

Florida Building Commission

Attachment to the September 18 - 19, 2000 Minutes

Facilitators' Report of the September 18 - 19, 2000 Commission Meeting

Gainesville, Florida

Meeting Design & Facilitation By:



consensus.fsu.edu

Florida Building Commission
Attachment to the September 18 - 19, 2000 Minutes

I. OVERVIEW OF COMMISSION'S KEY DECISIONS

Monday, September 18, 2000

Product Approval Ad Hoc

The Product Approval Ad Hoc met and committee members unanimously agreed to make recommendations on key system design concepts, and referring to technical and legal staff the task of compiling the specific language. They agreed that the three key issues for Commission consideration are evaluation entities, testing labs, and validation.

(Attachment 2—Product Approval Ad Hoc Report)

Plumbing TAC Forum on Swimming Pool Drain Safety

The Plumbing TAC held a forum to discuss entrapment protection for swimming pool and spa suction inlets. The TAC reached a consensus on recommendations that will be considered by the Commission at the October 2000 meeting.

(Attachment 3—Plumbing TAC Report and Forum Report)

Agenda Review and Approval

The Commission reviewed and unanimously, by a vote of 18 – 0 in favor, approved the agenda as amended.

Review and Approval of August 21, 2000 Meeting Minutes

The Commission unanimously, by a vote of 18 – 0 in favor, adopted the minutes as presented from the August 21, 2000 Commission meeting.

Code Dissemination Report

The Chair reported that he and staff had met with Miami-Dade County, Broward County, and SBCCI and were making progress toward reaching a consensus. In addition, the Chair indicated that he would be meeting with Miami –Dade, Broward, and SBCCI prior to the October Commission meeting and anticipates delivering recommendations for Commission consideration and approval at the October meeting.

Product Approval Ad Hoc Progress Report

Commissioner Mehlretter presented the committee's report and the Commission unanimously approved the report by a vote of 20 – 0 in favor.

(Attachment 2—Product Approval Ad Hoc Report)

Plumbing TAC and Forum Report

Commissioner Shaw presented the committee's report and the Commission unanimously approved the report by a vote of 18 – 0 in favor. Recommendations will be considered by the Commission at the October meeting.

(Attachment 3—Plumbing TAC Report and Forum Report)

Review and Approval of Commission’s Updated Workplan

The Commission reviewed the workplan and task delivery schedule and voted unanimously, by a vote of 18 – 0 in favor, to adopt the modified workplan as presented. (Attachment 4)

Reconsideration of Code Transition Training Contract

The Commission voted 18 – 0 in favor to reconsider the contract award decision for transition training.

The Commission voted unanimously, by a vote of 18 – 0 in favor, to open the transition training development project for competitive bids to qualified bidders and to instruct staff to present the Commission with the results of the bidding process prior to awarding the contract/s. In addition the motion divided Option 2 into two separate modules (2A and 2B) to allow separate bidding on 2A and 2B; and, to require the vendor to provide an analysis of differences between the SFBC and the SBC.

Testimony and Public Comment on Building Code Effectiveness

(Education Workplan Task “I”: Simplification, Education, Accountability)

The Chair gave the Commission an overview of the importance of an education system component to the Florida Building Code for the long-term effectiveness and viability of the code. He explained that the Commission is required to report annually to the Legislature on the effectiveness of the code and that the Study Commission’s findings indicated that education is the most effective method to ensure that the code is effectively enforced and compliance enhanced.

There were a series of presentations from invited speakers that ranged from Study Commission findings to existing educational systems and programs such as the State Fire College. The speakers highlighted the critical role of education in fostering compliance and enforcement of the code and in ensuring the effectiveness/efficacy of the Florida Building Code.

Following are bulleted highlights of the sequence of presentations:

- □ Overview of goals, statute, and Legislative requirements (Jeff Blair, Rick Dixon, and Jim Richmond)
- □ Overview of Process for Workshop I and beyond (Jeff Blair)
- □ Chairman Rodriguez read a letter from Tom Lewis—Study Commission Chair
- □ Leonard Tylka (Study Commission homebuilder representative)
- □ Fire College presentation (Randy Napally)
- □ Education Task Group Report (Doug Murdock—FBC Education TG Chair)
- □ Core Course Presentation (Charlie Hickey)
- □ ISF presentation (Robin Safley & Annette D'Amico)
- □ BOAF presentation (Doug Murdock)
- □ DBPR presentation (Tony Spivey)
- □ Question and Answers (Q & A) followed each presenter

(Attachment 5—Education Workshop Report)

Discussion on Building Code Effectiveness (Issue and Problem Identification)

Jeff Blair from FCRC led the Commission in a facilitated discussion to begin the process of developing the Education Training system. The Commission was asked to review the identified key topical areas and to suggest any additional topics that were not included in the list. The Commission reviewed and agreed to the following topical areas for further discussion and development:

- Design, implementation, oversight
- Administration: funding & sustainability, delivery of training
- Education courses: individuals, contractors, designers, enforcement officials, and secondary school
- Supervisors & workers (apprenticeships - license holders)
- Basic courses
- Advanced courses
- Code effectiveness - general
- Monitor & report to Legislature

Finally, the Commission was reminded of the need to develop and deliver recommendations to the Legislature on system recommendations as well as the ongoing requirement to report annually to the Legislature on code effectiveness.

