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Overview
Chairman Rodriguez announced the appointment of a termite workgroup to consider proposals for enhancing the Code’s termite provisions. The Workgroup will be a conducted as a facilitated stakeholder consensus-building process.

Workgroup Membership
The following members were appointed to serve on the Termite Workgroup:

Summary of Workgroup’s Key Decisions

Opening and Meeting Attendance
The meeting started at 9:15 AM, and the following Workgroup members were present: Steve Dwinell, Jack Glenn, Phil Koehler, Mike Moore, D.R. Sapp, Jim Schock, and Jeff Stone.

DCA Staff Present
Rick Dixon, Mo Madani, and Betty Stevens.

Meeting Facilitation
The meeting was facilitated by Jeff Blair from the Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium 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/tw.html

Meeting Objectives
The Workgroup voted unanimously, 7 - 0 in favor, to approve the agenda as presented including the following objectives:

• To Review and Adopt Work Group Procedures and Guidelines
• To Hear an Overview of Workgroup Charge and Scope
• To Hear a Presentation on Formosan Termites in Florida
• To Hear a Presentation on Existing Control Efforts in Florida and Nationally
• To Review Proposed Modifications to Section 1816.1 and R320.1 and Related Definitions
• To Propose Options for Evaluation
• To Evaluate, Rank, and Refine Proposed Options
• To Consider Public Comment
• To Identify Needed Next Steps and Agenda Items For Next Meeting
Work Group’s Decision-Making Procedures and Meeting Guidelines
Jeff Blair reviewed the Workgroup’s decision-making procedures found on page 3 of the agenda packet.

Issue Identification and Meeting Scope
Jeff Blair explained that the scope and purpose of the Workgroup is to review a proposed modifications to Section 1816.1 and R320.1of the Code and related definitions, requiring that: “In areas where Formosan termites have been identified, all structural members shall be composed of termite resistant material”, with a corresponding definition of termite resistant material. In addition, the Workgroup would consider any additional termite related provisions proposed by Workgroup members.

Presentation and Q&A on Formosan Termites in Florida
Dr. Phil Koehler from the University of Florida, provided members with an overview of Formosan Termites in Florida, and answered member’s questions. In addition members of the public were offered an opportunity to ask questions on the presentation. Phil reported that treatment for Formosan termites was the same as for native subterranean species, and there is no accurate data base maintained to track where Formosan are found in Florida.

Presentation and Q&A on Existing Control Efforts
Steve Dwinell, Assistant Division Director of the Division of Agriculture and Environmental Services at DACS, provided members with an overview existing termite control methods in Florida, and answered member’s questions. In addition members of the public were offered an opportunity to ask questions on the presentation. Steve reported that wood treatment with Borates has is becoming a predominant method for termite control in new construction.

Review and Discussion of Proposed Modifications to Section 1816.1 & R320.1
Mike Moore as proponent for proposed modifications to Section 1816.1 & R320.1 and relevant definitions, provided members with an overview of the proposed amendment requiring that: “In areas where Formosan termites have been identified, all structural members shall be composed of termite resistant material”, with a corresponding definition of termite resistant material, and answered member’s questions. In addition members of the public were offered an opportunity to ask questions on the presentation.

Options Identification and Initial Evaluation of Options
Results are found on pages 4 – 7 of this Report.

Evaluation of Options—Ranking and Refinement of Options
Results are found on pages 4 – 7 of this Report.
**Recommendations Regarding Termite Provisions of the Code to the Florida Building Commission**

The members voted to make the following recommendations regarding the Termite provisions of the Florida Building Code:

**Recommendations to Approve:**

1. The Workgroup voted unanimously, 7 – 0 in favor, to the following proposal in concept, with details to be worked out with the Structural TAC:
   
   *If wood treatment (pesticides applied to wood) is used for subterranean termite protection in new construction, wood areas disturbed or added after initial treatment shall be retreated with a wood treatment (pesticides applied to wood).*

2. The Workgroup agreed in concept that pipe sleeves should not be used for CPVC, and the issue should be reviewed by the Plumbing TAC. Pipe sleeving in general should also be reviewed for issues of corrosion, insulation, and termite damage, and the Code amended as needed.

