 18 – 0 in favor, to dismiss the petition.

**DCA06-DEC-014 by Kevin McGrath, P.E. for Four Seasons Solar Products, LLC**

**Motion**—The Commission voted unanimously, 18 – 0 in favor, to approve the TAC/POC's recommendations on the petition as presented.

**DCA06-DEC-067 by Joseph Hetzel, P.E., DASMA**

**Motion**—The Commission voted unanimously, 18 – 0 in favor, to approve the TAC/POC's recommendations on the petition as presented.

**DCA06-DEC-068 by Jack Glenn, CBO for Florida Home Builders Association**

**Motion**— The Commission voted unanimously, 18 – 0 in favor, to approve the TAC/POC's recommendations on the petition as presented.

**DCA06-DEC-071 by Bob Ousley for Kodi Klip Corporation**

**Motion**—The Commission voted unanimously, 18 – 0 in favor, to dismiss the petition.

**DCA06-DEC-072 by Diego Rivera for Diritec Corporation**

**Motion**— The Commission voted unanimously, 18 – 0 in favor, to approve the TAC/POC's recommendations on the petition as presented.

**Commission Member Comment/Issues**

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

Commissioner Browdy requested that the Commission/DCA notify building departments that the existing accessibility waiver requirements provide certain exceptions, allowing local jurisdictions, under certain conditions to issue building permits without the need for a petition before the Council.

**Commission Member Agenda Items**

Chairman Rodriguez invited Commission members to propose issues for the Commission's next (May 2006) meeting. No Commission members offered any agenda items.

**Accessibility Awareness Presentation**

Commissioner Norkunas led an accessibility awareness presentation highlighting disabilities besides mobility. These included demonstrations on issues faced by those with hearing and sight impairments.

**General Public Comment**

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

**Recess**

**Motion**—The Commission voted unanimously, 18 - 0 in favor, to recess the plenary session until 8:30 AM on Wednesday, March 22, 2006. The session recessed at 6:05 PM.

## **WEDNESDAY, MARCH 22, 2006**

### **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 Consider/Decide on Chair's Discussion Issues/Recommendations.
- To Review and Update the Workplan.
- To Consider/Decide on Accessibility, Electrical, Fire, and Structural TAC's Reports/Recommendations.
- To Consider/Decide on Product Approval/Prototype Buildings/Manufactured Buildings Program, and Education Program Oversight Committees (POC's) Report/Rec's.
- To Consider/Decide on Hurricane (HRAC's) Report/Recommendations.
- To Consider/Decide on the Product Approval Validation Workgroup's Report.
- To Discuss and Decide on the Commission's 2006 Code Rule Development Process.
- To Hear on Update on the 2006 Legislative Session.
- To Hear an Update on the Panhandle Windborne Debris Region Study.
- To Receive General Public Comment.
- To Review Committee Assignments and Issues for the Next Commission meeting—May 1 - 3, 2006 in Orlando.

### **CHAIR'S DISCUSSION ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **A. Termite Workgroup**

Chairman Rodriguez announced the appointment of a termite workgroup to consider proposals for enhancing the Code's termite provisions. The Workgroup will be a conducted as a facilitated stakeholder consensus-building process. The following members were appointed to serve on the Termite Workgroup:

Steve Dwinell, Jack Glenn, Roland Holt, Phil Koehler, Mike Moore, Doug Murdock, D.R. Sapp, Jim Schock, Jeff Stone, and George Wiggins. The Workgroup will meet in Tampa on May 17, 2006.

#### **B. Energy Code Transition Study Workgroup**

Chairman Rodriguez explained that as a result of discussions on amendments proposed to the Energy TAC, the TAC recommended that the proposed transition to the International Energy Conservation Code be evaluated and recommendations developed during the next code update process. In order to accomplish this, the Chair appointed an IECC Transition Study Workgroup. The Workgroup will be a conducted as a facilitated stakeholder consensus-building process. The following members were appointed to serve on the Energy Code Transition Study Workgroup:

Bob Andrews, Steve Bassett, Bob Cochell, Phillip Fairey, Jack Glenn, Gary Griffin, Jeff Householder, Patty Krause, Larry Nelson, Pete Quintella, Roger Sanders, and Ivan Zuniga. The Workgroup will meet in Tampa on May 18, 2006.

### **C. Window Labeling Workgroup**

At the February 2006 meeting the Chair appointed a Windows Workgroup to consider and develop recommendations on labeling and water intrusion issues. Based on stakeholder input the Chair announced four changes to the membership. Dick Wilhelm requested and the Chair agreed, to replace him with Steve Strawn, and Rusty Carrol, Craig Parrino, and Mark Daniels are also added as members. This Workgroup will be conducted as a facilitated stakeholder consensus-building process. The members of the Window Labeling Workgroup are as follows: Robert Amoruso, Chuck Anderson, Rusty Carrol, Mark Daniels, Jaime Gascon, Dale Griener, Jon Hill, C.W. Macomber, Dave Olmstead, Craig Parrino, Roger Sanders, Jim Schock, Steve Strawn, Sigi Valentine, and Dwight Wilkes. The Workgroup will meet in Tampa on May 31, 2006.

### **D. 2007 Edition of the Florida Building Code (Code)—Code Update Schedule**

Chairman Rodriguez noted that Section 553.73 (6)(a) of Florida Statutes states:

The commission, by rule adopted pursuant to ss. 120.536(1) and 120.54, shall update the Florida Building Code every 3 years. When updating the Florida Building Code, the commission shall select the most current version of the International Building Code, the International Fuel Gas Code, the International Mechanical Code, the International Plumbing Code, and the International Residential Code, all of which are adopted by the International Code Council, and the National Electrical Code, which is adopted by the National Fire Protection Association, to form the foundation codes of the updated Florida Building Code, if the version has been adopted by the International Code Council and made available to the public at least 6 months prior to its selection by the commission.

