

**BUILDING CODE SYSTEM ASSESSMENT**  
**REPORT TO THE FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION**



**JUNE 6, 2011—WORKSHOP II**

**GAINESVILLE, FLORIDA**

**FACILITATION, MEETING AND PROCESS DESIGN BY**



**CONSENSUS CENTER**

**REPORT BY JEFF A. BLAIR**  
**FCRC CONSENSUS CENTER**  
**FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY**



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

*This document is available in alternate formats upon request to Dept. of Community Affairs,  
Codes & Standards, 2555 Shumard Oak Blvd., Tallahassee, FL 32399, (850) 487-1824.*

**FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION**  
**FLORIDA BUILDING CODE SYSTEM JUNE 6, 2011 REPORT**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

*TABLE OF CONTENTS*..... 1  
*TABLE OF ATTACHMENTS* ..... 2

**PROJECT OVERVIEW AND SCOPE**..... 3

**WELCOME AND ATTENDANCE** ..... 4

**WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES** ..... 4

**WORKSHOP OVERVIEW AND SCOPE** ..... 5

**IDENTIFICATION OF SYSTEM ENHANCEMENTS**..... 6

**GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT** ..... 7

**NEXT WORKSHOP OVERVIEW AND ISSUES** ..... 7

<b>ATTACHMENTS .....</b>	<b>8 - 27</b>
<b>I. WORKSHOP PUBLIC ATTENDANCE .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>II. BUILDING CODE SYSTEM OVERVIEW .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>III. BUILDING CODE SYSTEM ASSESSMENT WORKPLAN .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>IV. OPTIONS IDENTIFICATION EXERCISE RESULTS .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>V. COMMENT FORM SUBMITTALS .....</b>	<b>27</b>

# FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION

## BUILDING CODE SYSTEM ASSESSMENT WORKSHOP REPORT

### OVERVIEW

**Triennial Report to the Legislature.** Chapter 553.77(1)(b), requires the Commission to make a continual study of the Florida Building Code and related laws and on a triennial basis report findings and recommendations to the Legislature for provisions of law that should be changed. The Commission conducted the first assessment in 2005 and effected changes to the System as a result of the assessment process. 2011 will mark the ten-year anniversary since the Florida Building Code became effective, and the Commission will initiate a comprehensive assessment of the Building Code System with recommendations being developed by the Commission's Building Code System Assessment Ad Hoc Committee. Public input will be a major component of the assessment process and this Survey in addition to multiple public comment opportunities will be an important part of the Commission's analysis of the Building Code System. The Commission's recommendations will be a major component of their Report to the 2012 Legislature.

Chairman Rodriguez appointed an ad hoc committee of Commission members (Building Code System Assessment Ad Hoc Committee) to review the results of the Building Code System assessment survey and comments received during a series of public workshops and to develop consensus recommendations for the Commission regarding any proposed changes to the Building Code System. The project will be a facilitated consensus-building process and will conclude with recommendations for enhancements to the System submitted to the 2012 Legislature.

### Members and Representation

Raul Rodriguez (Chair)	Architects
Dick Browdy	Home Builders
Ed Carson	Contractors, Manufactured Buildings, Product Approval
Herminio Gonzalez	Code Officials (SE Florida) and Product Evaluation Entities
Jim Goodloe	State Insurance and Fire Officials
Dale Greiner	Code Officials (Central Florida) and Local Government
Jeff Gross	Building Management Industry
Jon Hamrick	Public Education and State Agencies
Jim Schock	Code Officials (NE Florida)
Chris Schulte	Roofing/Sheet Metal and AC Contractors
Tim Tolbert	Code Officials (NW Florida)
Mark Turner	Electrical Contractors and Construction Subcontractors
Randy Vann	Plumbing Contractors and Construction Subcontractors

## REPORT OF THE JUNE 6, 2011 WORKSHOP

### WELCOME

Chairman Rodriguez opened the Workshop at 1:00 PM, and welcomed participants. The Chair noted that there were a number of Commissioners present at the Workshop. The following Commissioners participated in the Workshop:

Raul Rodriguez (Chair), Bob Boyer, Dick Browdy (vice-chair), Ed Carson, Herminio Gonzalez, Jim Goodloe, Dale Greiner, Jeff Gross, Jon Hamrick, Nicholas Nicholson, Rafael Palacios, Jim Schock, Chris Schulte, Jeffery Stone, and Tim Tolbert.

*(Attachment I—Workshop Participants)*

### DCA STAFF PRESENT

Joe Bigelow, Rick Dixon, Jim Hammers, Ila Jones, Mo Madani, Marlita Peters, Jim Richmond, and Ann Stanton.

