

BUILDING CODE SYSTEM ASSESSMENT
REPORT TO THE FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION



AUGUST 8, 2011—WORKSHOP III

ORLANDO, FLORIDA

FACILITATION, MEETING AND PROCESS DESIGN BY



CONSENSUS CENTER

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



jblair@fsu.edu
[http:// consensus.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 Boulevard, Tallahassee, FL 32399, (850) 487-1824.*

FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION
FLORIDA BUILDING CODE SYSTEM AUGUST 8, 2011 REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>TABLE OF CONTENTS</i>	1
<i>TABLE OF ATTACHMENTS</i>	2
PROJECT OVERVIEW	3
WELCOME AND ATTENDANCE	4
WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES	4
WORKSHOP OVERVIEW AND SCOPE	5
SUMMARY OF SURVEY COMMENTS	6
OPTIONS EVALUATION RANKING EXERCISE	7
OPTIONS ACHIEVING \geq 75% SUPPORT	8
GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT	11
NEXT WORKSHOP OVERVIEW AND ISSUES	11

ATTACHMENTS	12 - 42
I. WORKSHOP PUBLIC ATTENDANCE	12
II. BUILDING CODE SYSTEM OVERVIEW	13
III. BUILDING CODE SYSTEM ASSESSMENT WORKPLAN	17
IV. OPTIONS IDENTIFICATION EXERCISE RESULTS	19

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.

MEMBER	REPRESENTATION
Raul Rodriguez (chair)	Architects
Dick Browdy (vice-chair)	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 AUGUST 8, 2011 WORKSHOP

WELCOME

Chairman Rodriguez opened the Workshop at 1:00 PM, and welcomed participants. The Chair noted that there were sixteen (16) Commissioners present at the Workshop. The following Commissioners participated in the Workshop:

Raul L. Rodriguez, AIA, Chair, Bob Boyer, Dick Browdy (vice-chair), Ed Carson, Herminio Gonzalez, Dale Greiner, Jeff Gross, Jon Hamrick, Scott Mollan, Nick Nicholson, Rafael Palacios, Jim Schock, Chris Schulte, Drew Smith, Jeff Stone, and Mark Turner.
(Attachment I—Workshop Participants)

DCA STAFF PRESENT

Rick Dixon, Jim Hammers, Mo Madani, 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 II Options Identification Exercise
- To Identify Any Additional Proposed Options for System Enhancements
- To Evaluate Proposed Options to Enhance Building Code System (Acceptability Ranking Exercise)
- To Identify Needed Next Steps

PROJECT 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. 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

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 is 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)

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.

ACCEPTABILITY RANKING OF PROPOSED OPTIONS TO ENHANCE THE FLORIDA BUILDING CODE SYSTEM AND IDENTIFICATION OF ADDITIONAL PROPOSED OPTIONS TO ENHANCE THE FLORIDA BUILDING CODE SYSTEM

Jeff Blair, Commission Facilitator, explained that the goal of Workshop III is to conduct an acceptability ranking exercise of options to enhance the System offered by participants during Workshop II or proposed during Workshop III.

During Workshop III the worksheet was used to identify and evaluate 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 were asked to participate in an options acceptability ranking exercise by ranking each option identified during Workshop II 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>
------------------------------------	-------------------------------	---	---	--------------------------

During the course of Workshop III participants were also invited to offer additional options by topic. Each of the new options was added to the worksheet and evaluated using the four-point acceptability ranking scale.

Once ranked, options achieving a 75% or greater number of 4's and 3's in proportion to 2's and 1's will be considered consensus recommendations and will be further 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 (≥) 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 rank each of the options to enhance the Florida Building Code System using the four-point acceptability ranking scale. Ranking results were captured real-time and projected for participants to see. The complete results of the Options Evaluation Ranking Exercise are included as "Attachment "IV" of this Report.