The Chair noted that the International Code Council (ICC) has completed their adoption of the 2006 Edition of the I-Codes with the adoption of the International Residential Code (IRC) on March 1 2006. The Chair explained that the six month clock started on March 1, 2006, and the Commission may select 2006 Edition of the I-Codes on September 1, 2006 and begin the update process for the 2007 Edition of the Florida Building Code.

### **Code Amendment Process Review Workgroup (CPR)**

The Chair indicated that at the February meeting, Jeff Blair was tasked with conducting an assessment to identify the range of issues and options identified by stakeholders regarding the Commission's annual consideration of proposed amendments to the Code and the triennial code update process. Chairman Rodriguez decided that the assessment should wait until after the 2006 session so that the Commission's recommendation for an expedited amendment process will have been decided by the Legislature. In the mean time, the Chair indicated that he is appointing a Code Amendment Process Review Workgroup tasked with a short-term (Phase I) scope and a long-term (Phase II) scope. The scope of the Workgroup in the short-term is to make a recommendation regarding the 2007 Code Update schedule. The long-term focus of the Workgroup will be to deliver recommendations to the Commission regarding proposed enhancements to the annual interim amendment and triennial code update processes.

The Chair stated that Jeff Blair's assessment and/or survey will serve as the basis for the Phase II aspects of the Workgroup process. The Workgroup will be conducted as a facilitated stakeholder consensus-building process and meet on April 19 in Tampa for Phase I. The following members were appointed to serve on the Code Amendment Process Review Workgroup:

Hamid Bahadori, Jeff Burton, Nick D'Andrea, Jack Glenn, Jim Goodloe, Dale Greiner, Gary Griffin, Jon Hamrick, Kari Hebrank, and Randy Vann.

### **E. Roofing TAC**

Based on stakeholder input, including the Florida Roofing and Sheetmetal Association (FRSA), Chairman Rodriguez has decided to form a Roofing TAC. Chris Schulte will serve as Chair, and the Chair will make the other appointments as soon as staff can consult with stakeholders on proposed TAC members.

### **Review and Update of Commission's Workplan and Meeting Schedule**

#### ***Commission Actions:***

**Motion**—The Commission voted unanimously, 20 - 0 in favor, to approve the updated workplan and meeting schedule as presented, to reflect the Commission's priorities.

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

### **May Code Hearing/Rule Development Workshop Process**

Chairman Rodriguez reminded members that at the February 2006 Commission meeting, the Commission voted unanimously to consider only amendments related to hurricane provisions, glitch, and standards updates and correlation issues, during the 2006 annual interim amendment process. Staff prepared a proposed process for how the Commission will consider the amendments. The proposal, similar to how the Commission has done this in the past, involves packaging the amendments into three consent and one discussion agenda packets.

Staff reviewed each amendment that was recommended for approval by the TAC's, as submitted and as amended. The compiled list of amendments meeting the "Glitch" criteria together with those deemed not to meet the criteria was then vetted through member's of the Commission's Correlation Committee (the Commission's building and fire official members: Nick D'Andrea reviewed Structural, Jim Goodloe reviewed Special Occupancy, Herminio Gonzalez reviewed Fire and Code Administration, Dale Griener reviewed Energy, Mechanical, and Accessibility, and George Wiggins reviewed Plumbing and Electrical) for corroboration. Members were given code subject areas to review that were not their particular TAC's subject areas, in order to preserve objectivity. The final list of "Glitch" amendments recommended for approval on the consent and discussion agenda are those amendments that the TAC's recommended approval as submitted and as amended, and the members of the Correlation Committee recommend meet the "Glitch" criteria.

The Chair indicated that there will be four agenda packets for each of the seven TAC/code subject areas. There will be a standing motion to approve all proposed amendments (550). The amendments are packaged as follows:



Consent agenda “TAC recommends approval as submitted meets glitch criteria” (~223 modifications), Discussion agenda (for individual consideration) “TAC recommends approval as amended by the TAC meets glitch criteria” (~95 modifications), Consent agenda “not recommended to approve by TAC”, Commissioner’s should vote against approval in a negative roll call (~202 modifications). Consent agenda “does not meet glitch criteria (TAC recommended approval):, Commissioner’s should vote against approval in a negative roll call (~31 modifications).

The Chair highlighted several key points:

**First**, only Commission members may pull amendments from the consent agendas for individual consideration, there will be no automatic courtesy pulls resulting from public comment.

**Second**, amendments pulled from the “no recommendation to approve” and “does not meet glitch” agendas must have discussion by the Commission on why they are a glitch modification, since the Commission voted unanimously that all amendments considered during the 2006 annual interim amendment process must meet the “glitch criteria”.

**Third**, all Commission members should be prepared to vote:

1. In favor of the consent agenda “TAC recommends approval as submitted meets glitch criteria”,
2. Against approval of the consent agenda “not recommended to approve by TAC”, (a negative roll call vote).
3. Against approval of the consent agenda “does not meet glitch criteria (TAC recommended approval)”, (a negative roll call vote).

The Chair instructed that if member’s could not vote as recommended above, each Commissioner must determine which, if any amendments to pull for individual consideration, so they are able to vote for each of the three consent agendas as approved by the Commission.