Following are the sequential steps of the Commission's facilitated session:

- Brainstorm on issues for inclusion in key topical areas
- Brainstorm and identify existing resources/models/pilots
- Brainstorm role of Commission
- Identify needed resources/information
- Identify key stakeholders
- Review and next steps
- Appoint Education Training System Ad Hoc

(Attachment 5—Education Workshop Report)

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 2000

Agenda Review

The Commission agreed to modify the agenda by deferring the decision on consideration of comments on notice of proposed changes to the building code rule until the October meeting. The Commission agreed to review the proposed changes but not to decide on them until October's meeting.

Closed Session to Discuss Settlement of Rule Challenges to the Building Code Rule

The Commission held a closed session to discuss possible options for resolving the pending rule challenges to the Building Code Rule.

Public Comment

The Chair invited members of the public to address the Commission relative to issues before or already considered by the Commission. The Commission heard from members of the public who expressed and supported the need for swimming pool safety devices. In addition, the speaker's conveyed their support for the pool drain safety recommendations that the Plumbing TAC will be offering the Commission at the October meeting.

Discussion and Decision on Homebuilder's Proposal for Settlement of the Rule Challenges to the Building Code Rule

The Commission voted 14 – 1 to reject the Homebuilder's proposed settlement offer. The Commission voted unanimously, by a vote of 15 – 0 in favor, to instruct staff to work out a joint proposal based on discussion and direction from the closed session and to seek direction from an Administrative Law Judge as to the possibility of bifurcating the Building Code Rule in order to allow the Rule, with the exception of any unresolved specific issues, to proceed forward with the rule adoption process.

Consideration of Changes to the Fiscal Impact Criteria Rule

The Commission voted unanimously, by a vote of 14 – 0 in favor, to approve the proposed changes to the fiscal impact statement that resulted from public comment; and, to proceed with notice of proposed changes to the rule.

(Attachment 6)

Consideration of Additional Changes/Modifications and Comments on Notice of Proposed Changes to the Building Code Rule

The Commission agreed to reschedule consideration of the comments on notice of proposed changes to the Building Code Rule until the October meeting to allow time for review, and pending discussion of issues relating to the rule challenges to the Building Code Rule.

Rick Dixon oriented the Commission on the organization of the materials (in binders) that contain the proposed changes to the Building Code Rule and the relevant supporting documents included in the materials. In addition, the Commission was reminded to bring the binders with them to the October meeting.

Appointment of Education System Development Ad Hoc Committee

Chairman Rodriguez appointed the following Commissioners to serve on the Education Ad Hoc committee:

Dick Browdy (chair), John Calpini, Peggy Harris, Suzanne Marshall, Doug Murdock, Christ Sanidas, Dan Shaw, Diana Richardson, Karl Thorne, and Frank Quintana.

Committee Assignments and Issues for October's Commission Meeting

- ☐ Consider action pursuant to rule challenges to the Building Code Rule
- ☐ Decide on comments on proposed changes to the Building Code Rule.
- ☐ Education Training System Ad Hoc (I)
- ☐ Product Approval Ad Hoc (E)
- ☐ Discuss Commission Rules of Procedure(Q)
- ☐ Technical Support for the Code Update (S)
- ☐ Code Dissemination report from Commission Chair. (O)
- ☐ Mechanical TAC report and recommendations
- ☐ Plumbing TAC report and recommendations
- ☐ Manufactured/Prototype Buildings AD Hoc report and recommendations
- ☐ Accessibility TAC report and recommendations
- ☐ Joint Building/Fire report and recommendations

Attachment 1

Meeting Evaluation Summary

**Florida Building Commission
September 18 - 19, 2000
Gainesville, Florida**

How Well Did the Commission Achieve the Meeting Objectives?

