



FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION

"STRONGER CODES THROUGH SCIENCE AND CONSENSUS"

CODE COORDINATION & IMPLEMENTATION WORKGROUP

OPTIONS EVALUATION WORKSHEET MEETING III—JUNE 18, 2015



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

**CODE COORDINATION AND IMPLEMENTATION WORKGROUP
OPTIONS ACCEPTABILITY RANKING WORKSHEET—MEETING III**

ACCEPTABILITY RANKING EXERCISE OVERVIEW

During the meeting(s) members and stakeholders will be asked to review existing proposed options and invited to propose any additional project relevant options for *Workgroup* consideration. A preliminary list of options was proposed by stakeholders, and other options were referred by the Commission. During meetings members will be asked to rank the options for acceptability. In addition, following discussion and refinement of options, members may be asked to do additional rankings of proposed options if requested by a *Workgroup* member. Members should be prepared to offer specific refinements to address their reservations.

Once ranked, options with a 75% or greater number of 4s and 3s in proportion to 2s and 1s shall be considered consensus recommendations. The *Workgroup's* consensus recommendations will be submitted to the Commission for consideration.

The following scale will be utilized for the ranking exercises:

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

KEY TO SYMBOLS	
SYMBOL	MEANING OF SYMBOL
Ⓟ	Proposed Option
Ⓢ	Consensus Ranked Option

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

I. CODE PRINTING AND PUBLICATION

OPTIONS RANKED ACHIEVING CONSENSUS WITH A $\geq 75\%$ LEVEL OF SUPPORT

© 1.) Publish a fully integrated FBC for all code volumes (maintain the status quo). **[91% in favor]**

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3=minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1=not acceptable</i>
<i>Ranked 04/13/15</i>	10	0	1	0

OPTIONS RANKED NOT ACHIEVING $\geq 75\%$ LEVEL OF SUPPORT

Publish a fully integrated FBC using a third party publisher (not ICC). **[9% in favor]**

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3=minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1=not acceptable</i>
<i>Ranked 04/13/15</i>	1	0	5	5

Integrate Building, Residential, Existing and Energy Codes, and use supplements for Mechanical, Plumbing, Gas and Electrical Codes. **[45% in favor]**

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3=minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1=not acceptable</i>
<i>Ranked 04/13/15</i>	2	3	2	4

Consider changing the base code from the I-Codes. (ANSI consensus standards development is not required for development of I-Codes.) **[9% in favor]**

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3=minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1=not acceptable</i>
<i>Ranked 04/13/15</i>	1	0	0	10

Publish the Florida Code electronically by using the appropriate I Codes as the base and create a hyperlink or other best technique to insert the Florida modifications in each Chapter, Section or throughout the code in use (whichever works best). The hyperlink text would show the modification(s) made to the base Code. (Rationale: This provides a fully integrated code while allowing designers and other code users the ability to use the base I codes for projects outside of Florida.) **[55% in favor]**

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3=minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1=not acceptable</i>
<i>Identified and Ranked 04/13/15</i>	1	5	1	4

Publish fully featured integrated Code in electronic version free to the user. **[55% in favor]**

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Identified and Ranked 04/13/15</i>	1	5	5	0

MEMBER'S DECIDED NOT TO RANK THESE OPTIONS SINCE THE TOPICS WERE COVERED BY OTHER RANKED OPTIONS

- Publish Florida Amendments as a supplement.

- Publish Florida Amendments as a supplement with exception.*
 *Exception: Where Florida technical amendments cannot be easily inserted or understood for design and enforcement purposes, otherwise provide supplements to parts of the codes. For example certain wind provisions may require integration.
 (Intent: Publish amendments to the greatest extent possible without degrading usability of the code(s).)

II. ERRATA

OPTIONS RANKED ACHIEVING CONSENSUS WITH A $\geq 75\%$ LEVEL OF SUPPORT

OPTION MODIFIED BY WORKGROUP DURING THE 4/13/15 MEETING

© 1.) Allow the Commission to issue errata only to correct scrivener’s errors or simple typographical errors without additional rulemaking to implement the adopted errata. The proposed errata will be reviewed by the TACs prior to Commission consideration. The Commission will require a 75% or greater voting threshold for approving errata. **[100% in favor]**

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3=minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1=not acceptable</i>
<i>Ranked 04/13/15</i>	11	0	0	0

MEMBER’S DECIDED NOT TO RANK THESE OPTIONS SINCE THE TOPICS WERE COVERED BY OTHER RANKED OPTIONS

- Allow the Commission to issue errata and publication. Provide clear definition of what constitutes errata.
- Seek authority to issue errata only to clarify the intent of code amendments. Errata should include the ability to adopt the latest edition dates of adopted codes and standards into the adopted Code.