   *Pipe sleeves shall not be used with CPVC, and require non-cellulose-containing material for pipe sleeves.*

3. The Workgroup agreed that the Structural TAC should review all noncellulosic materials used in construction (i.e., rigid foam insulation, insulated concrete forms (ICF), for use above and below grade), and develop recommendations to ensure termite protection is provided in the Code.

**Recommendations Against Approval:**

4. The Workgroup voted 1 – 6 in favor of recommending that the Commission approve the proposed modification to Section 1816.1 and R320.1 of the Code and related definitions, requiring that: “In areas where Formosan termites have been identified, all structural members shall be composed of termite resistant material”, and the corresponding definition of “Termite Resistant Material: Pressure preservatively treated wood, heartwood of redwood, eastern red cedar, concrete, masonry, steel, or other approved material.”

   **By a vote of 6 – 1, the Workgroup recommends that the Commission not approve this proposed amendment.**

5. The Workgroup voted 1 – 6 in favor of AF&PA’s proposal to adopt the IBC termite provisions, with Florida specific amendments.

   **By a vote of 6 – 1, The Workgroup recommends that the Commission not approve this proposed amendment, in favor of the existing FBC termite provisions.**
OPTIONS ACCEPTABILITY RANKING EXERCISE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptability Ranking Scale</th>
<th>4 = acceptable, I agree</th>
<th>3 = acceptable, I agree with minor reservations</th>
<th>2 = not acceptable, I don’t agree unless major reservations addressed</th>
<th>1 = not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Mike Moore’s Proposed modifications to Section 1816.1 and R302.1
In areas where Coptotermes Formosan termites have been identified, all structural members shall be composed of termite resistant material. See Section 202, Termite Resistant Material.

Section R202 Definitions
TERMITE RESISTANT MATERIAL. Pressure preservatively treated wood, heartwood of redwood, eastern red cedar, concrete, masonry, steel, or other approved material.

Members Comments and Reservations (5/18/06):
- The statement “in areas where…” is too broad. The map(s) are vague as to where the termites are located in Florida.
- This proposal would limit the use of wood frame construction throughout Florida.
- Pressure preservatives would not necessarily meet termite resistant requirements in Florida.
- Pressure treated should be considered as a stand alone system.
- In addition use termite resistant materials.
- No mechanism for determining where Coptotermes occur, no legal basis, is anecdotal, no reason to do this.
- In practice all major products have been used successfully where termites occur.
- This issue is already adequately addressed in the code.

AF&PA’s Proposal
R320.1 Termite protection shall be provided by registered termiticides, including soil applied pesticides, baiting systems, and pesticides applied to wood, or other approved methods of termite protection labeled for use as a preventative treatment to new construction (see Section 202, Registered Termiticide). Subterranean termite control methods. In areas subject to damage from termites as indicated by Table R301.2(1), methods of protection shall be one of the following methods or a combination of these methods:

1. Registered termicide treatment, as provided in Section R320.2 (see Section 202, Registered Termicide).
2. Termite baiting system installed and maintained according to the label.
3. Pressure-preservative-treated wood in accordance with the AWPA standards listed in Section R319.1.
4. Naturally termite-resistant wood as provided in Section R320.3.

5. Physical barriers as provided in Section R320.4.

**R320.1.1 Quality mark.** Lumber and plywood required to be pressure-preserve-treated in accordance with Section R320.1 shall bear the quality mark of an approved inspection agency which maintains continuing supervision, testing and inspection over the quality of the product and which has been approved by an accreditation body which complies with the requirements of the American Lumber Standard Committee treated wood program.

**R320.1.2 Field treatment.** Field-cut ends, notches, and drilled holes of pressure-preserve-treated wood shall be retreated in the field in accordance with AWPA M4.

**R320.2 Registered termiticide treatment.** Registered termiticide treatment shall include soil treatment and/or field applied wood treatment. The concentration, rate of application and method of treatment of the chemical termiticide shall be in strict accordance with the termiticide label.