	<i>Circle One</i>					<u>Avg.</u>
	<u>Good</u>	<u>Poor</u>				
Review and Adoption of Updated Commission Workplan	5 8	4 3	3 1	2 0	1 0	4.59
Mechanical TAC Report and Recommendations	5 7	4 3	3 1	2 0	1 0	4.55
Code Dissemination Update	5 5	4 4	3 2	2 0	1 0	4.28
Product Approval Ad Hoc Report	5 7	4 5	3 0	2 0	1 0	4.59
Plumbing TAC Forum Report and Recommendations	5 7	4 5	3 0	2 0	1 0	4.59
Testimony/Public Comment on Building and Recommendations	5 6	4 5	3 0	2 0	1 0	4.55
Discussion on Building Code Effectiveness	5 7	4 4	3 1	2 0	1 0	4.91
Closed Session to Discuss Settlement of Rule Challenges to the Building Code Rule	5 6	4 3	3 2	2 0	1 0	4.00
Consideration of Changes to the Fiscal Impact Criteria Rule	5 6	4 5	3 1	2 0	1 0	4.42
Consideration of Additional Changes/Modifications and Comments on Notice of Proposed Changes to the Building Code Rule	5 5	4 5	3 1	2 0	1 1	4.37
Review of Assignments for Next Month	5 6	4 3	3 1	2 0	1 0	4.50

Rate the Following Aspects of the Meeting?

Clarity of the meeting purpose and plan	5	4	3	2	1	
	7	5	0	0	0	4.59
Background Information was helpful	5	4	3	2	1	
	7	4	2	0	1	4.34
Agenda Packet was helpful	5	4	3	2	1	
	9	2	1	0	0	4.67
Balance of Structure and Flexibility	5	4	3	2	1	
	7	5	0	0	0	4.59
Group involvement and productivity	5	4	3	2	1	
	9	3	0	0	0	4.75
Facilitation	5	4	3	2	1	
	8	4	0	0	0	4.67
Facility	5	4	3	2	1	
	3	2	1	4	2	3.00

Comments:

Facility/Service Poor.

Hotel had no idea if we were meeting or not (they said it was scheduled).

What Did You Like Best About the Meeting?

We covered a lot of ground & issues.

Someone needs to let the hotel know in case there is ever another natural or unnatural disaster.

How Could the Meeting Have Been Improved?

Different hotel.

Attachment 2

Product Approval Ad Hoc Committee Report

Rick Dixon explained that the statutes provide specific direction on many of the key issues to be incorporated in the development of the Product Approval system, and indicated that there are three areas that the Ad Hoc should consider developing recommendations on. They are: evaluation entities, testing laboratories, and validation. After discussions the Ad Hoc voted unanimously (6 – 0 in favor) to approve a process/strategy that would incorporate the requirements of statute and allow the Ad Hoc to develop conceptual recommendations which technical and legal staff will put into specific language for Commission review and consideration. Staff should provide a list of options and possible recommendations for the Ad Hoc to use for developing their recommendations on system design. In addition, staff was requested to compile a list of accredited evaluation entities and testing laboratories.

Presentation by Henn Rebane, P.E. and Nasir Alam, P.E.

The improper use of sealed documents. Engineers seal template documents and sales representatives use them to imply product compliance.

Issues presented by engineer's committee:

- Many jurisdictions do not require sealed plans in residential construction.
- Need to specify exact application criteria for shutters – conditions for use.
- May be appropriately resolved at local jurisdiction level by the building official.
- Should not issue blank approval of product – engineer should review by interpreting applicable design tables.
- Should meet design pressure standards in Florida Building Code.
- Will go into effect when Florida Building Code becomes effective.
- Use truss application process for shutters – engineered application.
- Need site specific approval for appropriate use of product (the shutters)
- Engineers should verify use for each project.

Rick Dixon - Presentation

Key issues:

- Conceptual aspects are in the law.
- Statewide system
 - Acceptance of local permitting process is implied.
 - Building Official is still responsible if statewide approved products meet conditions of local area.
 - Information of how building official makes decisions is determined at the state level.
 - If product applies w/certain condition – and validated by state local jurisdiction must accept and not require further evaluation as long as it meets standard in the Florida Building Code.

Issues for Ad Hoc Resolution and Recommendation:

- How do you determine if information for state approval is valid.
- Determine which accreditation entities will be accepted by State of Florida.
- Evaluation entities - if product deemed to comply – product approved by entities will also be approved for state use - still requires building officials.
- Determine which evaluation entities will be approved – must approve accreditation entities.
- Who approves testing labs needs to be addressed.
- Determine which entities will be approved.
- Timing issues should be considered relative to acceptance date. (ie, effective date of code)
- Regulations must be in sync., products will have to comply with requirement of the code.
- Need approved statewide process for testing products – local officials would then ensure product applies with code in their jurisdictions.
- Grand-fathering: term is misleading
- All products will be required to meet requirements of code for every jurisdiction.
- Not approval of product rather, approval of engineering evaluation of the product – must meet requirements of the Code.
- General principle in law -- any approved evaluation entities, evaluation reports are recognized.
- Required effective government oversight, set up procedures to ensure compliance with state intent.