Jeff Blair then reviewed the consideration process for reviewing proposed amendments to the Florida Building Code in greater detail, including the standing motion to approve, and the amendment review and consideration moderation and public input process. Following questions from members, the Commission took the following action:

***Commission Actions:***

**Motion**—The Commission voted unanimously, 20 - 0 in favor, to adopt the code consideration process for reviewing proposed amendments to the Florida Building Code—2006 Annual Interim/Glitch Amendment process, as presented.

*(Included as Attachment 3—Commission’s Adopted Glitch Code Amendment Review Process)*

### **Update on the 2006 Legislative Session**

The Chair noted that the Commission held their first “Legislative Liaison” conference call on March 13, 2006 and the next calls are scheduled for April 3 (850.922.2903) and April 17 (850.921.6623) respectively. The calls are scheduled for 10:00 AM and are an opportunity to discuss relevant legislative issues and provide guidance to staff in representing the Commission’s interests before the Legislature. The Chair informed members that the public is welcome to call-in and listen, but discussion will be limited to Commissioners, DCA staff, the facilitator, and legislators and Commission invited guests.

Rick Dixon then updated the Commission on the status of proposed bills supporting the Commission’s recommendations to the 2006 Legislature as well as any other legislative issues of interest to the Commission, and answered member’s questions. The main issue of discussion involved pending legislation regarding temporary foundations for temporary buildings. The Commission discussed the following proposed legislation:

#### REVISION PROPOSAL STATUE 553.1 (12)

12) Modular buildings, manufactured buildings, and factory-built buildings, regardless of the occupancy type, which meet the requirements of this part and do not exceed a maximum of twenty-four (24) months occupancy from date of certificate of occupancy, shall be considered temporary. A request for extension can be applied for after said twenty-four months with a maximum of forty-eight (48) months allowed. Such temporary buildings shall use a temporary foundation design that meets or exceeds the wind load capacity of the building and the soil bearing capacity of the building location and shall be exempt from soil and foundation requirements of the Florida Building Code. If the occupancy length is greater than forty-eight (48) months, or the building is located in a flood zone area, then these buildings shall be considered permanent structures and shall comply with all requirements of the Florida Building Code, unless otherwise exempted.

#### ***Commission Actions:***

The Commission provided the following guidance to staff regarding the temporary buildings proposed legislation:

The Commission recommends that this issue be referred back to the Commission so that the Commission can consider the technical aspects of the issue with representative stakeholders. After a technical review the Commission will develop and adopt appropriate definitions in the Code by Rule.

### **Preliminary Reporting on Panhandle Wind Borne Debris Study**

Chairman Rodriguez provided the Commission with an overview of the Panhandle Windborne Debris Region project. The Chair noted that the 2005 Florida Legislature debated whether to revise the definition of the windborne debris region along the panhandle coast from Franklin County to the Alabama border and determined further study was warranted. It directed the Florida Building Commission to review the effects of Hurricane Ivan on damage caused by windborne debris and other data, and in conjunction with building officials from the impacted areas, to develop a recommendation for consideration by the 2006 Legislature.

On September 13, 2005 the Commission conducted the first workshop which was held at the Okaloosa County Airport, for the purpose of soliciting input from local building officials and other stakeholders in the Panhandle region of the State. At the conclusion of the workshop, there was consensus for the strategy of conducting a study on the treed environment effects and historical wind data effects, in order to provide additional data for consideration in developing recommendations to the Legislature.

It should be noted that although the building officials from the Florida Panhandle expressed support for the study, all but one agreed that changes were not warranted at this time to the definition of the windborne debris region of the Florida Panhandle region. The local building officials' comments ranged from most damage was related to surge and not windborne debris, to the Panhandle is a unique environment that ASCE 7 does not adequately reflect, to extra windborne debris protection should be voluntary and not mandatory, to mandatory protection will increase the cost of already unaffordable housing in the region.

Subsequent to the Panhandle workshop, at the October 2005 meeting, the Commission voted unanimously to request budgetary authority to contract with a consultant to conduct an engineering based risk assessment of hurricane windborne debris protection options for the Panhandle in order to analyze the risks, costs, and benefits of windborne debris protection for the region. The research will focus on factors unique to the Panhandle region including treed areas inland of the coast, and consider historical wind data effects. The requested funding authorization was approved, and the consultant updated the Commission at our February 2006 meeting.

At the February 2006 Commission meeting, the consultant reported that the goal of the study is to perform wind tunnel tests for houses located in treed environments characteristic of the Florida Panhandle, and to develop computer models for analysis of wind borne debris protection effects for representative Panhandle houses. The consultant has subsequently updated the windborne debris model and conducted wind tunnel tests designed to perform hurricane simulations of the representative houses located at various positions in the Panhandle, designed to evaluate building damage and loss with and without windborne debris protection. To date, wind tunnel tests have been conducted, hurricane data has been analyzed, and computer models modified.

At the conclusion of the Panhandle Study update provided at the February 2006 meeting, the Commission voted unanimously to recommend that the Legislature remove the Panhandle Windborne Debris Region definition from law, thereby authorizing the Commission to adopt a new definition within the Code by rule.

The Commission is committed to working with stakeholders to develop consensus on a new definition to be developed and adopted by rule into the Code. To this end, the Commission conducted a second Panhandle region workshop on February 16, 2006, where stakeholders were presented with an update on the research project's status and the Commission's recommendation to the Legislature. In addition, the Commission remains committed to working with stakeholders in a consensus based process once the Study is complete. The Report from the second workshop is linked to this agenda item.