### MEETING FACILITATION

The meeting was facilitated by Jeff Blair from the FCRC Consensus Center at Florida State University. Information at: <http://consensus.fsu.edu/>



### PROJECT WEBPAGE

Information on the project, including agenda packets, meeting reports, and related documents may be found in downloadable formats at the project webpage below:

<http://consensus.fsu.edu/FBC/bcsa.html>

### AGENDA REVIEW

Jeff Blair, Commission Facilitator, reviewed the agenda with Workshop participants including the following objectives:

- To Review Regular Procedural Topics (Agenda and Procedural Guidelines)
- To Review Building Code System Assessment Project Scope
- To Review Results of Workshop I Key Issues Ranking Exercise
- To Identify Specific System Functions to Evaluate for Possible Enhancements
- To Identify and Evaluate Possible Options to Enhance Building Code System
- To Identify Needed Next Steps

## **WORKSHOP OVERVIEW**

Chairman Rodriguez indicated that one of the Commission’s responsibilities established by law is the continual study of the Florida Building Code and other laws relating to building construction. Traditionally the Commission identifies issues of concern each year and makes recommendations to the Legislature and Governor where relevant. However, it has not conducted an in-depth comprehensive review of the Florida Building Code System since its inception. Laws creating the Commission and giving it direction to building the system were passed in 1998. The 2000 Legislature ratified the first edition of the Florida Building Code and that first code took effect in March of 2002. The Product Approval system also took effect in 2002 and both it and the Code have undergone significant changes since that time. We are now roughly ten years down the road and it is time for reflection and evaluation to determine if the state code system is achieving the intended goals and whether the system needs updating to remain responsive and relevant to these times.

The Chair explained that when the Commission was in the middle of the 2010 Code development proceedings they decided to conduct an in-depth assessment of the Building Code System beginning spring 2011 and concluding December 2011 with a status report and recommendations for the 2012 Legislature to consider. It is important that every major stakeholder group be involved in this effort as they were in the Building Code Study Commission Project in 1997 that resulted in the current system. The Commission will hold meetings over the next eight months to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the Florida Building Code System and to identify the opportunities for innovation and adaptation that will make the System better. This is a very important initiative for the Commission. The Chair explained that too often we see special interests go unilaterally to the Legislature with their ideas and initiatives. The traditions and role of the Commission is to provide the forum where all groups can come together to develop consensus on recommended changes to the Code and the System that supports it. The Chair invited all groups to participate in this Commission project and encourage all Commissioners to set aside time in the coming months to get actively involved as well.

## **BUILDING CODE SYSTEM ASSESSMENT PROJECT SCOPE OVERVIEW**

Jeff Blair, Commission Facilitator, reviewed the scope of the project and answered participant’s questions.

Florida Statute, Chapter 553.77(1)(b), requires the Commission to make a continual study of the Florida Building Code and related laws and on a triennial basis report findings and recommendations to the Legislature for provisions of law that should be changed. The Commission conducted the first assessment in 2005, and during 2010 the Commission again solicited stakeholder input in the form of an on-line survey (conducted from June 25 – August 30, 2010), and at the October 2010 meeting the Commission voted to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the Building Code System. The Commission decided to conduct an expanded survey running from June 2010 through January 2011 and to use the results as one of the inputs for developing a package of recommendations for enhancements to the key components of the Florida Building Code System as follows:

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

To coordinate the project the Chair appointed an ad hoc committee of Commission members to review the results of the Building Code System Assessment Surveys (I and II) as well as comments received during a series of workshops, and to develop recommendations for the Commission regarding any proposed changes to the Building Code System. This will be a facilitated consensus-building process and the Ad Hoc met for the first time at the October 2010 Commission meeting, and the Commission will consider the Ad Hoc’s recommendations at the December 2011 meeting for inclusion in the Report to the 2012 Legislature. The goal of the project is to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the Florida Building Code System at the ten-year anniversary of the Florida Building Code.

*(Attachment II—Building Code System Overview)*

**IDENTIFICATION OF SPECIFIC BUILDING CODE SYSTEM FUNCTIONS TO EVALUATE FOR POSSIBLE ENHANCEMENTS (BASED ON WORKSHOP I RANKINGS)**

Jeff Blair, Commission Facilitator, explained that the goal of Workshop II is to solicit options to enhance System aspects ranked by Workshop I participants as needing improvements. A worksheet was drafted 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. Following are the criteria used to rank key System components:

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 {Adjustments Needed}	There is a specific improvement that you can identify to enhance the System aspect/component.
1	Unacceptable {Major Changes Needed}	The System component is not functional and requires specific major comprehensive changes.

The Facilitator explained that once a range of options for System enhancements is 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>
------------------------------------	-------------------------------	---	---	--------------------------

The Facilitator indicated that the options ranking exercise would likely occur during Workshop III. 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 (≥) 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.*

Using the worksheet projected on the overhead screens participants were asked to offer options to address Identified concerns and/or to enhance the Florida Building Code System. Options were captured real-time and projected for participants to see. The complete results of the Options Identification Exercise are available as “Attachment “IV” of this Report.

