

FLORIDA BUILDING CODE SYSTEM ASSESSMENT



OPTIONS IDENTIFICATION WORKSHEET

JUNE 6, 2011

FLORIDA BUILDING CODE SYSTEM ASSESSMENT WORKSHOP II

OPTIONS IDENTIFICATION WORKSHEET—JUNE 6, 2011

FLORIDA BUILDING CODE ASSESSMENT 2011 OVERVIEW

Florida first established statewide building codes in 1974 in a law that mandated local governments adopt one of six national model codes approved by the state and enforce it as the minimum building standard within their jurisdiction. That system of state minimum building codes was determined to be inadequate for protecting the interests of the state and the safety and welfare of the public after Hurricane Andrew in 1992. A Building Code Study Commission conducted a study in 1996-97 that developed significant recommendations for modifying the state building code system the majority of which were implemented through changes to Florida law in 1998 and 2000. The Study Commission presented its findings and recommendations as a set of five foundation principles with recommendations addressing each. It has been a decade since the Florida Building Code system was implemented and the Florida Building Commission initiated this system-wide review to determine whether the goals for the system have been accomplished and where it can be improved. The Study Commission's five Foundations for a Better Built Environment provide the framework for the 2011 Florida Building Code System Assessment.

The Goals of the 2011 Florida Building Code System Assessment are to evaluate the System for its successes and deficiencies, and to identify and select options for improvement. The Foundations of the Building Code System that will be evaluated are:

Foundation I	The Code and the Code Development Process
Foundation II	The Commission
Foundation II	Local Administration of the Code (Enforcement)
Foundation IV	Strengthening Compliance and Enforcement (Education)
Foundation V	Product Approval

The Output of the Assessment will be:

Development of a comprehensive set of recommendations to the 2012 Florida Legislature for improving the system.

RANKING SCALE FOR EVALUATING SYSTEM COMPONENTS AND ISSUES		
VALUE	METRIC	CRITERIA FOR RANKING
3	Acceptable as Is	On balance, given the technical, political and economic factors, the System component is functioning as well as could be reasonably expected.
2	Should be Improved <i>{Adjustments Needed}</i>	There a specific improvements that you can identify to enhance the System aspect/component.
1	Unacceptable <i>{Major Changes Needed}</i>	The System component is not functional and requires specific major comprehensive changes.

OPTIONS IDENTIFICATION EXERCISE

This worksheet will be used to solicit specific options to enhance System aspects deemed to need improvements by a significant number* of participants (from Workshop I). For each of the key System issues evaluated as needing improvements (2: Should be Improved) or unacceptable (1: Unacceptable) participants will be asked to identify a range of potential options to enhance the System. Once a range of options are identified participants will be asked to participate in an acceptability ranking exercise by ranking each option using a 4-point scale as follows:

<i>Acceptability Ranking Scale</i>	<i>4= Acceptable, I agree</i>	<i>3= Minor Reservations, I agree with minor reservations</i>	<i>2= Major Reservations, I don't agree unless major reservations addressed</i>	<i>1= Not Acceptable</i>
---	--------------------------------------	--	--	---------------------------------

Once ranked, options achieving a 75% or greater number of 4's and 3's in proportion to 2's and 1's shall be considered consensus recommendations and will be evaluated by the Commission's Building Code System Assessment Ad Hoc Committee.

**System aspects that 25% or greater (\geq) of the participants in the initial System assessment exercise (Workshop I) ranked with a 2 (Should Be Improved) or 1 (Unacceptable)—indicating that changes to the System aspect are needed.*

RANKING TEMPLATE

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking 06/06/11</i>				
<i>Revised</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (06/06/11):

OPTIONS IDENTIFICATION TEMPLATE

SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:	
Option:	
Option:	
Option:	

OPTIONS IDENTIFICATION EXERCISE

FOUNDATION I THE CODE

≥ 25% of Participants Ranked the System Aspect/Component as Needing Changes:

Do the administrative provisions of the Code adequately emphasize streamlining and uniformity of permitting and inspection, standards for plan review and emergency procedures to effectuate coordinated response to disasters? {100%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
0	44	1

SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:

How can the administrative provisions of the Code better emphasize streamlining and uniformity of permitting and inspection, standards for plan review and emergency procedures to effectuate coordinated response to disasters?