It should be noted that the Commission's decision to proceed with this regional strategy, is consistent with State policy of recognizing that Florida is a diverse State geographically and climatically, and risks are not uniform throughout the State. On this basis, the Florida Building Code and National Engineering Standards consider requirements specific to different regions of the State, when and where appropriate, such as, the High Velocity Hurricane Zone (HVHZ) provisions of the Code specific to Miami-Dade and Broward counties in Southeast Florida, and variations of design wind speeds relative to proximity to Florida's coasts. In addition, the Commission has always advised that Code should be developed by the Commission in a consensus process and not written into law.

The Chair then stated that now that the Commission had reviewed the history and status of the project, Dr. Larry Twisdale and Dr. Peter Vickery would provide the Commission with preliminary results from the Panhandle Windborne Debris Region study and answered member's questions.

Dr. Larry Twisdale and Dr. Peter Vickery provided the Commission with a PowerPoint presentation and answered member's questions.

#### *Summary of Preliminary Results:*

#### **Wind-Borne Debris Criteria for the Florida Panhandle**

The project consists of 5 tasks:

1. Wind Loads
2. Model Representative Houses
3. Update/validate Wind-Borne Debris Model
4. Simulate House Performance
5. Quantify Performance, Risks, Benefits, and Costs of Wind-Borne Debris Protection

Tasks 1 and 2 are essentially complete and Task 3 is well underway. Tasks 4 and 5 are expected to begin in early April. The main results will be available in early May and the final report in June.

The objective of the wind load task is to estimate the wind speeds and pressure coefficients on houses located in treed environments. Wind tunnel testing was performed at the University of Western Ontario in December 2005. Seven terrains were tested: open, suburban, and five tree variations. Mean velocity and turbulence intensity profiles were developed for each case. Pressure measurements were made on one and two story model houses. The results of the tests and resulting analysis can be summarized as:

1. Trees significantly reduce wind speeds on houses.
2. While the pressure coefficients are higher, due to increased turbulence intensity, the pressure loads are about 30-50% less than on houses located in suburban locations without tall trees.
3. The reductions in loads are not as great on two story houses as for one story houses.

Six new houses in the Panhandle have been selected for modeling. Each house is being built to the Florida Building Code and has been modeled with a three-dimensional computer model that captures the building geometry and location of all windows and doors. The replacement values

of the homes range from about \$118,000 to \$343,000. The costs of adding wind borne debris protection to the glazed openings of each house is being estimated for the following protection options:

1. Aluminum panel shutters
2. Accordion shutters
3. Impact resistant glass
4. Plywood/OSB wood panels

The wind-born debris model is being updated to reflect the new load information for houses located in treed environments, characteristic of the Panhandle. New validation work of the model is being done for Hurricane Andrew and Hurricane Charley to compare predicted and field estimated numbers of windows damaged in these storms. Aerial photographs of Hurricane Ivan damage have also been evaluated to characterize typical tree canopy cover and tree blowdown in the Panhandle area.

Once the validation work is complete, the Panhandle homes will be individually analyzed for damage and loss with and without windborne debris protection. Each house will be located on the 110, 120, and 130 mph ASCE- 7 wind speed contours. The damage and loss data will be compared with and without opening protection to produce the reduction in loss for opening protection. This data will be evaluated against the cost of opening protection to obtain measures of benefits and costs. Building performance reliabilities will also be estimated.

## **Committee Reports and Recommendations**

### **Accessibility TAC**

Commissioner Gross presented the Committee's report, which was accepted unanimously, 19 – 0 in favor. (*See Commission Minutes for Committee report*)

### **Commission Actions:**

**Motion**—The Commission voted unanimously, 19 – 0 in favor, for the TAC to pursue changes to require automatic waivers if 30 degree or less sight lines is demonstrated; specific modification to toilet room design for self closing doors and interior hardware; overall review of the code to assess if additional changes are required.

**Motion**—The Commission voted unanimously, 19 – 0 in favor, for the TAC to develop a system to allow public comment on TAC issues.

**Motion**—The Commission voted unanimously, 19 – 0 in favor, to request a presentation at the May TAC meeting by DOT staff regarding recent federal guidelines on detectable warnings and curb cuts.

**Motion**—The Commission voted unanimously, 19 – 0 in favor, for the TAC to develop a process for assisting hotels with making facilities more accessible and suitable for needs of specific disabilities. TAC members to submit up to date profiles of accommodation needs.

## **Education POC**

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

From the Building Code Education and Outreach Council Report:

Commissioner Browdy reported that according to Chapter 553.841, the Building Code Education and Outreach Council is now responsible for course development. The responsibilities of the Florida Building Commission Education POC is now:

- To approve/reject recommendations made by the Council regarding subjects for education and outreach concerning the Florida Building Code.
- To review and approve advanced courses, which are then submitted to the various boards for approval.
- To develop and maintain the Accreditation process.

### ***Commission Actions—Education POC:***

**Motion**—The Commission voted unanimously, 20 – 0 in favor, that providers shall have up to 60 days from the date of Code implementation to update their courses. All courses shall be labeled to specify under which version of the Code the course was developed, and the Commission may revoke approval of any course not timely updated pursuant to Chapter 120 requirements.

**Motion**—The Commission voted unanimously, 20 – 0 in favor, to approve Accreditor application: UF Rinker School of Building Construction.

**Motion**—The Commission voted unanimously, 20 – 0 in favor, to approve ATI – How Do the Code Changes Affect Me?: Aquatic Training Institute.

**Motion**—The Commission voted unanimously, 20 – 0 in favor, to approve Advanced Administration Internet: Gold Coast School of Construction.

**Motion**—The Commission voted unanimously, 20 – 0 in favor, to approve Florida Existing Building Code, Advanced Module: BRB Code Educators Inc.

**Motion**—The Commission voted unanimously, 20 – 0 in favor, to approve the consent agenda for approval of updated courses.