Approval of Evaluation Entities

- Nationally recognized entities shall be recognized – determine list
- How to approve entities that have not gone through national accreditation process.
- Options
 - Florida only recognizes nationally accredited entities.
 - Accreditation criteria established by Florida Building Commission and then approve additional entities.
 - Florida Building Commission, by consensus, identify evaluation entities w/o identify criteria for products – in essence grand-fathering entities (not products).
 - establish criteria for evaluation entities and engineers
 - Staff to identify nationally accredited entities
 - Allow others to apply – and then decide
 - Need to provide appeal process.
 - Develop list by rule or legislation – need legislative authority.
 - Legal staff to review and make recommendations
 - System should allow approval for period of time and then require accreditation.
 - Don't need to repeat what is in law.
 - Agree on concepts and allow staff to provide rule language.
 - Complete system operation approval prior to session.

Approval of Testing Laboratories

Same issues as evaluation entities apply to labs and recommendations on evaluation entities will apply to labs as well.

Validation

- Exercise of Florida Building Commission unless delegated specifically by Commission
- Submittal by applicant
- Validation by Florida Building Commission (may be delegated)
- Validation is not part of building official process, done by Florida Building Commission or designee.
- Internal peer review process to review and verify compliance report approval.
- Separation of evaluations and validators.
- How does validation apply to engineer approval process.
- Engineer must practice in field of competence/expertise.
- How to validate, especially if engineer is approving outside field of competence.
- How to verify to the Commission - peer review.
- Commission validation
 - Effective government oversight
 - Peer review process to verify engineer approval.
- Engineer approval is subject to validation criteria/evaluation.
- Subject to building official scrutiny.
- How to address challenges and what are time frames for resolution
- Process could require peer review before seeking Commission approval of decision.
- Could use local board appeal process prior to review by Commission.
- Establish procedures for primary approval entity to go through rigorous review – state approval of products impacts many users.
- Need higher standards for statewide approval of products.
- Still allows local jurisdictions to approve for single application.

Next Steps

Staff to provide synthesis of key concepts relative to:

- Approval of entities including list of current accredited, entities and test labs
- validation
- Legal staff to compile language
- Commission to approve key concepts and principles – including recommendations to legislature for rule authority/statute changes.
- Provide options and possible recommendations
- Agree to conceptual strategy.
- Ensure that architects and engineers to have competitive advantage or disadvantage over evaluation entities.

Attachment 3

Plumbing Gas TAC Report

- □ Recommend establishing a subcommittee to address entrapment protection on private swimming pools.
- □ The TAC took action after its forum on swimming pool entrapment criteria to delete added provisions (b), (c) and (d) of section 424.4 - 304.2, Required Equipment, in Draft III and replace it with a proposed new subsection 424.2 - 304.6, Entrapment Protection For Suction Inlets (see attached proposal).
- □ Propose to meet for a full day in October to address two issues: 1) dip tube failure impacts and 2) copper pipe corrosion.

Pool Safety Forum Report and Recommendations

Section 424.2-304.6 ENTRAPMENT PROTECTION FOR SUCTION INLETS

- **Location:** Suction inlets shall be provided and arranged to produce circulation throughout the pool or spa.
- **Testing and Certification:** All Pool and Spa suction inlets shall be provided with a cover that has been tested and accepted by a recognised testing facility and comply with ANSI/ASME A112.19.8M, "Suction Fittings for Use in Swimming Pools, Spas, Hot Tubs, and Whirlpool Bathtub Appliances".

EXCEPTION: Surface skimmers.

IMPORTANT SAFETY NOTE: Do not use or operate pool or spa if the suction inlet fitting is missing, broken, or loose.

- **Entrapment Avoidance:** If the suction inlet system, such as an automatic cleaning system, is a vacuum cleaner system which has a single suction inlet, or multiple suction inlets which can be isolated by valves, then each suction inlet shall protect against user entrapment by either an approved antivortex cover, 12"X12" grate or larger, or other approved means.

In addition, all pools and spas shall be required to have an alternative backup system which shall provide vacuum relief should grate covers be missing. Alternative vacuum relief devices shall include either:

- . Approved Vacuum Release system
- . Approved Vent piping
- . Other approved devices or means

- **Suction Inlets Per Pump:** A minimum of two (2) suction inlets shall be provided for each pump in the suction inlet system, separated by a minimum of three feet (3') or located on two (2) different planes; i.e. one (1) on the bottom and one (1) on the vertical wall, or one (1) each on two (2) separate vertical walls. These suction inlets shall be plumbed such that water is drawn through them simultaneously through a common line to the pump.
- **Cleaner Fittings:** Where provided, the vacuum or pressure cleaner fitting(s) shall be located in an accessible position(s) at least six inches (6") and not greater than twelve inches (12") below the minimum operating water level or as an attachment to the skimmer(s).