(Attachment IV—Options Evaluation Ranking Exercise Results)

OPTIONS ACHIEVING A 75% OR GREATER THRESHOLD OF WORKSHOP III PARTICIPANT SUPPORT

Following are the options achieving a 75% or greater number of 4's and 3's in proportion to 2's and 1's as ranked by Workshop III participants:

FOUNDATION I

THE CODE

Options Achieving $\geq 75\%$ Level of Support

- ⊖ *Establish an interagency coordination workgroup to ensure there is effective coordination and communication between state regulatory agencies and local jurisdictions. {27 – 0 in support}*
- ⊖ *Require all building code related professions to have mandatory CEU requirements regarding building code related “laws and rules”. {27 – 0 in support}*
- ⊖ *Develop insurance credits/incentives for building better/ stronger than code (e.g. hurricane resistant, fire and etc provisions). {27 – 0 in support}*
- ⊖ *Develop an effective communication vehicle/process connected with a comprehensive database that ensures local jurisdictions receive regular updates regarding the Florida Building Code System. {25 – 0 in support}*
- ⊖ *Evaluate current requirements in coastal areas and mandate connectors that will withstand salt-air corrosion. {25 – 0 in support}*
- ⊖ *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. {24 – 0 in support}*
- ⊖ *Establish a joint FBC workgroup with the Department of Emergency Management (DEM) and relevant stakeholders (e.g., BOAF) to develop SOPs and MOUs for use by local Emergency Operation Centers (EOC). {23 - 0 in support}*
- ⊖ *Get the ISO to recognize Florida Code for more points for BSEGS (provide equal credit to the I codes). {23 – 0 in support}*
- ⊖ *Workgroup to evaluate expanding interpretation authorities for Accessibility Code to non-binding opinions. {29 – 1 in support}*
- ⊖ *Evaluate coastal high hazard zone building construction provisions. (Evaluation of all coastal areas construction provisions was intended, broad generic definition if CHZ, not just the state law CHZ). {23 – 1 in support}*
- ⊖ *Develop a cross-reference table regarding state agency regulations that impact construction. {27 – 2 in support}*
- ⊖ *Agricultural exemptions should be clarified (i.e., show horse arenas). {22 – 2 in support}*
- ⊖ *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. {19 – 3 in support}*

⊖ *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). {25 – 4 in support}*

⊖ *Conduct a comprehensive review and evaluation of all exemptions in the Code (i.e., statutory, I-Codes, etc.). {19 – 4 in support}*

Options Achieving Between 51% and 74% Level of Support

⊖ *Have Florida hurricane resistant provisions added to the I-Codes as appendices (reducing variations between the FBC and the I-Codes). {16 – 13 in support; 55%}*

⊖ *Consider adopting the International Performance Code into the Florida Building Code. {12 – 11 in support; 52%}*

⊖ *Conduct a study regarding building official's use of alternative methods to identify trends and address issues. {12 – 11 in support; 52%}*

FOUNDATION II

THE COMMISSION

Options Achieving ≥ 75% Level of Support

⊖ *Provide a link from the Florida Building Code to all relevant local technical amendments. {24 – 0 in support}*

⊖ *Continue to use the Commission's workgroup process to deal with special topical issues, and to eliminate conflicts between the codes (e.g. FFPC and FBC). {23 – 0 in support}*

⊖ *Provide notice to all building codes/ construction related professional associations regarding updates, issues and notifications. {21 – 0 in support}*

⊖ *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. {23 – 1 in support}*

Options Achieving Between 51% and 74% Level of Support

⊖ *Develop an effective reporting mechanism allowing local partners to report when local technical amendments are implemented. {14 – 6 in support; 70%}*

FOUNDATION III

LOCAL ADMINISTRATION

Options Achieving $\geq 75\%$ Level of Support

⊖ Utilize local BOAF chapters to find out from clients in their region where code interpretations are uniform, and then work out consensus on interpretations. {24 – 0 in support}

⊖ Require local technical amendments to be approved by the Florida Building Commission prior to adoption. {21 – 0 in support}

FOUNDATION IV

STRENGTHENING COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT

Options Achieving $\geq 75\%$ Level of Support

⊖ Investigate development of an associate degree program with Universities/Colleges for building officials. {24 – 0 in support}

