

FLORIDA BUILDING CODE SYSTEM ASSESSMENT



**OPTIONS RANKING WORKSHEET
WORKSHOP III—AUGUST 8, 2011**

FLORIDA BUILDING CODE SYSTEM ASSESSMENT WORKSHOP III

OPTIONS EVALUATION WORKSHEET—AUGUST 8, 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 Objectives of the Assessment Process is:

To develop a comprehensive suite of recommendations to the 2012 Florida Legislature for improving the system.

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS FROM SURVEY

In reviewing the over 4,070 individual comments submitted by 324 respondents regarding the Florida Building Code System there were divergent stakeholders'/respondents' comments representing the full range of perspectives on each specific component of the Florida Building Code System ranging from complete support to indifference to neutrality to complete dissatisfaction to no knowledge of or experience with a specific component of the System. The following summary provides an overview of commonly offered stakeholder perspectives that enjoyed a high level of support.

Many respondents appreciate the consensus-building and stakeholder involvement aspects of the process, including the workgroup process for special issue topics. There is broad support for a Florida Building Code with a preference for aligning the FBC with the IBC as closely as possible, with variations for only truly needed Florida specific requirements. There is concern with the quantity and frequency of amending the Code, and a strong desire for the FBC code development cycle to more closely align with the IBC cycle. The FBC and FFPC should be coordinated and correlated as much as possible and conflicts resolved. There is a desire for readily accessible web-based codes and relevant standards and information. Many respondents expressed a desire for an enhanced BCIS/Commission website with an integrated (Florida Building Code, Product Approval, Education and all relevant Commission programs and functions) data-base that is user-friendly, fully searchable, comprehensive, and linked to relevant documents and websites. There is a strong desire for the Commission to regularly and effectively communicate to AHJs, associations and stakeholders regarding Commission policy decisions, code changes, declaratory statements, updates, and all other relevant information. There is concern for political and special interest interference with the consensus process. There is a desire to make the System as user friendly and responsive as possible, and to eliminate any duplication or effort and unnecessary requirements. There is agreement state agency regulations and enforcement should be coordinated and consistent across jurisdictions. Product Approval Program users appreciate the timely review and approval of products and the searchable on-line functionality of the Program. Many respondents' expressed that there are inadequate resources at the state and local levels to support needed training, education, enforcement and development of the Code and a dedicated, protected and adequate funding source should be secured.

OPTIONS EVALUATION WORKSHEET—ACCEPTABILITY RANKING EXERCISE

This worksheet was 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 were asked to identify a range of potential options to enhance the System (identified during Workshop II). During Workshop III participants will be asked to participate in an acceptability ranking exercise by ranking each option identified during Workshop II using a 4-Point scale as follows:

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

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. The Ad Hoc Committee will deliver recommendations to the Florida Building Commission for the Commission's consideration.

**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 SCALE USED FOR EVALUATING SYSTEM COMPONENTS AND ISSUES		
VALUE	METRIC	CRITERIA FOR RANKING
3	ACCEPTABLE AS IS	On balance, given existing 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 are 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 ACCEPTABILITY RANKING TEMPLATE

☉ Option:

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
<i>Initial Ranking</i> 08/08/11				

Options in the worksheet are preceded by the following symbol: ☉

NOTE:

This worksheet includes options offered by participants during Workshop II and from the Building Code System Assessment Survey conducted on-line between June 25, 2010 and January 28, 2011 (7 months).

Participants are encouraged to offer additional options during the Workshop.

OPTIONS ACCEPTABILITY RANKING EXERCISE

FOUNDATION I

THE CODE

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

A.) 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?

⊖ Establish a joint FBC workgroup with the Department of Emergency Management (DEM) and relevant stakeholders (e.g., BOAF) to develop SOPs and IOUs for use by local Emergency Operation Centers (EOC).

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
<i>Initial Ranking</i> 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Seek legislative authority for the Commission to establish uniform administrative procedures (e.g., uniform building permit application).