*(Attachment IV—Options Identification Exercise Results)*

#### **GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT**

Workshop participants were encouraged to provide comments throughout the Workshop. In addition, participants were invited to provide general comments regarding the Building Code System. Following are the comments offered:

There were no additional comments offered.

#### **REVIEW OF PROJECT DELIVERY AND MEETING SCHEDULE, AND NEXT STEPS**

Jeff Blair explained that the results of the Workshop will be compiled and posted to the project webpage (<http://consensus.fsu.edu/FBC/bcsa.html>). Jeff indicated that the Workshop Summary Report and agendas for subsequent workshops will be e-mailed to all participants who signed-in and provided an e-mail address. Jeff explained that the goal is to conduct additional workshops at subsequent Commission meetings between April and October of 2011. Workshops are anticipated to be conducted concurrently with the April, June, August and October 2011 Commission meetings. The complete project “Workplan” is included as “Attachment III” of this Report. The next Workshop is scheduled for August 8, 2011 in Orlando.

*(Attachment III—Project Workplan)*

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The Workshop concluded at 3:30 PM on Tuesday, April 5, 2011.



**ATTACHMENT I**  
**WORKSHOP ATTENDANCE**

**WORKSHOP ATTENDANCE—JUNE 6, 2011—GAINESVILLE, FLORIDA**

<b>NAME</b>	<b>REPRESENTATION</b>
Raul L. Rodriguez	FBC Chair/Architects
Richard Browdy	FBC/FHBA/Builders
Jeffery Gross	FBC/BOMA/Architects
Jeffery Stone	FBC/Product Manufactures
Jim Goodloe	FBC/Fire/Insurance
James Schock	FBC/BOAF
Herminio Gonzalez	FBC/Code Enforcement
Chris Schulte	FBC/Roofing Contractors
Bob Boyer	FBC/Local Governments
Jon Hamrick	FBC/DOE/Education
Ken Gregory	FBC/Holland Pools/Pool Contractors
Ed Carson	FBC/Manufactured Buildings/Cont.
Nicholas Nicholson	FBC/Engineers
Tim Tolbert	FBC/Code Officials
Dale Greiner	FBC/Code Officials
Jaime Gascon	Miami Dade County
Ed Riley	Collier County FCO
Jeff Russell	The Quikrete Companies
Dennis Chapper	Archwindows, LLC
Chris Moody	
Michael Lafevre	Custom Window System
Michael Goolsby	Miami Dade County
Tim Richardson	Tampa Electric
Larry M. Schneider	AIAFL
Vicki Long, EVP	AIAFL
Barbara Harrison	AIAFL
Donny Pittman	City of Orlando
David Oliver	YKKAP America
Sal Delfino	MRCS
James Bell	Assa Abloy
Joe Hetzel	DASMA
Dwight Wilkes	AAMA
Doug Harvey	BOAF
Joseph K. Eysiz	FNGA
Jim Heise	PGT
Lynn Miller	PGT
Shanna Collins	AII
Bob James	UC
Frank O'Neill	Full Service Green

## ATTACHMENT II

### FLORIDA BUILDING CODE SYSTEM OVERVIEW

In 1997, the Governor's Building Codes Study Commission recommended that a single state-wide building code be developed to produce a more effective system for a better Built Environment in Florida. It was determined that in order to be effective, The Building Code System must protect the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of Florida, and in doing so:

1. Be simple to use and clearly understood;
2. Be uniform and consistent in its administration and application;
3. Be affordable; and
5. Promote innovation and new technology.

The Study Commission determined that an effective system must address five key components: the Code, the Commission, code administration, compliance and enforcement, and product evaluation and approval.

#### **THE FLORIDA BUILDING CODE SYSTEM IS COMPRISED OF FIVE ESSENTIAL COMPONENTS. A SUMMARY OF EACH FOLLOWS:**

**I. The Florida Building Code and the Code Development Process.** Historically the promulgation of codes and standards was the responsibility of local jurisdictions. It was determined that Florida's system is "a patchwork of codes and regulations developed, amended, administered and enforced differently by more than 400 local jurisdictions and state agencies with building code responsibilities". A critical component for an effective building code system was to develop and implement a single state-wide code.

The purpose of developing a single state-wide building code was to:

1. Serve as a comprehensive regulatory document to guide decisions aimed at protecting the health, safety and welfare of all of Florida's citizens.
2. Provide uniform standards and requirements through the adoption by reference of applicable national codes and providing exceptions when necessary.
3. Establish the standards and requirements through performance-based and prescriptive based criteria where applicable.
4. Permit and promote innovation and new technology.
5. Require adequate maintenance of buildings and structures, specifically related to code compliance, throughout the State.
6. Eliminate restrictive, obsolete, conflicting and unnecessary construction regulations that tend to increase construction costs unnecessarily or that restrict the use of innovation and new technology.

The new Florida Building Code is a state-wide code implemented in 2001 and updated every three years. The Florida Building Commission developed the Florida Building Code from 1999 through 2001, and is responsible for maintaining the Code through annual interim amendments and a triennial foundation code update.