⊖ 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.} {23 – 0 in support}

⊖ Convene workgroup to evaluate and make recommendations on the current education system. {22 – 0 in support}

⊖ 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. {23 – 0 in support}

⊖ 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. {25 – 1 in support}

⊖ Use the Commission education approval process as an interface between licensing boards so approved courses are approved across the relevant professions. {22 – 1 in support}

⊖ Consult with various licensing boards regarding the use of the Commission's evaluation model for course accreditation (enhance consistency and cross discipline course approvals). {23 – 3 in support}

⊖ 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). {18 – 3 in support}

⊖ 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.). {18 – 6 in support}

Options Achieving Between 51% and 74% Level of Support

⊖ Increase the building permit surcharge fee to provide funding for enhanced training and education on the Florida Building Code System for all licensees. {16 – 10 in support; 62%}

FOUNDATION V

PRODUCT APPROVAL

Options Achieving ≥ 75% Level of Support

⊖ 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. {29 – 0 in support}

⊖ 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. {23 – 3 in support}

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 meetings will be e-mailed to all participants who signed-in and provided an e-mail address. Jeff explained that the Commission conducted workshops at Commission meetings between April and August of 2011. Workshops were conducted concurrently with the April, June, and August 2011 Commission meetings. The complete project “Workplan” is included as “Attachment III” of this Report. The next step in the Project is for the *Building Code System Assessment Ad Hoc Committee* to meet on October 10, 2011 in Daytona Beach, Florida to develop recommendations for the Commission to consider at the December 2011 meeting in Gainesville, Florida.

(Attachment III—Project Workplan)

ADJOURNMENT

The Workshop concluded at 5:00 PM on Monday, August 8, 2011.

ATTACHMENT I
WORKSHOP ATTENDANCE

WORKSHOP ATTENDANCE—JUNE 6, 2011—GAINESVILLE, FLORIDA	
NAME	REPRESENTATION
Raul L. Rodriguez, AIA	FBC Chair/Architects
Richard Browdy	FBC/FHBA/Builders
Jeffery Gross	FBC/BOMA/Architects
Jeffery Stone	FBC/Product Manufactures
Rafael Palacios	FBC/Mechanical Engineer
James Schock	FBC/BOAF
Herminio Gonzalez	FBC/Code Enforcement
Chris Schulte	FBC/Roofing Contractors
Bob Boyer	FBC/Local Governments
Jon Hamrick	FBC/DOE/Education
Mark Turner	FBC/Electrical Contractor
Ed Carson	FBC/Manufactured Buildings/Cont.
Nicholas Nicholson	FBC/Engineers
Drew Smith	FBC/Green Building
Dale Greiner	FBC/Code Officials
Scott Mollan	FBC/ Mechanical Contractor
Jaime Gascon	Miami-Dade County
Ed Riley	Collier County Fire Code Office
Michael Lafevre	Custom Window System
Jack Glenn	FHBA
Joseph K. Eysie	FNGA
C.W. Macomber	APA
Linda R. Patrick	BOAF/ City of Gainesville
Tim Richardson	Tampa Electric Company
Joe Hetzel	DASMA
Doug Harvey	BOAF
Timothy Johnson	City of Orlando
Larry M. Schneider	AIA-FL
Joe Belcher	JDBCS
Jim Heise	PGT & FMA
Bruce Jasewic	City of Orlando
Craig Parrino	Cast-Crete

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

	START DATE	COMP. DATE
• Ad Hoc conducts on-line Survey Phase I.	June 2010	Aug. 2010
• Ad Hoc Meeting I—Organizational Meeting.	Oct. 12, 2010	
• On-Line Survey Phase II conducted.	Oct. 2010	Jan. 2011
• Large Forum Public Workshop.	April 2011	--
• Second Workshop	June 2011	
• Third Workshop	Aug 2011	
• Fourth Workshop and Ad Hoc finalizes recommendations	Oct 2011	--
• Commission considers recommendations.	Dec. 2011	--
• Commission transmits recommendations to 2012 Legislature	Feb. 2012	--

C. AD HOC COMMITTEE AGREEMENTS/RECOMMENDATIONS

	START DATE	COMP. DATE
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

D. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT		
	START DATE	COMP. DATE
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 EVALUATION EXERCISE RESULTS

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 MOUs 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	22	1	0	0

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

- Schock: EOCs seem to have their own procedures so need uniformity. Option 2 could be rolled into Option 1.