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
<i>Initial Ranking</i> 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

B.) [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?

⊖ Require local technical amendments to be approved by the Commission, and require the same justifications/ criteria for local amendments as is required for state amendments.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
<i>Initial Ranking</i> 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Develop a process for enforcing the requirement that local amendments must be submitted to the Commission at the triennial code update cycle, and to ensure local technical amendments are adopted through a building code process.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Establish an interagency coordination workgroup to ensure there is effective coordination and communication between state regulatory agencies and local jurisdictions.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Develop an effective communication vehicle/process connected with a comprehensive database that ensures local jurisdictions receive regular updates regarding the Florida Building Code System.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Require all building code related professions to have mandatory CEU requirements regarding building code related “laws and rules”.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Review the Florida Building Code and develop prescriptive requirements for all “grey areas” of the Code to ensure more uniform Code.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

C.} 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?

⊖ Conduct a comprehensive review and evaluation of all exemptions in the Code (i.e., statutory, I-Codes, etc.)

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Agricultural exemptions should be clarified (i.e., show horse arenas).

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

D.} 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?

⊖ Review and evaluate whether to continue allowing an individual to re-build a house to the code that was in effect when the house was originally constructed.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Develop insurance credits/incentives for building better/ stronger than code (for hurricane resistant provisions).

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

E.} [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?

⊖ Develop a Florida supplement to the I-Codes (integrate Florida requirements into the I-Code).

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Develop recommendations for how Florida can more effectively participate in the I-Code process and successfully get needed Florida specific requirements into the I-Codes (reducing variations between the FBC and the I-Codes).

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Have Florida hurricane resistant provisions added to the I-Codes as appendices (reducing variations between the FBC and the I-Codes).

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Develop recommendations for more stringent qualifiers/criteria for allowing Florida Specific Requirements (Statutory).

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

F.} [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?

⊖ Create a consistent numeration/categorization system for zones/regions for all aspects of the energy/building code.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

G.) [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?

⊖ Evaluate coastal high hazard zone building construction provisions.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Evaluate current requirements in coastal areas and mandate connectors that will withstand salt-air corrosion.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Evaluate current Base Flood Elevations (BFEs) for Florida coastal areas and adjust as needed.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

H.) [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?

⊖ Consider adopting the International Performance Code into the Florida Building Code.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Conduct a study regarding building official's use of alternative methods to identify trends and address issues.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

I.} 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?

⊕ *Develop a Florida Building Code Commentary and Issue Advisory Opinions.*

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

J.} 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?

⊕ *Convene the Florida Accessibility Code Workgroup, Florida Energy Code Workgroup, Flood Standards Workgroup, Code Amendment Process (and other relevant topical workgroups) prior to each triennial code update to develop recommendations to the Commission regarding their respective topical areas.*

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊕ *Develop compliance checklists for accessibility, flood, energy, etc. standards.*

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

K.) [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?

⊖ Develop a cross-reference table regarding state agency regulations into the FBC appendix.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

L.) [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?

⊖ Convene a workgroup to review which areas of the Code are not adequately addressed by either prescriptive or performance methods.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

M.) [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?

⊖ No specific options were offered.

OPTIONS COMPILED FROM THE SURVEY—THE CODE

⊖ Streamline the FBC update process to be not more than one year behind the most current editions of the International codes (eliminate statutory delays) and keep in sync. with the FFPC.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Fully correlate the FFPC with the FBC so there is a single set of fire provisions with clear interpretations and enforcement (eliminate all inconsistencies).

Note: This is a compilation of multiple comments.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Adopt the I-Codes and provide a Florida specific addendum publication.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Do not adopt (implement) codes until annotated interpreted version is available in searchable electronic format, and publish fully descriptive comparison between adopted code changes and previous code section (versions).