**II. The Commission.** The Commission is an appointed representative stakeholder body that develops, amends and updates the Code. The Commission is comprised of members representing each of the key interests in the building code system. The Commission meets every six weeks and in addition to their code development responsibilities, regularly consider petitions for declaratory statements, accessibility waiver requests, the approval of products and entities, and the approval of education courses and course accreditors. The Commission also monitors the building code system and reports to the Legislature annually with their recommendations for changes to statute and law.

**III. Local Administration of the Code.** The Study Commission recommended, and subsequent legislation maintained, that the Code shall be administered and enforced by local government building and fire officials. The Commission has certain authorities in this respect such as the number and type of required inspections. However, the Commission's main responsibility remains amending the Code, hearing appeals of local building officials decisions, and issuing binding interpretations of any provisions of the Florida Building Code.

**IV. Strengthening Compliance and Enforcement.** Compliance and enforcement of the Code is a critical component of the system with the Commission's emphasis in this regard is on education and training. The Study Commission determined that in order to have an effective system a clear delineation of each participant's role and accountability for performance must be effected. There should be a formal process to obtain credentials for design, construction, and enforcement professionals with accountability for performance. Opportunities for education and training were seen as necessary for each participant to fulfill their role competently. Although many of the Commission's functions related to education were recently assigned to a legislatively created Education Council, education remains a cornerstone of the building code system. The Commission remains focused on the approval of course accreditors and the courses developed/recommended by approved accreditors.

**V. Product Evaluation and Approval.** In order to promote innovation and new technologies a product and evaluation system was determined to be the fifth cornerstone of an effective Building Code System. The product approval process should have specific criteria and strong steps to determine that a product or system is appropriately tested and complies with the Code. Quality control should be performed by independent agencies and testing laboratories which meet stated criteria and are periodically inspected. A quality assurance program was also deemed essential. The Commission adopted a Product Approval System by rule and currently approves products for state approval and product approval entities. Local product approval remains under the purview of the local building official as a part of the building permit approval process.

## ADDITIONAL KEY BUILDING CODE SYSTEM PROGRAMS

**A. Building Code Information System.** The Building Code Information System (BCIS) was developed in early 2000 to implement the new responsibilities, business practices, and automated systems required by the Florida Building Code. The BCIS is a multi-functional database that provides building professionals, the general public, local governments, and manufacturers with single-point access to the Florida Building Code, Manufactured Building Program, Product Approval System, Prototype Program, local code amendments, declaratory statements, nonbinding opinions, and the interested party list.

Since its initial deployment, significant new functionality has been added to the BCIS in response to new legislation and to accommodate the changing needs of the Commission and DCA. The amount of information now available via the BCIS has more than doubled in the last four years; the number and type of users has correspondingly increased as new needs are addressed. The web site has become more complex and more difficult to locate needed information. As a result, the Department is in the process of updating the BCIS to address the overall accessibility of information contained within the BCIS.

**B. Manufactured Buildings Program.** Chapter 553, Part I, FS, known as the Manufactured Buildings Act of 1979, governs the design, plans review, construction and inspection of all buildings (excluding mobile homes) manufactured in a facility to ensure compliance with the Florida Building Code. Rule Chapter 9B-1 FAC was subsequently adopted by the Commission to adequately govern the program and to ensure that manufacturers and independent Third Party Inspection Agencies maintain performance standards. Inspections agencies qualified under this program and serving as agents for the State, provide construction plan reviews and in-plant inspections. All manufacturers and Third Party Agencies are monitored at least once per year to ensure quality assurance and adequate code enforcement. Manufactured Buildings approved under this program are exempted from local code enforcement agency plan review except for provisions of the code relating to erection, assembly or construction at the site.

**C. Prototype Buildings Program.** Chapter 553.77(5) F.S., Rule 9B-74 Prototype Plan Review and Approval program. The plans review program was developed by the Florida Building Commission to address public and private entities such as buildings and structures that could be replicated throughout the state. This program is conducted by an Administrator delegated by the Commission, this Administrator has qualifications to review plan compliance with the Florida Building Code and certified per the requirements of Chapter 468, F.S. The program Administrator contracts with qualified plans examiners to review Prototype plans for Code compliance with the Florida Building Code and Florida Fire Prevention Code, these plans examiners are certified in Chapter 468 or 633 F.S., or both Chapters 468 and 633, F.S. The prototype plans are reviewed for completeness in a timely manner compliant with Chapter 120 F.S.. Each approved Prototype plan is issued an identification tracking number, this number is used to track replicated plans to local governments. The Administrator regularly attends the Florida Building Commission and reports on the progress of the Prototype Buildings Program.