III. THE CODE AMENDMENT PROCESS: 1.) TRIENNIAL, 2.) ANNUAL, 3.) GLITCH

1.) TRIENNIAL CODE UPDATE

OPTIONS RANKED ACHIEVING CONSENSUS WITH A $\geq 75\%$ LEVEL OF SUPPORT

© 1.) Maintain the 3-year code update cycle (maintain status quo). [100% in favor]

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3=minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1=not acceptable</i>
<i>Ranked 04/13/15</i>	11	0	0	0

MEMBER'S DECIDED NOT TO RANK THESE OPTIONS SINCE THE TOPICS WERE COVERED BY OTHER RANKED OPTIONS

- Maintain one comprehensive 3-year code update cycle, with no Glitch amendment.
- Consider/Evaluate a 5-year code update cycle.
- Maintain one comprehensive 3-year code update cycle, skipping a cycle to realign. (Proposed 4/13/15)

2.) ANNUAL AMENDMENTS

OPTIONS RANKED ACHIEVING CONSENSUS WITH A $\geq 75\%$ LEVEL OF SUPPORT

© 1.) Maintain status quo for annual amendments. [100% in favor]

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3=minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1=not acceptable</i>
<i>Ranked 04/13/15</i>	10	0	0	0

MEMBER'S DECIDED NOT TO RANK THESE OPTIONS SINCE THE TOPICS WERE COVERED BY OTHER RANKED OPTIONS

- Utilize the Annual Amendment Process to update the FBC to the latest reference codes and standards adopted into the Code.
- Limit annual amendments to update standards and emergencies based on natural disasters
- Issue two annual amendment cycles after the triennial code update is completed.

3.) GLITCH AMENDMENTS

OPTIONS RANKED ACHIEVING CONSENSUS WITH A $\geq 75\%$ LEVEL OF SUPPORT

© 1.) Issue glitch amendments whenever needed (status quo) and continue to conduct a glitch cycle within (concurrent with) the code update cycle. (The two proposed options (A and B) were combined during the 4/13/15 meeting) **[100% in favor]**

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3=minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1=not acceptable</i>
<i>Ranked 04/13/15</i>	11	0	0	0

IV. FLORIDA SPECIFIC AMENDMENTS

Ⓟ A.) Maintain the current practice (status quo).

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking 06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

Ⓟ B.) Provide that all Florida Specific Amendments (FSA) are carried forward for each Code update cycle. (Eliminate the sunset provision; FSAs would have to be proactively removed).

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking 06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

Ⓟ C.) Ensure Florida Specific Amendments have Florida specific need.

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking 06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

Ⓟ D.) Provide additional scrutiny to proposed Florida Specific Amendments via the Commission adopting a “test” or “definition” as to what constitutes a Florida specific need.

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking 06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

Ⓢ E.) Provide additional scrutiny to proposed Florida Specific Amendments, in meeting the requirements of FS 553, by requiring a staff recommendation as to if the submitted amendment qualifies as meeting a Florida specific need.

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking 06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

Ⓢ F.) Eliminate the statutory exemption for sunseting of Florida Building Code “amendments or modifications related to state agency regulations.”

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking 06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

Ⓢ G.) Adopt statutory language that sunsets statutory technical changes to the Florida Building Code every six (or X) years.

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking 06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

V. STATUTORY TIMELINE REQUIREMENTS

CODE ADOPTION REQUIREMENTS

Ⓟ A.) Due to the extensive industry input into the Code adoption process eliminate the requirement to adopt the Code using the Chapter 120, F.S. rule process.

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

Ⓟ B.) Maintain the 6-month I-Codes publication requirement (maintain status quo). Commission shall wait six months after publication of the latest I-Code Edition before selecting the same as the foundation code for the Florida Building Code for future Code Editions.

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

Ⓟ C.) Commission Process Review Ad Hoc Committee (2009) recommended that the Commission recommend to the Florida Legislature eliminating the statutory requirement for the Commission to wait six months after publication of the latest I-Code Edition before selecting the same as the foundation code for the Florida Building Code for future Code Editions.

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

Ⓟ D.) The FBC shall take effect no sooner than 3 months after publication.
Reduce the 6-month availability requirement to 3 months (do to recent training changes).

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

ⓔ E.) The Florida Building Code shall take effect no sooner than 3 months after publication of the updated code, and 6 months after completion of on line draft code.
 (Intent: Both conditions would apply resulting giving code users the necessary 6 month lead time for training and education.)

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

ⓔ F.) Remove any time constraints on use of the I Code base document. Start the review process as soon as the base code is issued.

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

ⓔ G.) Maintain status quo for TAC and Commission review process (45 day/45 day review process).

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

ⓔ H.) Proposed amendments shall be published on BCIS for 30 days before consideration by TAC (instead of 45 days).

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

ⓔ I.) After TAC review and recommendations publish TAC comments/recommendations on BCIS for 30 days before FBC consideration (instead of 45 days).

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

ⓔ J.) Provide a minimum of 60 days for TAC review and public comment. 60day/60 day review cycle.