Attachment 4

Workplan—By Tasks

(Reviewed and Prioritized June 2000; Adopted Unanimously July 2000)
(Amended Unanimously September 2000)

I. HB 219 — Tasks Mandated by Statute

1. Finalize the Code

- A. Establish Criteria for Fiscal Impact Statement of Proposed Amendments and for Reviewing Previously Adopted Modifications to the Base Code That Receive Public Comment Prior to May 19, 2000 [553.73 (7)(a)(b)]**

Tasks Schedule

May 2000: Chair elects to address issue at Commission level.

June 2000: **Commission holds rule development workshop at June meeting, adopts criteria, and moves to proceed with rule adoption.**

August 2000: **Rulemaking hearing on adopting criteria for fiscal impact statements.**

September 2000: **Commission approves changes and proceeds with NOPC to the Rule.**

October/November 2000: Administrative rule adopted.

- B. Plans Review Criteria and Minimum Standards [553.73 (4)(a)]**

Tasks Schedule

(Including recommendations for emergency management/disaster relief permitting and inspections)

March 2000: Commission assigns task to Ad Hoc.

May- June 2000: Ad Hoc develops recommendations and reports to the Commission.

July 2000: **Ad Hoc delivers final recommendations and Commission adopts and includes as part of proposed changes to the Building Code Rule.**

- C. Integrate Standards for State Regulated Facilities Identified in HB 219 [Section 40; 553.73 (1)(2)]**

Tasks Schedule

June 2000: Legal reviews and recommends course of action.

Fall 2000: Proceed with rule adoption after Building Code Rule process finalized.

- D. Projects Relating to the Building Construction Industry or Continuing Education Programs [HB 219 Section 40 – 489.109 (3)]**

Tasks Schedule

Fall 2000: Chair appoints Building Construction Issues Ad Hoc and schedules organizational meeting for Ad Hoc.

2. Recommendations Mandated by HB 219 for 2001 Legislative Review

E. Product Approval System

(553.842—Recommendations on a statewide system for product evaluation and approval) Tasks Schedule

June, 1999: TG presents preliminary recommendation to Commission.

October 1999: Commission appoints Ad Hoc to make final recommendations

September-December 1999: Commission receives public comment on recommendation.

December 1999: Ad Hoc convenes and develops recommendations

Commission adopts conceptual design of system.

Commission approved products for approval under the system. [Leg. 7]

January 2000: Commission reviews Ad Hoc's preliminary recommendations.

*February 2000: **Commission approves continuing to develop system until July meeting and to report status to the Legislature***

May 2000: Legislature directs Commission to make recommendations and eliminates Commission's rule making authority for the system.

June 2000: Commission reviews Legislative direction and establishes new timelines.

July - November 2000: Ad Hoc develops recommendations, reviews Commission and public comments, and reports to the Commission.

November 2000: Commission adopts amendatory product approval system recommendations.

December 2000: Commission decides on amendments and adopts final recommendations to present to the Legislature.

F. Examine Applicability of FBC to Storage Sheds and Lawn Storage Buildings [HB 219 – Section 112] Report to 2001 Legislature

Tasks Schedule

July 2000: Referred to Manufactured Building Ad Hoc

November 2000: Commission reviews and identifies issues for Ad Hoc consideration.

November/December 2000: Ad Hoc proposes preliminary recommendations.

Commission approves preliminary recommendations and receives public comment.

December 2000: Commission adopts final recommendations.

G. Make Recommendations for Exceptions to Buildings Exempt from the Code [553.73 (7)]; [553.79 (3)(5)(7)(10)(12)(14)(16)]; [HB 219 – Section 112]

Tasks Schedule

January 2000: Commission appoints Ad Hoc to review and make recommendations.

July 2000: Task assigned to Manufactured Building Ad Hoc (M)

February 2001: Ad Hoc identifies key issues and forms workplan.

II. Education System

H. Information and Communication Support for the Building Code System

Tasks Schedule

September 1999: Center for Professional Development (at FSU) begins assessment phase for system conceptual design

December 1999: Report on assessment phase including system conceptual design

March 2000: Report and status update.

December 2000: System on line and operational

I. Refinement and Further Development/ Implementation of the Education/Training Programs for the Florida Building Code [HB 4181; HB 219— Section 42; Section 89; Section 120] and Transition Training

Tasks Schedule

April 2000: Commission reviews and approves workplan for 2000 – 2001.

June 2000: Commission discusses transition training requirements.

September 2000: Commission identifies key issues, stakeholders, and resources. Ad Hoc appointe

October 2000: Ad Hoc develops preliminary recommendations

November 2000: Ad Hoc amendatory text of recommendations and public input workshop.

December 2000: Review amendment and adopt final recommendations to present to Legislature.