**D. Alternative Plans Review and Inspections—Private Provider System for Plans Review and Inspection Functions.** §553.791, Florida Statutes, was created in 2002 to allow property owners to utilize the services of a private interest to perform plan review and/or inspection services in lieu of, but subject to review by the local permitting authority. The legislation creating the process also directed the Commission to review the system and report the results to the legislature which was accomplished in the Commission's 03-04 report. In addition, the Commission as a result of a consensus stakeholder process convened in 2004, proposed, additional refinements to the system in the Commission's 04-05 report. In 2005 the Florida Legislature adopted a package of refinement to the system which were signed into law in the summer of 2005.

**E. Interaction and Coordination Between the Florida Building Code and Other State Based Building Construction Regulations.** The Florida Building Commission is committed to coordinating with other State agencies charged with implementing and enforcing their respective State based building construction regulations. The Commission only has authority to amend the Florida Building Code and respective rules, and other state agencies have similar authority for their respective rules and regulations. The Commission has worked closely with other state agencies to ensure consistency and coordination between the various codes and rules.

**F. Enforcement of Other State Based Building Construction Regulations at the Local Level.** Enforcement of state agency regulations occurs primarily at the local level under the jurisdiction of the respective agency's local officials. Regulations should be clear and consistent across the State, and coordination is required between the Florida Building Code's and other agency's requirements.

**ATTACHMENT III**  
**BUILDING CODE SYSTEM ASSESSMENT WORKPLAN**

**BUILDING CODE SYSTEM ASSESSMENT PROJECT WORKPLAN BY TASK**

**A. COMMISSION, AD HOC COMMITTEE AND TAC TASKS**

- ◆ Committee meets at Commission meetings starting October 2010 and ending Dec. 2011.
- ◆ A large forum public workshop is held to start the project. TACs are appointed for areas corresponding to the Building Code Study Commission’s “Foundation\*” principles to review issues and develop recommendations. The Ad Hoc Committee considers TAC recommendations and develops final recommendations for the Commission to transmit to the Legislature.  
*\* The Study Commission determined that an effective system must address five key components: the Code and Code development process, the Commission, local administration of the Code, strengthening compliance and enforcement, and product evaluation and approval.*
- ◆ The Ad Hoc Committee manages the project for the Commission.
- ◆ Project Workplan is reviewed and updated at each meeting, as needed.

**B. AD HOC COMMITTEE TASKS**

	<b>START DATE</b>	<b>COMP. DATE</b>
1. Ad Hoc conducts on-line Survey Phase I.	June 2010	Aug. 2010
2. Ad Hoc Meeting I—Organizational Meeting.	Oct. 12, 2010	
3. On-Line Survey Phase II conducted.	Oct. 2010	Jan. 2011
4. Large Forum Public Workshop.	April 2011	--
5. Second Workshop	June 2011	
6. Third Workshop	Aug 2011	
7. Fourth Workshop and Ad Hoc finalizes recommendations	Oct 2011	--
8. Commission considers recommendations.	Dec. 2011	--
9. Commission transmits recommendations to 2012 Legislature	Feb. 2012	--

**C. AD HOC COMMITTEE AGREEMENTS/RECOMMENDATIONS**

	<b>START DATE</b>	<b>COMP. DATE</b>
1. Committee recommends the Commission conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the System for submittal to the 2012 Legislature.	October 12, 2010	
2. Commission adopts Ad Hoc’s recommendations.	October 13, 2010	
3. On-Line Survey Phase II will be compiled and a report issued.	Oct. 2010	Feb. 2011
4. Commission adopts final recommendations for submittal to 2012 Legislature.	--	Dec. 2011

<b>D. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT</b>		
	<b>START DATE</b>	<b>COMP. DATE</b>
1. Survey Phase I conducted on-line	June 2010	Aug. 2010
2. Survey Phase II conducted on-line.	Oct. 2010	Jan. 2011
3. Public comments solicited at Ad Hoc Committee meetings. (2010: October; 2011: April, October, and December)	Oct. 12, 2010	Dec. 2011
4. Public comments received at each Commission meeting. (2010: October; 2011: February, April, June, August, October, and December)	Oct. 2010	Dec. 2011

### **DEVELOPMENT OF THE FLORIDA BUILDING CODE OVERVIEW**

In 1997, the Governor’s Building Codes Study Commission recommended that a single state-wide building code be developed to produce a more effective system for a better Built Environment in Florida. It was determined that in order to be effective, The Building Code System must protect the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of Florida, and in doing so:

1. Be simple to use and clearly understood;
2. Be uniform and consistent in its administration and application;
3. Be affordable; and
5. Promote innovation and new technology.

The Study Commission determined that an effective system must address five key components: the Code, the Commission, code administration, compliance and enforcement, and product evaluation and approval.

The Florida Building Code is a state-wide code implemented in 2001 and updated every three years. The Florida Building Commission developed the Florida Building Code from 1999 through 2001, and is responsible for maintaining the Code through annual glitch amendments and a triennial foundation code update.

The Commission is required by Florida law to update the Florida Building Code every three years, and the 2010 Edition will represent the third update and fourth edition of the Code. The update process is based on the code development cycle of the national model building codes, which serve as the “foundation” codes for the Florida Building Code.