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Have the Florida Building Code available on-line and fully searchable. This would be a part of the updated, revised, fully searchable, user-friendly, and comprehensive BCIS.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Publish Chapter 11 (Accessibility) and Chapter 13 (Energy) as separate volumes and do not include them in the Building Code Volume.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Allow code changes only during the triennial update cycle, and do not allow any other interim code amendments/ modifications between cycles.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Change the code update cycle to every six years (instead of 3 years), and only allow Glitch amendments every three years (instead of annually). Note: there were suggestions ranging from 5 to 9 years for the update cycle.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Eliminate all sections of the Code dealing with areas/ requirements under 100 mph (charts, tables, etc.).

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Require all construction drawings (building plans) to be submitted electronically (require electronic building plans for building permit submittal, and eliminate paper building plans submittals).

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Sunset all Florida specific code amendments every three (or six years) and require re-adoption and only if there is a true Florida specific need. Do not automatically continue the current Florida specific code changes into the new code update.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ *Include the elevator code in the Building Volume (not a separate code).*

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking 08/08/11</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ *Limit the amount of time an individual can speak on a proposed code amendment (to reduce the amount of time the process requires).*

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking 08/08/11</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ *Convene a process to tighten up the gray areas of the Code that force interpretation differences by the users/enforcers of the Code.*

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking 08/08/11</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ *Convene a workgroup to conduct a comprehensive review of state agency rules and regulations to clarify roles and responsibilities, and develop clear and consistent enforcement and interpretation strategies and policies, to eliminate conflicts, discrepancies and redundancies between the various codes and rules (FBC, DSFM, DBPR, DOH, DACS, DOE, AHCA, DEM, FEMA, etc.), and to coordinate, communicate and correlate between agencies and codes.*

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking 08/08/11</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

≤ 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:

Topic	Issue to Address
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:

A.} 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?

⊖ Convened a workgroup to meet with ISO and develop recommendations.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

B.} 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?

⊖ Develop an effective reporting mechanism allowing local partners to report when local technical amendments are implemented.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Provide a link from the Florida Building Code to all relevant local technical amendments.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

C.} 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?

⊖ Provide notice to all building codes/ construction related professional associations regarding updates, issues and notifications.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

OPTIONS COMPILED FROM THE SURVEY—THE COMMISSION

⊖ Continue to use the Commission’s workgroup process to deal with special topical issues, and to eliminate conflicts between the codes (FFPC and FBC).

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Reduce the Commission to a smaller number (8) of experts with broad based expertise (demonstrated professional, technical and scientific expertise) in the Florida Building Code System.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Ensure the Commission has a dedicated, secure and adequate funding source to properly meet their mission and mandates. The dedicated funding source can only be used for Commission functions and Florida Building Code System related activities.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

≤ 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:

A.} 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?

⊖ Seek clear statutory language repealing local technical amendment not reported to the BCIS at each Code update cycle.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Include local appeals boards into the FBC Chapter 1 (Administration), so local contractors have a local point of appeal (providing the Commission with additional enforcement authority).

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

B.} 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?

⊖ Require local technical amendments to be approved by the Florida Building Commission prior to adoption.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

C.) 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?

⊖ Convene a workgroup to address uniform permit application form, uniform inspection requirements, and uniformity between municipalities hiring private providers (PPs) and owners hiring PPs.

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking 08/08/11</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

D.) 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?

⊖ Utilize local BOAF chapters to find out from clients in their region where code interpretations are uniform, and then work out consensus on interpretations.

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking 08/08/11</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

E.) 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?

⊖ Convene a group to develop Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for disaster response.

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking 08/08/11</i>				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

F.) 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?		

⊖ No specific options were offered.

G.) 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?		

⊖ Evaluate alternative intervention means for appeals and alternatives to appeals boards.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Require an appeals board in every jurisdiction, and allow agreements between different jurisdictions (allowing a jurisdiction to use another jurisdictions appeal board).

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

OPTIONS COMPILED FROM THE SURVEY—LOCAL ADMINISTRATION

⊖ Design and require a state-wide standardized building permit application process using a standardized building permit submittal form, and consistent document submittal requirements for building permits.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Require local building departments (AHJ's) to be audited under Commission oversight to ensure there is consistent interpretation and enforcement of the Code.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Implement a law mandating that the Legislature shall not make building code changes before consulting with the Florida Building Commission, after the Commission has solicited consensus recommendations from the full range of affected stakeholders (workgroup process).