Amendatory text of final recommendations.

January/February 2001: Report submitted to Legislature.

February – April 2001: Public feedback reviewed and legislative direction reviewed.

May 2001: Commission Workshop #6: Review of Legislative direction and refinement of recommendations.

June 2001: Public comment reviewed for potential modifications.

July 2001: Rule Adoption finalized

III. Ongoing Review and Response to Legislative Mandates

J. Develop Recommendations to the Legislature for Changes to Existing Laws and Conforming Amendments to Laws [553.77 (1)(a)(b)]

Tasks Schedule

June – December 2000: Commission develops recommendations as part of their annual review process and approves recommendations to be included in its report to the 2001 Legislature.

K. Respond to Legislative Mandates

Tasks Schedule

June – December 2000: Commission develops recommendations as part of their annual review process and approves recommendations to be included in its report to the 2001 Legislature.

L. Annual Report to Legislature

Tasks Schedule

June – December 2000: Commission develops recommendations as part of their annual review process and approves recommendations to be included in report to the Legislature.

M. Administrative Support for the Commission and Code Maintenance (Changes/Updates/Format/Glitches)

Tasks Schedule

Ongoing: Commission identifies tasks for staff review and recommendations.

January Annually: Commission reviews recommendations and takes action as needed.

IV. Commission Prioritized Tasks

N. Review Effectiveness of the Manufactured Buildings Regulation and Code Enforcement—s. 553.77(1)(b) [HB 4181 Task] [553.35 – 553.42]

Tasks Schedule

January 2000: Commission adopts amendatory text of recommended changes to law and additional preliminary program recommendations.

February 2000: Commission adopts final recommendations on changes to law and additional preliminary program recommendations.

March - July 2000: Ad Hoc develops recommendations, reviews Commission and public comments, and reports to the Commission.

August 2000: Ad Hoc delivers final recommendations to Commission on effectiveness of manufactured buildings regulation and code enforcement.

Commission receives public comment and approves recommendations to be included in its report to the 2001 Legislature.

O. Code Dissemination

Review Royalty and Copyright Agreements and Make Recommendations

Tasks Schedule:

May 2000: Chair appoints Ad Hoc to develop recommendations.

June 2000: Ad Hoc reports preliminary recommendations to the Commission.

July 2000: Ad Hoc reports and develops recommendations for the Commission.

August 2000: Commission approves Chair negotiating for Commission.

Sept – Oct: Commission approves final recommendations.

P. Establish System for Plans Review and Approval of Prototype Buildings [HB – 4181 Task] [553.77 (6)]

Tasks Schedule:

October 2000: Ad Hoc identifies key issues and forms workplan.

December 2000: Commission approves preliminary recommendations and receives public comment.

January 2000: Commission adopts final recommendations.

Q. Establish Commission Rules of Procedure [Procedural Task]

Tasks Schedule

Develop and adopt recommendations for Commission operational and decision-making procedures and adopt by administrative rule.

October 2000: Commission reviews statutes and identifies key issues.

November 2000: Commission approves preliminary recommendations and receives public comment.

December 2000: Commission adopts final recommendations.

R. Board of Appeals Process [Procedural Task]

October 2000: Commission reviews statutes and identifies key issues.

November 2000: Commission approves preliminary recommendations and receives public comment.

December 2000: Commission adopts final recommendations.

🍏 S. Technical Support for the Code [Procedural Task]

Tasks Schedule

Recommendations to Commission for ongoing review and support for technical review of the code.

October 2000: Commission assigns to administrative agency (DCA) to develop recommendation:

T. Role of State in Collaborating with Building Inspection Departments

Tasks Schedule

February 2000: Commission assigns task to Partnership for Building Department Effectiveness Task Group.

February 2001: Ad Hoc identifies key issues and forms workplan.

June 2001: Commission approves preliminary recommendations and receives public comment.

July 2001: Commission adopts final recommendations.

🍏 U. Develop Procedure and Process for Commission Commentary [Procedural Task]

Tasks Schedule

Review and adopt recommendations for Legislative consideration.

October 2000: Commission reviews statutes and identifies key issues.

November 2000: Commission approves preliminary recommendations and receives public comment.

December 2000: Commission adopts final recommendations.

**🍏 V. Voluntary Standards for Building Departments [HB 4181 Task] [553.76 (5)]
ISO Ratings Program for Building Departments [HB 4181] [553.77 (1)(n)]**

Tasks Schedule

February 2000: Commission assigns the task of developing recommendations for voluntary professional standards for operation of building departments and personnel development to Ad Hoc: Partnership for Building Department Effectiveness Task Group.

March 2000: Ad Hoc identifies key issues and forms workplan.