**Triennial Report to the Legislature.** Florida Statute, Chapter 553.77(1)(b), requires the Commission to make a continual study of the Florida Building Code and related laws and on a triennial basis report findings and recommendations to the Legislature for provisions of law that should be changed. The Commission conducted the first assessment in 2005, and during 2010 and 2011 Commission has appointed an Ad Hoc Committee to work with stakeholders to develop a package of recommendations for enhancements to the Florida Building Code System. The Commission’s recommendations will be a major component of their Report to the 2012 Legislature.

**ATTACHMENT IV**  
**OPTIONS IDENTIFICATION EXERCISE RESULTS**

**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?

<b>OPTIONS:</b>	J Schock: Establish joint workgroup with DEM to develop SOPs for use by local EOCs. FAAIA has a program and should be included. Add IOUs to workgroup. BOAF.
	Give FBC more authority to establish uniform Admin procedures. Uniform building permit application.

*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?

<b>OPTIONS:</b>	Jim Schock- require local amends to have same justification as state amends and must have Commission approval
	Nick N- increase training and communication between BOs to improve uniformity of interp
	Tim- Enforce current process for state review and inclusion of local amends. Some sort of reporting of local amends.
	Chris S- how to get at code tech amends being adopted through non- building code ordinances
	Herminio- Carry code change process to more areas throughout the state to increase visibility
	Jim G- improve coordination with other state agencies with regulatory authority. Interagency coordination group
	Mo- Develop an improved means of getting info to local government enforcement official. Improve communication. Current system relies on “self sign-up”. Improve outreach.
	Nick N- Need total database for good communication.
	Raul R- Even within local code enforcement offices there are differences in interpretation. Improved training can address this but a certain amount is going to be there anyway.



	Carson- agree with Chairman so just focus on getting info out available as possible. Greiner- ditto
	Dwight Wiles- Address through “Laws and Rules” CE requirements for professions
	Herminio- A more prescriptive code can create more uniformity. Take gray areas of the code be made more prescriptive.
	Hamrick- commentary/code handbook

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
<b>SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:</b>		
What exemptions should be added and/or removed from the Code?		
<b>OPTIONS:</b>	Jim G- clarification on Ag exemption, e.g. show horse arenas with large assembly occup numbers	
	Herminio- is duplication of statutory exemptions in the Code necessary. Something to look at.	
	Mo- I code exemptions should be reviewed for carry forward into the code	
	Jim S- need to look at owner exemptions for commercial construction	
	Dwight- reference sections of statutes that exempt buildings from the building code	

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

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
3	38	3
<b>SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:</b>		
How can homeowners be better credited for Florida Building Code compliant homes?		
<b>OPTIONS:</b>	Raul R- how to get credits for existing homes	
	Schulte- mitigation of existing homes is still a problem	
	Gross- energy also an issue	
	Jim Schock- being allowed to build back to code house was built to needs to be evaluated	
	Gross- getting some sort of recognition for building to better than code. Building rating system for hurricane performance	

*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
<b>SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:</b>		
How can the Code be better oriented to eliminate restrictive, obsolete, conflicting and unnecessary construction regulation?		
<b>OPTIONS:</b>	Nick N- training is a key. Need to get info out to everyone. Get more involvement of public and local officials.	
	Jim Schock- sunseting local amendments and state to the code addresses this in part	
	Schulte- keep Legislature out of writing code	

	More stringent qualifiers for Florida specific modifications. Process for Florida to submit Florida issues to the ICC process
	Mo- HB 849 requires resubmission of Florida mods every 3 years
	Chris- review Commission policies and how it may participate more in the ICC processes
	Boyer- not getting Florida BOs participation in ICC processes
	Doug Harvey- Florida was influential in the SBC processes but not as much in the ICC processes. The ICC is evolving and there are bylaw etc changes that improve ability of Florida BOs to participate. Bldg permit surcharge admin fee was set up to provide for ICC processes but now depts' training budgets are being moved over to the "new fee source". BOAF is trying to promote Florida officials participation and Commission could help. Letters from the Commission on participation in ICC stressing use of the funding source set up from the surcharge fee.
	Palacios- A Florida supplement to the ICC code
	Herminio- Do word search on code for words shall and may. Where the word "May" is used remove criteria from the code
	Larry Schneider- Florida specifics have taken life of their own not being eliminated as originally intended. Need to keep up with current codes. Have Florida hurricane criteria added to I codes as appendices.