## **Electrical TAC**

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

### ***Commission Actions:***

Commissioner McCombs requested that the Commission convene a workgroup at the July meeting to work with BOAF, the Engineering Board, and others design professionals and stakeholders to develop recommendations on how to deal with existing permits/projects that do not comply with the Energy provision of the Electrical Code.

## **Fire TAC**

Commissioner D'Andrea 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. (*See Commission Minutes for Committee report*)

### ***Commission Actions:***

**Motion**—The Commission voted unanimously, 20 – 0 in favor, that Prototype Buildings: storage shed/kit falls within the scope of Rule 9B-74.

**Motion**—The Commission voted unanimously, 20 – 0 in favor, to approve the POC's recommendations regarding criteria for conditional approval status. The criteria are as follows:

When a product application has been voted on by the Florida Building Commission (FBC) for Conditional Approval, the Program System Administrator will send an e-mail to the manufacturer stating:

1. If the product application applicant/product manufacturer complies with making the changes voted on by the FBC prior to the next scheduled FBC Meeting, their application will be **approved**
2. If the product application applicant/product manufacturer does not comply with making the changes voted on by the FBC prior to the next scheduled FBC Meeting, their application will be **denied**.

If the product application applicant does not agree with the changes voted on by the FBC, the product manufacturer can petition the FBC to defer consideration of their application until the next POC & FBC meeting by making an e-mail request to the Program System Administrator to have their application **deferred** no later than the product validation date for the next POC & FBC meeting. Product approval shall be taken by the POC at the following meeting.

**Motion**—The Commission voted unanimously, 20 – 0 in favor, to start the proceedings to revoke FL3946 and FL3946R1.

**Motion**—The Commission voted unanimously, 20 – 0 in favor, that no changes are needed to the revocation process and Chapter 120 is sufficient.

The POC was asked to consider an accelerated revocation process and recommended no changes.

**Motion**—The Commission voted unanimously, 20 – 0 in favor, to adopt Staff's recommendations regarding affirmations of approved products being subject to the new requirements of Rule 9B-72 as implemented January 1, 2006. Amended to include:

- (1) Editorial revision and affirmation are not required to meet the new requirements of Rule 9B-72 as determined by the Program Administrator.
- (2) Technical Revision will trigger compliance with the new provisions of Rule 9B-72 as determined by the Program Administrator.

### **Hurricane Research Advisory Committee**

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

### **Product Approval Validation Workgroup**

Jeff Blair presented the Committee's report, which was accepted unanimously, 20 – 0 in favor.  
The next meeting will be on May 3 – 4, 2006 in Orlando following the Commission meeting.  
(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

#### *Summary of Public Comments:*

- Hold joint TAC meetings whenever code areas overlap, to allow both TAC's to discuss.
- The 2007 Code update should be done in legislative format so people can see changes between the base ICC codes and also for Florida specific changes.

### **Adjourn**

The Commission voted unanimously, 20 – 0 in favor, to adjourn the meeting at approximately 11:45 AM.

### **Staff Assignments**

- Accessibility Waiver Council requests more time on their agenda to hear waiver applications.
- E-mail the Glitch Code review process to Commission members.
- E-mail the Glitch Code packages to Commissioner's as soon as they are ready—send an e-mail to notify them when the amendment packages are on the webpage.
- DCA should research the feasibility of providing signing and Braille services at Commission members and report back to the FBC.
- Send Commission members the specific Code references related to the Energy Code provisions regarding the Electrical Code.
- Legal to advise TAC's on how they can add agenda items during a meeting. For example having an item "New Business" to the noticed agendas.
- Notify design professionals of Code changes such as the Energy provisions to the Electrical Code.
- Convene a workgroup at the July meeting to work with BOAF, the Engineering Board, and others design professionals and stakeholders to develop recommendations on how to deal with existing permits/projects that do not comply with the Energy provision of the Electrical Code.
- Commission/DCA should notify building departments that the existing accessibility waiver requirements provide certain exceptions, allowing local jurisdictions, under certain conditions to issue building permits without the need for a petition before the Council.



**ATTACHMENT 1**  
**MEETING EVALUATION RESULTS**

**March 21 - 22, 2006—Tampa, 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.**

- 8.7 The background information was very useful.
- 8.4 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.
- 9.2 Accessibility Waiver Applications.
- 9.4 Requests for Declaratory Statements.
- 9.6 Approval of Products and Product Approval Entities.
- 9.8 Chairs Issues and Recommendations.
- 9.4 Update of the Commission's Workplan and Meeting Schedule.
- 9.7 TAC, POC, Committee, and Workgroup Reports and Recommendations.
- 9.3 Commission's 2006 Code Rule Development Process Discussion/Decision.
- 9.1 Update on the 2006 Legislative Session.
- 8.9 Update on the Panhandle Windborne Debris Region Study.
- 9.1 Report on 2006 Code Purchases.
- 9.3 Product Approval Validation Workgroup Report.
- 9.3 Hurricane Research Advisory Committee Report.

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

- 9.7 The members followed the direction of the Facilitator.
- 9.8 The Facilitator made sure the concerns of all members were heard.
- 9.7 The Facilitator helped us arrange our time well.
- 9.7 Participant input was documented accurately.