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Create an office of “State Building Official” to oversee building departments and ensure there is consistent enforcement and interpretation of the Code.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Make building inspectors and plans examiners state employees to avoid local interference/ manipulation.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Create an efficient and fair appeals process (independent of the jurisdiction involved in the appeal). There should also be a joint appeal process between the Commission and State Fire Marshal (FBC and FFPC).

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

≤ 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:

A.} 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?

⊖ *No specific options were offered.*

B.} 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?

⊖ *Education system should only approve providers and not specific classes.*

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

C.} 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?

⊖ *Initiate escalating inspection fees that increase for re-inspections.*

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

D.) 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?

⊖ Use the Commission education approval process as an interface between licensing boards so approved courses are approved across the relevant professions.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Consult with various licensing boards regarding the use of the Commission’s evaluation model for course accreditation (enhance consistency and cross discipline course approvals).

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

E.) 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?

⊖ No specific options were offered.

OPTIONS COMPILED FROM THE SURVEY—COMPLIANCE & ENFORCEMENT

⊖ Create and maintain a comprehensive searchable data-base containing all Commission/ Code related items and automatically communicate/ transmit all relevant updates and changes to all jurisdictions (i.e., FBC policy decisions, statutory changes, declaratory statements, binding interpretations, product approval issues, code updates, etc.). This would be an updated, revised, fully searchable, user-friendly, linked, and comprehensive BCIS. The Florida Building Code and all relevant standards and documents should be available on the BCIS (fully searchable).

{Note: There were many suggestions regarding enhancing the BCIS/FBC website and the need to communicate more effectively and frequently with local jurisdictions, associations and stakeholders.

Reviving the e-newsletter was also suggested to enhance communication.}

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Mandate that at least half of the required hours of CEUs for license renewal be on the Code, and require that one of these hours be on the code development process.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ The Florida Building Commission and the State Fire Marshal should approve/ accredit and require joint training for fire and building officials (consistency of interpretation and enforcement of fire provisions).

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Require licensing and continuing education for construction superintendents, and change contractor licensing laws to include specific requirements/ criteria for what constitutes supervision by contractors.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Mandate a continuing education process for code officials requiring them to keep current in the codes and administrative practices. Require CEUs on the Florida Building Code. Increase the number of CEUs required for all licensees (building officials, plans examiners, inspectors, etc.).

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Create a Building Safety Academy that would serve as the foundation for creating and delivering consistent code education programs and certifications. Must be under the jurisdiction of a state agency and not a not-for-profit organization.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Have the different licensing agencies work closer together to develop core classes required by all and accept each other's approved courses. Fire Safety Inspector, BCAIB, CILB, ECILB, Architect's Board, Engineer's Board.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Increase the building permit surcharge fee to provide funding for enhanced training and education on the Florida Building Code System for all licensees.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Require that all Building Code System trainers have certain minimum qualifications, and develop criteria to ensure training materials are accurate and trainers are properly qualified.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

≤ 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:

A.} 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?

⊖ Evaluate the use of local board of appeals for appealing state product approvals.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

B.} 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?

⊖ No specific options were offered.

OPTIONS COMPILED FROM THE SURVEY—PRODUCT APPROVAL

⊖ Provide resources to use professional engineers, on staff, to review product approval applications. Provide independent, FBC approved, staff reviewers that can provide technical review of submittals.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Establish a statewide requirement for how product approval documentation should be submitted to Building Departments, with a standard form and the minimum documents required for submittal.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

⊖ Develop a faster, user-friendly, comprehensive, integrated and fully searchable product approval data-base and submittal system. The Product Approval data-base should be part of the comprehensive BCIS.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11				

Participants Comments and Reservations (08/08/11):

≤ 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