May 2000: Ad Hoc develops recommendations and receives presentations from representatives of Miami-Dade and Broward counties, state building officials association (BOAF), the insurance industry, federal emergency management agency (FEMA) and other vested groups.

June 2000: Ad Hoc reports to Commission.

November 2000: Ad Hoc reports to Commission.

December 2000: Ad Hoc develops recommendations, reviews Commission and public comments, and delivers completed recommendations to the Commission.

December 2000: Commission receives public comment and approves recommendations to be included in its report to the 2001 Legislature.

W. Develop Funding Recommendations for Code Enforcement

Note: Part of ongoing review for Commission's annual report to the Legislature.

Tasks Schedule

October 1999: Deferred to DCA Administrative Support Agency and Governor's office to address and make recommendations to the Legislature.

February – December 2000: Staff reviews as needed or requested by the Commission.

July 2000: Task referred to Partnership for Building Department Effectiveness Task Group

February 2001: Ad Hoc identifies key issues and forms workplan.

X. Review Commission and Staff Roles Relative to Public Information and Involvement & Review and Clarify Mutual Roles of DCA and Commission.

Task Schedule:

On Going: Commission and staff hold discussions as needed or requested on mutual roles in providing for public information and involvement in the code process.

Y. Guidelines for Local Government Privatization of Inspection Functions [HB 4181 Task] [553.77 (1)(o)]

Tasks Schedule

Jan. 2000: Commission assigns task to Ad Hoc committee

May 2000: Task referred to Partnership for Building Departments Ad Hoc.

February 2001: Ad Hoc identifies key issues and forms workplan.

Z. Review Creating a Rating System for Structural Integrity Under Storm Conditions

Task Schedule:

February 2001: Commission reviews task, identifies key issues, and forms workplan.

AA. Make Recommendations on FBC Policy for Transition to International Building Code

Task Schedule:

February 2001: Commission reviews task, identifies key issues, and forms workplan.

BB: ISO Ratings Program for Building Departments [HB 4181] [553.77 (1)(n)]

Task Schedule:

February 2001: Commission reviews task, identifies key issues, and forms workplan.

Attachment 5

Education Workshop Flipchart Notes

Education System: Steve Pfeiffer

- □ Accountability/Predictability > Compliance
- □ Compliance hindered by too many different codes.
- □ Education & training were done on a case-by-case basis - no comprehensive system.
- □ Consistent code with only critical regional difference.
- □ Focus on next steps of code.
- □ Ensure effective code.
- □ -design professionals, builders > education
- □ Need core & advanced module.
- □ Educate: designers/builders/official.
- □ Don't delay implementation of code due to delay of education system.
- □ Thoughtful look at rules of procedure.
- □ Consensus-building element critical.
- □ Inclusive processes critical.

Lyn Tylka

- □ Field people & code officials varied in understanding - no consistency.
- □ Licensing of professionals - responsible for compliance to code.
- □ Dependent on trades for education/experience.
- □ Building officials delay process due to lack of trained people.
- □ People in field should be educated/trained.
- □ Partner w/ manufacturers to train workers in the field - during work hours.
- □ Education not regulation is the answer.
- □ Need worker training!

Fire College Presentaion (Randy Napally)

- □ Fire inspection training model.
- □ National focus
- □ Standardization & consistency
- □ Competent personnel & coordination (i.e., proper inspection, design)
- □ Certification req.'s in statute
- □ Education task group
- □ Directed by Legislature to develop recommendations on education.

Education Task Group (Doug Murdock)

- □ 4 hour core
- □ Fundamental elements of building code area topics.
- □ Emphasis on how to operation in FBC.
- □ Highlight differences between current & FBC and develop technical later.
- □ Focus on institutionalizing training.
- □ Program w/ high level/standards

ISF Presentation (Robin Safley and Annette D'Amico)

Robin Safley and Annette D'Amico from Information Systems of Florida presented the Building Codes Information System that has been developed with the Department of Community Affairs. The emphasis of this system is on the dissemination of information to the users of the Unified Building Code through a dynamic web site. Some of its key features include:

- Allows Building Professionals to view the latest amendments and interpretations on the Unified Building Code
- Allows Building Professionals to take the Building Code Core Training Online or view instructor-led course offerings
- Allows Building Professionals to subscribe to Mailing Lists on multiple topics
- Allows Training Providers to enter their Building Code Core Training class information
- Allows Training Providers to record Building Professionals License numbers, and the system automatically sends the Continuing Education credits to DBPR
- Provides latest information on approved Modular Unit Manufacturers, their building plans, and building insignia requests
- Allows third-party agencies to update building plan review results and building inspections online
- Provides access to the DBPR and FBPE web sites to perform a search on a Building Professional's license number

This site is expected to be available later this fall.