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

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
7	31	0
<b>SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:</b>		
How can the Code better address regional and local variations in climate/weather?		
<b>OPTIONS:</b>	Ed C- coordination with DEP on backflow preventers in western panhandle (freezing). Locating above ground!!!	
	J Gross- E code and roofing codes use different number of climate regions. Review how the number could be set same for different parts of code.	
	Chris S- Why HVHZ	

*Regional/Local Concerns: Coastal Risk {75%}*

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
8	23	1
<b>SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:</b>		
How can the Code better address regional and local variations in coastal risk?		
<b>OPTIONS:</b>	Jim S- recent ASCE adoption will address this to some measure	
	Rick D- address Coastal High Hazard zone building construction	
	Tim T- connectors in the salty coastal environments should be investigated	
	Dwight- hesitancy to require stainless connectors due to cost	
	Tim T- look at adequacy of bfe's for coastal areas of Florida	

*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
<b>SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:</b>		
How can the Code be better oriented to permit and promote innovation and new technology?		
<b>OPTIONS:</b>	Jim S- investigate adoption of I Performance Code	
	Tim T- alternate methods authority clarification on interrelationship with product approval	
	Larry S- architects having problem. Big variation around the state. Education is one approach to address. AIA and BOAF have been working on issues and possibly this can be addressed too	
	Jeff Russel- Quicrete- allow state approved alternates. Some materials are with ICC acceptance criteria are approved statewide by other states.	
	Address the legal side of inhibiting innovation	
	Herminio- collect data on BO's use of alternate methods so trends can be verified and problems addressed	
	Dwight- new products falling outside bounds of state PA system requirements. Lot of manufacturers getting outside of ICC evaluation reports process and mfgs wanting BO to approve just based on testing reports. Requiring evaluation reports would help.	

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
<b>SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:</b>		
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?		
<b>OPTIONS:</b>	Previous discussion addressed this issue too	
	Jim Schock- commentary and advisory would help	
	Mo- Florida Code based on national foundation code. Hard to implement this within the current Florida code document	
	Herminio- external parts of the code, e.g. state employees who could be called for info	

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
<b>SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:</b>		
<b>OPTIONS:</b>	Jim Schock- reinstitute all 3 workgroups specific to each of these issues at every code update proceeding	
	Herminio- create checklists for each that can be followed	
	Larry S- harmonization with minimum Florida amendments	

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

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
29	20	0
<b>SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:</b>		
How can the Code be made a more comprehensive regulatory document?		
<b>OPTIONS:</b>	Mo- current code is very comprehensive	
	Jim Schock- put a cross reference table to other state agency regulations into appendix. Not as mandatory enforceable.	

*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
<b>SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:</b>		
How can the Code be more performance based and supplemented by prescriptive criteria meeting the performance standards?		
<b>OPTIONS:</b>	Jim Schock- Look at adopting ICC Performance Code	
	Have a workgroup look at what areas of the code are not adequately addressed by either prescript or performance methods	

*Regional/Local Concerns:* Soil types {39%}

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
14	9	0
<b>SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:</b>		
How can the Code better address regional and local variations in soil types?		
<b>OPTIONS:</b>	Mo- not an issue	
	Tim T- not much of an issue	
	Nick N- testing is already required	
	Rick- issue at the time of the Study Commission was the copper pipe pitting and failure in different areas of the state	

**≤ 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?

<b>OPTIONS:</b>	Jim Schock- 2 areas took hit, adoption of Code- not current I Code. Close time to adoption. Training hours was other issue.
	Nick- database for notifications needs to be comprehensive
	Dale- workgroup/meeting with ISO

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?

<b>OPTIONS:</b>	Jim Schock- no one knows about the system. Needs more outreach.
	Dale- some jurisdictions do not submit the info
	Doug Harvey- there is a good system with one point access
	Jeff G- put link from code to the local government amendments
	Rick- partnering with local HBAs and/or other associations to report local amendments

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

<b>SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:</b>	
How can the Commission better establish and notice the recurring 3 year Code update milestone events and other major proceedings?	
<b>OPTIONS:</b>	Jeff G- revive the newsletter
	Mo- how to reach persons who are not registered on the Commission website
	Dale- process has gotten better each code change cycle. Info was out there
	Larry S- contact relevant associations with the info to distribute through their networks
	Jim S- reiterate Larry's point

**≤ 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
<b>SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:</b>		
What can be done to ensure local jurisdictions are reporting local administrative and technical amendments for hosting on the state Building Code Information System?		
<b>OPTIONS:</b>	See comments on Foundation II also	
	Jim S- provide statutory lang that renders unreported local amends non-enforceable Having clear language in law results in less push back	
	Tim T- put local appeals boards into the code chapter 1 so local contractors have a local point of appeal. i.e. more statutory authority for Commission	

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
<b>SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:</b>		
What can be done to ensure local jurisdictions are following the required adoption criteria for local amendments?		
<b>OPTIONS:</b>	Jim S- subject local amendments to up-front approval by the Commission	
	Nick- since some locals are ignoring authority should be taken out of their hands and have state approval first	
	Chris S- example of BO trying to require something not in the code	
	Jim Goodloe- fire statute prohibits SFM from getting into local amendments. Might should do same for building code	
	Mo- some of problem with BOs is because of lack of knowing what code itself requires	

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

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
4	20	4
<b>SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:</b>		
What can be done to enhance the working of the private provider system?		
<b>OPTIONS:</b>	Nick- need more training	
	Jim Schock- something in statute to deal with PPs going out of business before project is complete	
	Doug Harvey- PP confused at times with contracted municipal service. If PPs could audit municipalities as well as munis auditing PPs it would provide balance. Uniformity of requirements for inspections would help. Workgroup to address uniform permit application form. WG would include munis and PPs and others.	