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

- 9.5 Overall, I am very satisfied with the meeting.
- 9.8 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?**

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

## **5. Member's Written Evaluation Comments.**

- Jeff Blair makes a difference on making the meetings go well. Give him a raise.
- I would appreciate receiving the CD with all of the meeting information as in the past. I was unaware this practice has been ceased.
- This facility works well. Try to use Embassy Suites as the hotel for all FBC meetings.
- Recommend individuals with disabilities be contacted and asked for their input as to hotels they feel are accessible for their needs.
- FBC meetings need to be held throughout the entire State so the public has access and input.
- Poor allocation of meeting time on the first day session.
- Update on the Panhandle Windborne Debris Region Study was too technical, need common language.
- Audio system for TAC's and plenary session was aggravating. Many comments could not be heard by Commissioners and the general public.
- Sound system was inadequate.
- Please load the 2001 Florida Building Code onto our laptops in order to cross-reference. Also, some of our Declaratory statements still refer to the 2001 Code. Thanks.

## **6. Public's Written Evaluation Comments.**

- Poorer sound and amplification management and quality in many meeting rooms. Please note that the sound system seemed improved on the third day.

## ATTACHMENT 2

### COMMISSION'S UPDATED WORKPLAN AND MEETING SCHEDULE

(Adopted Unanimously March 22, 2006)

#### MEETING DATES

##### 2005

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

##### 2006

January 23, 24 & 25	TACs	Tampa	Embassy Suites
February 6 & 7	Cmsn	Orlando	Rosen Plaza
March 20,21 & 22	Cmsn	Tampa	Embassy Suites
May 1, 2 & 3	Cmsn	Orlando	Sheraton Safari
July 10, 11 &12 Casino	Cmsn	Fort Lauderdale	Seminole Hard Rock Hotel &
August 21-23	Cmsn	Miami	Don Shula
October 9, 10 & 11	Cmsn	Tampa	Embassy Suites
December 4, 5 & 6	TACs	Tampa	Embassy Suites
December 18 & 19	Cmsn	Orlando	

Note: Based on experience developing the 2004 FBC, TAC meetings are scheduled separately from the Commission meeting for January and December to review proposed Code amendments for the Glitch Cycle and 2007 FBC Update respectively. Commission meeting set for 2 weeks after those TAC meetings. Scheduling set to avoid a week long Commission meeting at those workplan task points and to avoid back to back week meetings.

##### 2007

February 5, 6 & 7	Cmsn
March 26, 27 & 28	Cmsn
May 7, 8 & 9	Cmsn
June 25,26 & 27	Cmsn
August 20, 21 & 22	Cmsn
October 8, 9 & 10	Cmsn
December 3, 4 & 5	Cmsn

# FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION 200 WORKPLAN

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

## 2005 Tasks Carried Forward:

- |  |  |            |
|--|--|------------|
| <b>A. Amend Product Approval Rule 9B-72, 2004</b>                    | Rule effective   | 1/01/06    |
|  | Updated website implementing the revised rule replaces previous site                         | 2/27/06    |
|  | Note: Applications will not be accepted between January 1 and February 13                    |            |
| <b>1. Hurricane Damage Investigations</b>                            |  |            |
|  | <b>2005 Hurricanes</b>   |            |
|  | Staff report to HRAC on damages of Hurricane Dennis  | 8/22/05    |
|  | Reports to HRAC by Miami-Dade, Broward and Palm Beach Counties on damages of Hurricane Wilma | 12/7/05    |
|  | Identification of research needs   | 3/21/06    |
| <b>3. Recommendations for Report to 2006 Legislature</b>             |  |            |
|  | Consider preliminary recommendations to Legislature  | 10/12/05   |
|  | Approve recommendations to Legislature   | 12/07/05   |
|  | Report transmitted to Legislature  | 2/08/06    |
| <b>6. 2004 FBC Glitch Amendments/2006 Annual Interim Amendments:</b> |  |            |
|  | Amendment submittal cutoff   | 12/1/05    |
|  | Post on website (45 days minimum)  | 12/2/05    |
|  | TAC's consider proposals to develop recommendations  | 1/23-26/06 |
|  |  | 1/30-31/06 |
|  |  | 2/1/06     |
|  | Appoint Correlation Committee to Assist Staff  | 2/07/06    |
|  | Post TAC recommendations on website (45 days min)  | 2/15/06    |
|  | Commission considers in rule development workshop  | 5/2-3/06   |
|  | Rule adoption hearing and filing with DOS authorized   | 7/11-12/06 |
|  | Rule filed   | 8/1/06     |
|  | Effective date of glitch amendments (min 3 mo after adoption)                                | 11/1/06*   |

Glitch amendments could be implemented by August 1, 2006 if Rule 9B-3.050(9) is amended to waive the 3 month delay between filing the amendments with the Secretary of State and the amendments becoming effective.

**10. Florida Building Code System Review and Triennial Report to the Legislature**

Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium On-line Survey	Aug & Sept 2005
On-line Survey due date	Sept. 9, 2005
Present preliminary survey results to Commission	October 2005
Convene Workgroup	Aug 2005
Public input hearing	Aug 2005
Workgroup meetings	10/11/05 11/16/05
Workgroup's recommendations to the Commission	12/07/05
Commission recommendations to Legislature (first triennial report)	See Task 3

**11. Revise Rule 9B-3.004 to Allow Alternates for Committee Members**

Rule development workshop	5/06
Rule adoption hearing	7/06
Rule effective	9/06

**12. 2007 Update to the Florida Building Code**

Design of Update Process	Apr-May 06
2006 International Codes published and available to the public	3/1/06
2006 International Codes with currently adopted Florida amendments available to public <b>on website</b>	7/1/06
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	9/1/06
Proposed amendments posted to the Web by (45 day min before TAC review)	9/15/06
Commission selects 2006 I Codes as foundation for 2007 FBC	10/11/06
45 day comment period ends	11/1/06
<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	11/12-15/06
TAC recommendations posted to web (45 day min before Commission review)	12/22/06
45 day comment period ends	2/6/06
Commission considers TAC recommendations on proposed amendments via a Rule Development Workshop	3/27&28/07
Rule Adoption Hearing	5/8&9/07
File Rule adopting the 2007 FBC	6/1/07
Printed Codes available to the public	10/1/07
Code implemented	
Option 1 (6 months from publishing to web)	1/1/08
Option 2 (6 months from printed code on street)	4/1/09