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

FLORIDA FIRE PREVENTION CODE

Ⓟ A.) Adopt the ICC Fire Code with the Building Code using joint TAC and Fire Advisory Council recommendations.

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

Ⓟ B.) Integrate the adoption of the Florida Fire Code with the Building Code.
Integrate the Fire Code cycle into the Building Code cycle.

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

Ⓟ C.) Work with the DSFM to sync an accelerated code adoption cycle.

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

Ⓟ D.) Closer coordination between FBC and Florida Fire Code development.

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

Ⓟ E.) Ensure the SFMO and Florida Building Commission jointly adopt and publish an agreed to schedule for the adoption process of future FBC and FFPC editions.

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

Ⓟ F.) Provide a statutory change that allows for concurrent rulemaking of the FFPC and the FBC.

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

Ⓞ G.) Ensure the Florida Fire Code Advisory Council meets jointly with the Fire TAC at least once every six months to review DEC statements issued by the other agency and potential issues of improved coordination/cooperation between the FFPC/SFMO and FBC/Commission.

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

Ⓞ H.) To assist with cooperation and coordination, have the FFPC rule adoption hearings occur at the same locations and date as the Florida Building Commission meetings.

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

Ⓞ I.) Utilize the Florida Building Commission web based system to submit, track and publish proposed/adopted amendments to the FFPC. (SFMO would still administer the FFPC, but the system would be shared.)

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

Ⓞ J.) Ensure both the SFMO FFPC and DBPR FBC web pages, that display the codes, have direct links to the partner codes, DEC statements and informal interpretations.

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

Ⓞ K.) Create a “Binding Interpretation” process for the FFPC.

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

Ⓞ L.) Ensure the SFMO FFPC informal interpretations web page has the same quality as the BOAF Informal Interpretation page with a search friendly index.

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

Ⓢ M.) Ensure both the SFMO FFPC informal interpretation web page links to the SFMO informal interpretation web page and vice versa.

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

Ⓢ N.) Eliminate the statutory provisions in Section 633.206, F.S. adopting a “Uniform Fire Safety Standards” for certain occupancies. (This Uniform rule create a significant source of conflict and source of confusion for coordination with the FBC and even the core FFPC.)

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

National Electrical Code

Ⓢ A.) Electrical Code adoption should be consistent with the Base Code document date.

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

Ⓢ B.) The current issues with the NEC could be handled by using the authority currently granted in law to update the electrical and all other nationally recognized consensus standards adopted by reference.

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

Ⓢ C.) Provide authority requiring the Commission to adopt the latest NEC edition into the FBC.

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

VI. ADOPTION OF STANDARDS AND CODES BY REFERENCE

Ⓟ A.) Utilize the Annual Amendment Process to update to the latest editions of codes and standards adopted into the Code.

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

Ⓟ B.) Utilize the Glitch process to update to the latest editions of codes and standards adopted into the Code (NEC and FFPC).

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

Ⓟ C.) Allow update of standards by errata or any of the allowed update, glitch or cycle updates.

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

Ⓟ D.) Provide authority for the adoption of the latest edition of standards that will be become available prior to the final adoption of the FBC.

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

Ⓟ E.) Adopt latest standards by reference in conjunction with the latest code update with review by technical committees.

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

Ⓢ F.) Adopt latest standards by reference without review by technical committees under limited conditions only determined by Commission exception.*

*Exception: When an updated standard is substantially changed or modified the revised standard may only be adopted thru the normal 3 year Triennial Update of the Code. Determination of “substantially changed or modified” must be conducted by a designated Commission Workgroup.

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking 06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

VII. FBC PARTICIPATION WITH THE ICC CODE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

Ⓟ A.) Maintain the status quo. ICC develops the base code, and the Commission amends as needed through development of the FBC.

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

Ⓟ B.) Revise statutory language to encourage participation in the I Code process (Florida has not been very successful at the I Code process in my opinion this needs to change before we can get to using an integrated code).

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

Ⓟ C.) Allow Commissioners to participate fully in the I-Code process (including expression opinions), and address Sunshine issues by noticing Code hearings.

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

Ⓟ D.) Participate in the ICC Code Development Process for specific Florida Modifications or changes in the ICC base codes that impact Florida.

(Intent: For the benefit of Florida and other areas of the country that may benefit from Florida modifications, advocate those changes for adoption into the ICC family of codes. This will not only ratify the important Florida modifications for Florida’s use on a long term basis, but will also highlight the need for such base code changes in the building industry far beyond our border.)

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

Ⓢ E.) Create a Florida International Code TAC to coordinate all other TAC modifications and submit and present them into the ICC process.

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):

Ⓢ F.) Each Commissioner should attend at least one session of the ICC Code Action Hearings as an observer. This should convince any and all that the system for adopting the code and changes in Florida is superior resulting in a better code by addressing the concerns affecting the citizens of Florida. (Maintain status quo).

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (6/18/15):