⊖ *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	5	9	10	1

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

- Hamrick: disagree with this option.
- Carson: should be able to roll this option into option 1.
- Schulte: is the point to carve out just some part of the local official’s administrative authority or more broadly impact uniformity.
- Glenn: can’t go too far in imposing on local jurisdiction’s authority.

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
Initial Ranking 08/08/11	3	4	13	8

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

- Schock: this would establish accountability.
- Glenn: requirements to justify local amendments are more stringent than for Commission approved amendments.
- Carson: first choice is second option with this option the fall-back.
- Nicholson: want to vote on first option.

⊖ *Follow up step- eliminate authority for local technical amendments.*

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11	11	5	11	1

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

- Browdy: we are past the point where there should be any local amendments allowed.
- Madani: do not see many local amendments submitted anyway.
- Schneider: they are being done through zoning ordinances to bypass the system.
- Schulte: local amendments may be needed in some instances and if the Commission had oversight it could reject those not needed.

⊖ *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	8	4	6	5

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

- *None were offered.*

⊖ *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	24	3	0	0

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

- *None were offered.*

⊖ 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	23	2	0	0

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

- None were offered.

⊖ 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	22	5	0	0

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

- Schock: this is already in effect now.

⊖ 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	0	1	0	22

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

- Hamrick: will create many Florida specific amends. Should leave to national code.
- Madani: should leave as is.
- Dixon: has negative effect of stymieing innovation and impeding alternate methods authority.

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	9	10	4	0

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

- Carson: these options can/should be combined.
- Schock: the first option is an option in the code but second one is in law.

⊖ 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	17	5	2	0

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

- None were offered.

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	3	0	14	10

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

- None were offered.

⊖ Get the ISO to recognize Florida Code for more points for BSEGS (provide equal credit to the I codes).

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11	22	1	0	0

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

- Stone: ISO needs to recognize the Florida Building Code for more points.

⊖ Develop insurance credits/incentives for building better/ stronger than code (e.g. hurricane resistant, fire and etc provisions).

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11	26	1	0	0

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

- Glenn: insurance statute and OIR requires insurance companies to recognize compliance with Florida code.

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	5	7	13	2

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

- None were offered.

⊖ 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	19	6	4	0

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

- None were offered.

⊖ 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	7	9	12	1

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

- None were offered.

⊖ 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	5	3	13	4

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

- None were offered.

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 inumeration/ 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	3	1	15	4

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

- None were offered.

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. (broad generic definition not just the state law CHZ)

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11	17	6	1	0

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

- None were offered.

⊖ 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	19	6	0	0

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

- Schulte: has seen a lot of galvanized fastener and connector failures.

⊖ 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	4	1	11	5

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

- Schock: see a need for a workgroup to keep working on these issues. Commission did some previous work.

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	6	5	8	3

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

- None were offered.

⊖ 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	6	5	10	1

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

- Greiner: responses would not be valid.

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	2	3	22	1

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

- None were offered.

⊖ *Workgroup to evaluate expanding interpretation authorities for Accessibility Code to non-binding opinions.*

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11	20	9	1	0

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

- Browdy: will support non-binding but not binding opinion authority.

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	6	13	3	0

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

- None were offered.

⊖ *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	1	3	22	0

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

- Schock: concerned with checklists that can't include everything being misused.

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 that impact construction.*

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11	9	18	2	0

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

- *None were offered.*

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	1	1	4	17

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

- *None were offered.*

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	0	6	11	4

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

- Glenn: need time for training.

⊖ 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	0	0	5	18

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

- Greiner: can't do this.

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

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

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

- None were offered.

⊖ 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	0	0	2	18

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

- None were offered.

⊖ 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	22	2	0	0

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

- None were offered.

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

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

- Participants agreed this is already covered with the Code format.