*(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.)*

**14. Panhandle Hurricane Ivan Study**

Workshop in Panhandle to review studies	9/13/05
Commission approved consensus recommendation from workshop to conduct Panhandle windborne debris study	10/12/05
Hire contractor to conduct Panhandle windborne debris study	
Phase I (study initiation data development for models)	10/05
Obtain budget amendment	11/05
Initiate Phase II (modify models and conduct simulations)	12/05
Commission receives preliminary report from researchers	2/07/06
Public hearing and decide recommendation to Legislature at Commission meeting	2/07/06
Meeting with Panhandle Building Officials	2/16/06
Recommendation to the Legislature (In Annual Report)	2/24/06
Contractor preliminary report presentation on study at Commission meeting	3/22/06
Contractor final report presentation on study at Commission meeting	5/3/06
Contractor final written report due at end of FY	6/31/06
Initiate amendment of Code as directed by 2006 Legislature	

**15. Exposure Category C Study**

Assign to Hurricane Research Advisory Committee	8/24/05
Committee considers at meeting	12/07/05
Recommendations to Commission	12/07/05
Commission decides to have Structural TAC review	12/07/06
Structural TAC reports to Commission	2/07/06
Public hearing and Commission decides on recommendation to Legislature	2/07/06
Recommendation to the Legislature (Addenda to Annual Report)	2/24/06
Initiate amendment of Code as directed by 2006 Legislature	

**19. Standards for Hospice Facilities**

Standards development by ACHA	Jul-Nov 2005
Proposed Code Amendments considered in glitch amendment process	(See Task 6)

## NEW 2006 TASKS:

<b>1.</b>	<b>Establish Legislative Liaison Process</b>	
	Chairman establishes process for 2006 Legislative session	2/07/06
	Telephone calls throughout session	3/13/06
		4/03/06
		4/17/06
<b>2.</b>	<b>Develop and Implement an Accelerated Revocation Process for Noncompliant Product and Entity Approvals</b>	
	POC take public comment and begin discussion	3/06
	Recommendation to Commission	7/06
<b>3.</b>	<b>Review and Address Code Administration Needs of Local Governments and Measures to Improve Uniform and Effective Enforcement of the Code</b>	
	Assessment survey	7/06
	Report to Code Administration TAC	10/06
	Code Administration TAC Review and Develop Recommendations	10/06-12/06
	Recommendations to Commission	12/06
<b>4.</b>	<b>Develop Product Validation Criteria for Methods of Demonstrating Compliance with Code</b>	
	Meeting	2/7/06
	Meeting	5/3&4/06
	Meeting	6/1/06
	Meeting	7/10/06
	Recommendations to Commission	7/12/06
<b>5.</b>	<b>Develop Window Labeling and Default Installation Criteria</b>	
	Appoint Work Group	2/22/06
	Meeting	5/31/06
	Meeting	7/12&13/06
	Recommendation to Commission	8/23/06
<b>6.</b>	<b>Evaluate Termite Protection Requirements</b>	
	Appoint Workgroup	3/06
	Meeting	5/17/06
	Recommendations to Commission	7/12/06

**7. Evaluate Code Update, Amendment, Interpretation and Coordination with FFPC and with Model Base Codes Editions**

Appoint Workgroup	3/22/06
Meeting on 2007 FBC Update	4/19/06
Recommendation to Commission	5/3/06
Annual Interim Amendment Assessment	4/06-6/06
Report to Commission (on assessment)	7/12/06
WG Meeting	8/06
WG Meeting	9/06
Recommendation to Commission	10/11/06

**8. Assess Transition to IECC as Base for Florida Energy Code**

Appoint Workgroup	2/22/06
Hire Consultant to develop code comparisons	3/06
Meeting	5/4/06
Meeting	5/18/06
Recommendation to Commission	7/12/06



## **ATTACHMENT 3**

### **COMMISSION'S ADOPTED 2006 ANNUAL INTERIM/GLITCH CODE AMENDMENT CONSIDERATION PROCESS**

#### **CONSIDERATION PROCESS FOR REVIEWING PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE FLORIDA BUILDING CODE**

**(Adopted Unanimously March 22, 2006)**

#### **REVIEW OF AMENDMENTS FOR CONFORMANCE TO GLITCH CRITERIA**

The Commission voted unanimously that only amendments related to hurricane provisions, glitch, and standards updates and correlation issues will be considered during the 2006 Annual Interim Amendment "Glitch" process.

Staff reviewed each amendment that was recommended for approval by the TAC's, as submitted and as amended. The compiled list of amendments meeting the "Glitch" criteria was then vetted through Members of the Commission's Correlation Committee (the Commission's building and fire official members) for corroboration. The final list are those amendments that members of the Correlation Committee recommend meet the "Glitch" criteria.

#### **FOUR PACKAGES OF AMENDMENTS IN SEVEN CODE SUBJECT AREAS**

For each TAC (Code subject area) four packages of amendments (3 consent agendas and 1 discussion agenda) will be considered. Amendments will be considered in the following order: Code Administration, Electrical, Energy, Fire, Mechanical (including Joint Mechanical/Structural and Joint Mechanical/Fire), Plumbing/Fuel Gas, and Structural. Residential and Existing Building will be considered in each Code subject area.