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

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
7	40	0
<b>SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:</b>		
How can there be more uniformity and consistency between jurisdictions?		
<b>OPTIONS:</b>	Jim Schock- utilize local BOAF chapter to find out from clients in their region where code interpretations are uniform then work out consensus on interpretations.	

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
<b>SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:</b>		
What can be done to ensure the disaster response “Mutual Aid” system is in-place and operational?		
<b>OPTIONS:</b>	Jim Schock- SOP should be developed	
	Doug Harvey- BOAF has memo of understanding with DEM for a mutual aid system. Local chapter directors are members of the mutual aid committee.	

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

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
13	24	1
<b>SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:</b>		
How can building and fire officials work together better?		
<b>OPTIONS:</b>	Jim Goodloe- improve communication	
	Jim Schock- allow CE training to be reciprocal would help put officials in the same room together	
	Tim T- some clients will pit one against other to try to get something the client wants	
	Nick- sits down with both officials together in construction meeting	
	Herminio- review and correlation between two codes	
	Larry S- works in most jurisdictions. A few do not. It is an issue of personalities. More interfacing at the member organizations level builds relationships.	

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

3. Acceptable as Is	2. Should be Improved	1. Unacceptable
15	5	0
<b>SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS (OPTIONS) TO ENHANCE THIS ASPECT OF THE SYSTEM:</b>		
What can be done to enhance the working of the local and state appeal process?		
<b>OPTIONS:</b>	Rick- investigate alternative intervention means for appeals	
	Tim T- establish local board in every jurisdiction	
	Ed C- time is primary issue...appeals processes can take to long	
	Herminio- how to use another local appeals board if a jurisdiction doesn't have one	
	Rick- alternatives to appeals boards such as hearing officers	



**≤ 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?

<b>OPTIONS:</b>	Jim Schock- doesn't see a good way
	Chris Schulte- must be some way such as monitoring red tags. Maybe something like expedited permitting
	Nick- don't need special reward, ease of permitting

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?

<b>OPTIONS:</b>	Jim Schock- incentive set up for building depts. To get accreditation. Method of approving training classes could be better by just approving providers instead of courses. Need to be more flexible
	Nick- no red tag and reinspection fee and time is an incentive

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?

<b>OPTIONS:</b>	Jim Schock- elevated \$ scale for re-inspections
-----------------	--

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?

OPTIONS:	
	Jim Schock's comment- improve flexibility
	Tim T- requirement that percent of training is from outside sources
	Jon Hamrick- too much time required to get approvals
	Rick- talk with boards about using evaluation models used by the Commission for course accreditation/PA
	Tim T-
	Larry S- Commission being interface to get courses approved by multiple boards. Uniform application

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?

OPTIONS:	
	None were offered.

**≤ 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?

OPTIONS:	
	Mo- local acceptance appears to be good
	Jim Schock- allow appeal of state approval to local boards (not fully comfortable with idea)
	Ed C- do not hear complaints about this at PA POC meetings
	Jim Bell- some areas require Dade NOA and won't accept state approval. Address some other products not covered yet- swinging doors

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?

<b>OPTIONS:</b>	Jaime G- notify BOs more effectively about the appeal process and how to follow it effectively
	Rafael- Coral Gables requires sign and seal of engineer for louvers and not just state or MD approval
	Chris S – should a notice be on state website that product is being considered for revocation

**≤ 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

**GENERAL ENHANCEMENTS:**

Ed Carson- Elevator issue – Coordination of building, electrical, fire, elevator, plumbing inspections should be improved.

Inter-agency coordination workgroup is needed.

Tim Tolbert- Coordination of requirements for Type I commercial range hoods. Coordination of health dept, fire, building, mechanical, etc. Inter-agency coordination workgroup is needed.

## ATTACHMENT V

### PUBLIC COMMENT FORM SUBMITTALS

Name: Jeff Russell

Organization: The Quikrete Companies

Meeting Date: 6/6/2011

**Comment:** The Florida Building Code system could be improved by allowing “certain” alternate (to the FBC) to be approved on a statewide basis. This would include building materials where nationally recognized entities, such as the ICC, have developed acceptance criteria and code standard test guidelines. Such building materials are allowed under IBC, IRC, and UBC, and have national certification standards. These building materials are approved statewide in most of the states. One example is cementations exterior wall coatings where ICC-ES has developed acceptance criteria, including extensive fire testing of wall assemblies. This particular case would help the Florida economy by reducing construction labor. This improvement would bring the FBC into line with other state building commissions and improve Florida’s competitive stance with other states.