Option:	
Option:	
Option:	

Regional/Local Concerns: Code Compliance {98%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
1	47	1

SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:

How can the Code better address regional and local variations in code compliance?

Option:	
Option:	
Option:	

Are the exemptions to the Code appropriate? Should more exemptions be added? Should some exemptions be removed? {98%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
1	47	0

SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:

What exemptions should be added and/or removed from the Code?

Option:	
Option:	
Option:	

Do homeowners get credit for Florida Building Code compliant homes? {93%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
3	38	3
SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:		
How can homeowners be better credited for Florida Building Code compliant homes?		
Option:		
Option:		
Option:		

Intended Purpose: Did it eliminate restrictive, obsolete, conflicting and unnecessary construction regulation? {85%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
6	31	2
SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:		
How can the Code be better oriented to eliminate restrictive, obsolete, conflicting and unnecessary construction regulation?		
Option:		
Option:		
Option:		

Regional/Local Concerns: Climate/Weather {82%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
7	31	0
SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:		
How can the Code better address regional and local variations in climate/weather?		
Option:		
Option:		
Option:		

Regional/Local Concerns: Coastal Risk {75%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
8	23	1
SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:		
How can the Code better address regional and local variations in coastal risk?		
Option:		
Option:		
Option:		

Intended Purpose: Does it permit and promote innovation and new technology? {57%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
20	26	0
SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:		
How can the Code be better oriented to permit and promote innovation and new technology?		
Option:		
Option:		
Option:		

Is the Code organized around a framework that clearly states the objective or intent of each requirement and does it provide both performance and prescriptive standards and paths to compliance? {54%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
16	28	2
SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:		
How can the Code's framework be improved to more clearly state the objective or intent of each requirement and ensure there are both performance and prescriptive standards and paths to compliance?		
Option:		
Option:		
Option:		

Do the Code updates ensure compliance with federal regulations including but not limited to ADA, Flood Plain Management and energy conservation standards? {45%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
22	17	1
SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:		
How can Code updates better ensure compliance with federal regulations including but not limited to ADA, Flood Plain Management and energy conservation standards?		
Option:		
Option:		
Option:		

Intended Purpose: Is it a comprehensive regulatory document? {41%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
29	20	0
SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:		
How can the Code be made a more comprehensive regulatory document?		
Option:		
Option:		
Option:		

Intended Purpose: Is it performance based supplemented by prescriptive criteria where appropriate? {41%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
27	19	0

SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:

How can the Code be more performance based and supplemented by prescriptive criteria meeting the performance standards?

Option:	
Option:	
Option:	

Regional/Local Concerns: Soil types {39%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
14	9	0

SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:

How can the Code better address regional and local variations in soil types?

Option:	
Option:	
Option:	

≤ 24% of Participants Ranked the System Aspect/Component as Needing Changes:

Intended Purpose: Does it utilize national standards where available? {22%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
36	9	1

Regional/Local Concerns: Termites {11%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
24	3	0

Is the Code based on national model codes? {10%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
45	5	0

Has the Code had the intended effect of improved building performance in hurricanes? {0%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
41	0	0

Additional “Code” issues from the Assessment Survey:

Code Growth	How to arrest the number of amendments.
Changes too often	How to reduce the frequency of amendments.
Code is out-of-sync with I Codes	Streamlining the Update and Glitch Process.
Supplement vs. Integrated	What format should be used.
Facility licensing rules	State agency coordination with Commission and Code.

FOUNDATION II THE COMMISSION

≥ 25% of Participants Ranked the System Aspect/Component as Needing Changes:

Does the Commission provide adequate technical support to local building and fire departments in order to promote maximum ISO Building Code Effectiveness Grading System scores? {100%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
0	27	3

SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:

How can the Commission better provide adequate technical support to local building and fire departments in order to promote maximum ISO Building Code Effectiveness Grading System scores?

Option:	
Option:	
Option:	

Are local technical amendments to the Code being published in a format usable and obtainable by the public from a single source? {62%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
13	20	1

SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:

How can local technical amendments to the Code be published in a better format more usable and obtainable by the public from a single source?

Option:	
Option:	
Option:	

Does the Commission adequately establish and notice the recurring 3 year Code update milestone events and other major proceedings? {31%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
27	6	6

SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:

How can the Commission better establish and notice the recurring 3 year Code update milestone events and other major proceedings?