#### **TAC RECOMMENDS APPROVAL AS SUBMITTED MEETS GLITCH CRITERIA— CONSENT AGENDA**

- Amendments that received at least a 75% approval vote by the TAC (and have not been amended) will be on a consent agenda.
- Commission will solicit public comment on consent agenda amendments.
- Any Commission member may pull off any amendment for separate consideration on the discussion agenda.
- Commission will move to approve the consent agenda following opportunity for Commissioner's to remove specific amendments for individual consideration.
- The standing motion to approve will be used to approve the consent agenda package, a second will be required in order to vote for the amendment.

**TAC RECOMMENDS APPROVAL AS AMENDED BY THE TAC MEETS GLITCH  
CRITERIA—DISCUSSION AGENDA**

- Each proposed amendment will be considered individually.
- Public comment will be solicited.
- Following public comment, the Commission will request a second to the standing motion to approve and will require a 75% favorable vote for approval and subsequent amendment of the Florida Building Code.
- Once a motion is made, the floor is closed to public comment, except for requests by Commissioners as allowed by the Commission Chair for purposes of clarification.
- The standing motion to approve will be in effect, a second will be required in order to vote for the amendment.

**DOES NOT MEET “GLITCH” CRITERIA (TAC RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)  
CONSENT AGENDA**

- Amendments that achieved a 75% favorable vote, and therefore were recommended for approval but are found not to meet the “Glitch” criteria requirements, will be on a consent agenda for a negative roll-call.
- Commission will solicit public comment on consent agenda amendments.
- Any Commission member may pull off any amendment for separate consideration on the discussion agenda.
- A second to the standing motion will be solicited in order for the Commission to unanimously vote in the negative on the package of proposed amendments (Negative roll-call).

**NO RECOMMENDATION TO APPROVE BY TAC—CONSENT AGENDA**

- Amendments that did not achieve a 75% favorable vote, and therefore were not recommended for approval, will be on a consent agenda for a negative roll-call.
- Commission will solicit public comment on consent agenda amendments.
- Any Commission member may pull off any amendment for separate consideration on the discussion agenda.
- A second to the standing motion will be solicited in order for the Commission to unanimously vote in the negative on the package of proposed amendments (Negative roll-call).

**Note:** Only Commission Members May Pull Amendments For Individual Consideration—No Automatic Courtesy Pulls. Items Pulled From The “No Recommendation To Approve” And “Does Not Meet Glitch” Agendas Must Have Discussion On Why They Are A Glitch Modification.

## **STANDING MOTION TO APPROVE AMENDMENTS TO THE FLORIDA BUILDING CODE**

**Move to recommend approval of the proposed amendments by the Florida Building Commission (as presented by the TAC's) based on the following findings:**

- A. The amendment has a reasonable and substantial connection to the health, safety, and welfare of the general public; and,
- B. The amendment does not degrade the effectiveness of the Code and either strengthens or improves the Code or provides for innovation or new technology by allowing equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction; and,
- C. The Amendment does not discriminate against products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities; and,
- D. The Amendment has the following fiscal impact:
  - 1. The fiscal impact of enforcement imposed upon local government is as indicated by TAC's review.
  - 2. The fiscal impact of compliance imposed upon property and building owners is as indicated by TAC's review.
  - 3. The fiscal impact of compliance imposed upon industry is as indicated by TAC's review.
- E. The Amendment's benefits noted with regard to fiscal impact and efficacy outweigh the costs imposed.
- F. The Amendment addresses a Florida-specific need.
- G. Commission Criteria: The amendment addresses hurricane response issues, corrects glitches, or updates standards.

### **FBC AMENDMENTS**

FBC amendments to proposed amendments: require additional public comment, and FBC analysis of findings, rationale, and fiscal impact.

**FBC CODE AMENDMENT REVIEW PROCESS  
MAY 2006**

**AMENDMENT REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION PROCESS**

- \* Facilitator will serve as the moderator.
- \* One person speaks at a time.
- \* Limit your comment and be concise.
- \* Do not read lengthy prepared statements; Summarize and submit complete comment text for the record.
- \* Offer new points or state agreement with previous speakers; Please do not repeat what has been stated.
- \* The FBC wants to hear all view points, but not repeats of the same views.
- \* Facilitator will assist with process and groundrules.
  
- \* Facilitator will introduce each amendment.
- \* Proponents of proposed amendment will speak first.
- \* Opponents of proposed amendment will follow proponents.
- \* Each side (proponent/opponent) will be allowed one counterpoint opportunity.
  
- \* Standing motion to approve will be in effect.
- \* FBC will vote in favor of the Standing Motion to Approve (found on the next page) prior to considering proposed amendments.
- \* Four findings: rationale, Florida specific need, and fiscal impact data reviewed; and, Commission criteria: glitch, standards, and hurricane provisions.
- \* Clarifying questions by FBC members only.
- \* Staff, proponent, or specified commenter will respond to FBC Member's questions.
- \* Once a motion (second to the standing motion) is on the floor, discussion is limited to FBC members except as allowed by the Chair.
- \* FBC amendments to proposed amendments: require additional public comment (speaking only to the amendment), and FBC analysis of findings, rationale, and fiscal impact.
  
- \* A standing motion to approve will be in effect, a second is required in order to vote for the amendment—Only motions to approve may be considered.
- \* Motions to deny are not allowed by Commission Rules.
- \* All amendments not on a consent agenda must be voted on individually.
- \* Motions require a 75% favorable vote for approval; those with less than a 75% favorable recommendation, are recommended for denial.