BOAF (Doug Murdock)

Education: safe standards

Comments and Existing Resources

- □ ACT
- □ Rick Watson: Trade associations
- □ Apprentices - life safety trades.
- □ Contractor licensing - 4 hours mandatory.
- □ Training should be reasonable (4 hours) with meaningful content.
- □ Issue of cost & lower level worker's accessibility

Education System – Key Topics for Development

Design, implementation, oversight.

Administration: funding & sustainability, delivery of training.

Education courses: individuals, contractors, designers, enforcement officials, and secondary school.

Supervisors & workers (apprenticeships - license holders).

Basic courses

Advanced courses

Code effectiveness - general

Monitor & report to Legislature.

Process Suggestions

Need to design guiding principles

Develop training goals

Design system to operate for transition issues as well as long term operation

Design, Implementation, Oversight of Education System

Key Issues:

- ☐ Contractor exams - preparation courses, CLIB would include modules.
- ☐ Differences regionally - SFBC & SBC
- ☐ Updates of code s they occur - need system.
- ☐ Differences between current cod & FBC transition - list differences / changes.
- ☐ Consistency of interpretation of code - interactive - what process.
- ☐ Who will approve of content of courses?
- ☐ Who will approve trainers?
Approval of construction CEV process, approval of providers.
- ☐ Design/Education courses: How do we measure results? Do we measure results? Is it pass/fail? Do you get a grade?
- ☐ Competency of those taking courses.
- ☐ Quality assurance - effectiveness of training.
- ☐ Train the trainer course requirements - mandatory.
- ☐ Who can submit courses & who decides?
Consistency of curriculum statewide reviewed for accuracy.
- ☐ Use CEU credits - tied to disciplinary such as driving licenses (points).
- ☐ Design associations
- ☐ Contractors, officials
- ☐ Teach courses at different levels.
- ☐ Timelines for implementation/transition.
- ☐ Legislative Issues: (i.e., implementation)
- ☐ Transition issues, effective dates
- ☐ Design & review of plans by designer that comply with FBC prior to effective date.

Administration: Funding & Sustainability

Key Issues:

- ☐ Who prices code & sell modules to schools?
- ☐ Who administers the education program - DCA or private contractor?
- ☐ Courses updates or code changes - who is responsible? Update education system for consistency.
- ☐ After initial rush - who uses training?
- ☐ Review cost of course.
- ☐ Funding source - how funded?
- ☐ Outline of different aspects for training.
- ☐ Develop training goals - outline.
- ☐ Quality insurance
- ☐ Education Courses: licensed individuals, contractors, designers, and enforcement officials.
- ☐ As the code is updated - will it be a requirement of CEU's to require these updates as part of the 14 required CEU hours?

Education Courses

Key Issues:

- □ Accumulated credit hours with designation of status - beyond minimum requirements - designation of accrual of hours
- □ Testing of content of courses - efficacy.
- □ Basic course & advanced specialized courses & differences in treatment.
- □ System to accredit the teachers.
- □ How do you select teachers/trainers (i.e., trade associations)?

Supervisors & Workers

Key Issues:

- □ ACT - Academy Construction Trades, apprentices supervisors for life safety trades.
- □ Voluntary or mandatory?
- □ Recognition/Incentives for workers who take training.
- □ If design - will they take training?
- □ NAHB - homebuilders institute - credit & designation for taking course. Integrate into trades - core programs into delivery stem.
- □ OBCTPA - in IATCE at FCC Jax
- □ AGC - STP (Supervisory Training Program)
- □ Workshops at conventions - tie together
- □ Trade associations responsible for training coordinate system with all associations.
- □ Proactive involvement - synergism
- □ BOMA
- □ Building home inspector
- □ Residential designer
- □ bureau
- □ "Incentives" for contractors: Mandate super of public work projects have taken core courses.
- □ This would show to contractors the importance we feel this training should have. This would show to contractors the importance we feel this training should have.

Basic Courses

Key Issues:

- □ New FBC
- □ Core courses - building code related.
- □ New fire protection code.
- □ Changes between existing & new code (FBC, SFBC)
- □ Ongoing - code update
- □ Accessibility Code
- □ Fair housing
- □ Product Approval

Advanced Courses

Key Issues:

- □ Special topics within the code.
- □ Wind design - ASCE 7-98
- □ TAC issues/areas
- □ Special occupancies
- □ State Agency correlation
- □ Advanced Courses: Wood construction, masonry construction, & all prospective methods for Wind Load Compliance.

General Code Effectiveness

Key Issues:

- □ Local appeals - Report to FBC. Review / Resolve by staff > FBC
- □ Local Ordinance issues - awareness
- □ Monitor code effectiveness & report annually to Legislature.:
- □ Web-site for building officials & contractors to keep updates.
- □ Partnership TAC is addressing those issues.

Attachment 6
Fiscal Impact Criteria Rule