Option:	
Option:	
Option:	

≤ 24% of Participants Ranked the System Aspect/Component as Needing Changes:

Membership. Is the current Commission format (25 member representative format) effective or would a Public Service Commission format be more effective? {24%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
31	10	0

Does the Commission keep adequate lists of interested parties, keep them updated and notify parties appropriately? {21%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
23	6	0

Has the Commission reviewed legislative provisions and provided input to the Legislature that was developed by broad participation/coordination with state agencies, local government, industry and other affected stakeholders? {16%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
26	4	1

Are the TACs appropriate to the subject matter areas of the Code? Are they effective in their role? {14%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
32	5	0

Does the consensus process provide for effective public participation? {0%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
42	0	0

Are workgroups effective forums to address special issues? {0%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
33	0	0

FOUNDATION III LOCAL ADMINISTRATION

≥ 25% of Participants Ranked the System Aspect/Component as Needing Changes:

Are local jurisdictions reporting local administrative and technical amendments for hosting on the state Building Code Information System? {100%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
0	22	12

SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:

What can be done to ensure local jurisdictions are reporting local administrative and technical amendments for hosting on the state Building Code Information System?

Option:	
Option:	
Option:	

Are local jurisdictions following the required adoption criteria for local amendments? {96%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
1	9	17

SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:

What can be done to ensure local jurisdictions are following the required adoption criteria for local amendments?

- Option:
- Option:
- Option:

How is the private provider system working? {86%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
4	20	4

SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:

What can be done to enhance the working of the private provider system?

- Option:
- Option:
- Option:

Is there more uniformity and consistency between jurisdictions? {85%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
7	40	0

SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:

How can there be more uniformity and consistency between jurisdictions?

- Option:
- Option:
- Option:

Is a disaster response “Mutual Aid” system in-place and operational? {67%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
6	12	0

SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:

What can be done to ensure the disaster response “Mutual Aid” system is in-place and operational?

- Option:
- Option:
- Option:

Are building and fire officials working together better? {66%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
13	24	1

SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:

How can building and fire officials work together better?

Option:	
Option:	
Option:	

How is the local and state appeal process working? {25%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
15	5	0

SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:

What can be done to enhance the working of the local and state appeal process?

Option:	
Option:	
Option:	

≤ 24% of Participants Ranked the System Aspect/Component as Needing Changes:

How effective is the binding interpretations system? {10%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
19	2	0

FOUNDATION IV STRENGTHENING COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT

≥ 25% of Participants Ranked the System Aspect/Component as Needing Changes:

Does the Code promote and reward designer and contractor internal quality control programs? {100%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
0	9	11

SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:

How can the Code better promote and reward designer and contractor internal quality control programs?

Option:	
Option:	
Option:	

Is an effective system for worker training in place and expanding? {100%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
0	21	6
SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:		
What can be done to ensure an effective system for worker training is in place and expanding?		
Option:		
Option:		
Option:		

Have the licensing boards established meaningful discipline for code violations? {89%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
4	31	3
SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:		
How can the licensing boards establish more meaningful discipline for code violations?		
Option:		
Option:		
Option:		

Are the course offerings effective? {41%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
19	13	0
SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:		
What can be done to enhance course offerings?		
Option:		
Option:		
Option:		

Is the Florida Building Code Training program effective? {26%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
20	7	0
SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:		
How can the efficacy of the Florida Building Code Training program be enhanced?		
Option:		
Option:		
Option:		

≤ 24% of Participants Ranked the System Aspect/Component as Needing Changes:

Do Boards require code continuing education? {15%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
28	5	0

FOUNDATION V PRODUCT APPROVAL

≥ 25% of Participants Ranked the System Aspect/Component as Needing Changes:

Are local jurisdictions accepting state approvals as intended? {59%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
14	20	0

SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:

How can local jurisdictions acceptance of state approvals be enhanced?

Option:	
Option:	
Option:	

Is there a process for local jurisdictions to appeal state approvals? {44%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
14	11	0

SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:

How can the process for local jurisdictions to appeal state approvals be enhanced?

Option:	
Option:	
Option:	

≤ 24% of Participants Ranked the System Aspect/Component as Needing Changes:

Does the system effectively cover all relevant building systems? {8%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
24	2	0

Does the state system provide adequate oversight of private sector product testing and evaluation? {7%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
26	2	0

Does the system rely on appropriate product evaluation standards? {0%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
29	0	0