⊖ 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	0	0	6	18

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

- None were offered.

⊖ 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	0	0	1	25

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

- None were offered.

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

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

- Participants agreed this has already been done in the Code.

⊖ 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	1	3	10	12

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

- Greiner: not practical.
- Nicholson: local governments wouldn't like this.

⊖ 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.

{DONE}

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

- Participants agreed this is already required,

⊖ Include the elevator code in the Building Volume (not a separate code). {Not Needed}

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

- Madani: referenced in the code now.
- Participants agreed this is already covered.

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

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11	4	1	7	12

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

- None were offered.

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

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11	0	0	3	18

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

- None were offered.

⊖ 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.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11	2	3	9	10

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

- None were offered.

≤ 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. Covered by prior added issue

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

- Participants agreed this option is a duplicate of a previously evaluated option.

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	8	6	6	0

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

- None were offered.

⊖ 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	16	8	0	0

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

- None were offered.

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	10	11	0	0

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

- None were offered.

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 (e.g. FFPC and FBC).

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11	20	3	0	0

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

- None were offered.

⊖ 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	0	0	1	22

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

- None were offered.

⊖ 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	22	1	1	0

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

- None were offered.

≤ 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

≥ 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
<i>Initial Ranking 08/08/11</i>	0	0	7	16

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

- *None were offered.*

⊖ 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
<i>Initial Ranking 08/08/11</i>	0	0	1	22

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

- *None were offered.*

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
<i>Initial Ranking 08/08/11</i>	13	8	0	0

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

- *None were offered.*

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.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11	0	0	1	21

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

- Greiner this is unrealistic, even the jurisdictions aren't consistent.

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.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11	11	13	0	0

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

- None were offered.

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.
{DONE PREVIOUSLY}

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

- Participants agreed this option is a duplicate of a previously evaluated option.

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.

⊖ Combine 633 and 533 entities under one authority.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11	1	6	10	3

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

- None 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	0	0	0	25

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

- None were offered.

⊖ 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	2	3	11	5

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

- None were offered.

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. {DONE PREVIOUSLY}

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

- Participants agreed this option is a duplicate of a previously evaluated option.

⊖ 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	0	0	2	19

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

- None were offered.

⊖ 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	6	2	12	2

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

- None were offered.

⊖ 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	0	0	1	21

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

- None were offered.

⊖ 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	0	0	0	22

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

- None were offered.

⊖ 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	0	0	0	22

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

- None were offered.

≤ 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

≥ 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. {REMOVE IN LIEU OF OPTION ADDED BELOW}

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

- Schock: CE system is complex and redundant and needs to be evaluated for simplification and improved effectiveness;
- Browdy: Commission’s Education System results from no direct authority.
- Participants agreed to remove this option in lieu of another option.

⊖ Convene workgroup to evaluate and make recommendations on the current education system.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11	15	7	0	0

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

- None were offered.

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	0	0	5	19

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

- None were offered.

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	11	11	1	0

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

- None were offered.

⊖ 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	8	13	2	1

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

- None were offered.

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	21	2	0	0

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

- None were offered.

⊖ 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	4	7	9	2

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

- None were offered.

⊖ 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	5	13	3	0

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

- None were offered.

⊖ 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	1	3	11	8

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

- Greiner: the law doesn't allow this.

⊖ 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	11	7	6	0

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

- None were offered.

⊖ 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	0	0	2	25

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

- None were offered.

⊖ Investigate development of an associate degree program with Universities/ Colleges for building officials.

	4=acceptable	3= minor reservations	2=major reservations	1= not acceptable
Initial Ranking 08/08/11	22	2	0	0

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

- Gonzalez: suggested this solution.

⊖ 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	15	8	0	0

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

- None were offered.

⊖ 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	9	7	6	4

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

- None were offered.

⊖ 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	8	17	1	0

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

- 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:

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	0	0	2	23

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

- None were offered.

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	2	1	11	11

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

- None were offered.

⊖ 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	6	17	3	0

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

- None were offered.

⊖ 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	21	8	0	0

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

- None were offered.

≤ 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