**R320.5 Pressure preservatively treated and Naturally resistant wood.** Heartwood of redwood and eastern red cedar shall be considered termite resistant. Pressure preservatively treated wood and naturally termite-resistant wood shall not be used as a physical barrier unless a barrier can be inspected for any termite shelter tubes around the inside and outside edges and joints of a barrier.

**R320.5.1 Field treatment.** Field cut ends, notches and drilled holes of pressure preservatively treated wood shall be retreated in the field in accordance with AWPA M4.

**R320.6 Barriers.** Approved physical barriers, such as metal or plastic sheeting or collars specifically designed for termite prevention, shall be installed in a manner to prevent termites from entering the structure. Shields placed on top of an exterior foundation wall are permitted to be used only if in combination with another method of protection. Pressure preservatively-treated wood and naturally termite-resistant wood shall not be used as a physical barrier unless a barrier can be inspected for any termite shelter tubes around the inside and outside edges and joints of a barrier.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Ranking 5/18/06</th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2=major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Members Comments and Reservations (5/18/06):**

- Does not say what should be treated in 3. Amend to show which pieces of wood should be treated.
- Elevated raised floor system, mud tubes, inspection to prevent, preservative treated lumber, will termites invade the building? Yes.
- If preservative treated lumber used, is this considered a full house preservative treatment?
- Providing preventative treatment should protect structure and its contents. Borate treatment applied to floor prevents entry into structure.
- Spraying is a halfway treatment measure, spraying replaces pressure treatment in the plant (less concentrated).
- This was intentionally left out when the termite provisions of the Code were developed.
• Real protection is the contract with the treatment company. Anything can happen to the structure.
• Pressure treatment preserves that piece of wood, not termites coming into the structure. Termites would tunnel over. Borates have ethylene glycol base which draws water from the air and provides better structural protection.
• Pressure treated lumber will not stop termites, they will use the treated wood to reach untreated wood. Will not keep termites out of the structure.
• Code addresses structural issues.
• Termites can damage other items. Who will repair damage?
• Pressure treated borates or spray on borates? Damage in door frames and window frames.
• The added language was originally struck by the Florida code. Make code statewide.
• Originally in code to prevent decay from moisture and rot.
• Can not rely on 3 to be a stand alone system, depends on method and chemical used unless specifically treated for termites.
• Quality mark not needed to be there.
• 320.5 currently in code presently in different place

DACS Proposal:
The Workgroup agreed to the following in concept with details to be worked out with Structural TAC.
*If wood treatment is used for subterranean termites, wood areas disturbed or added after initial treatment shall be retreated with a wood treatment.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3=minor reservations</th>
<th>2=major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Ranking</td>
<td>5/18/06</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Members Comments and Reservations (5/18/06):
• Wood added after treatment is a problem.
• Code already requires this.
• Disturbed means changed wood or added wood. If add bathtub framing or if cellulosic materials may be added. “Any cellulosic materials” to replace “wood”.
• Submit proposals with specific language in the code change cycle.
• Spray application is an option in the code. Should be mandatory.
• Would have a fight with DOW Chemical.
• Southern pine pressure treated wood does not need field treatment.
• W4 is species specific and not required for all wood.
• Subsequent to spray treatment with added wood, additional treatment is needed.
• Spray treatment or pressure treated wood as a choice.
• 2304? 320? If soil treatment is used, add this text.
• Field treatment would not necessary require a pesticide in W4, creosote?
The Workgroup agreed in concept that pipe sleeves should not be used for CPVC, and the issue should be reviewed by the Plumbing TAC. Pipe sleeving in general should be reviewed for issues of corrosion, insulation, and termite damage, and the Code amended as needed.

_Pipe sleeves shall not be used with CPVC. Require termite resistant material._

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Ranking</th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2= major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/18/06</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phil Koehler and Cindy will draft a code change proposal.

**Members Comments and Reservations (5/18/06):**
- Pipe sleeves: code does not prohibit wrapping with sleeves. Should prohibit sleeves. Plumbing code prohibits pipe sleeves. Rupture of PVC into the sleeves causes problems.
- CPVC has failed in Florida. Should not have sleeves going through concrete. Corrosion problems historically.
- Sleeves are only required for copper pipe.
- Settlement in footings from non-straight pipes. Sleeves allows movement of pipe. Nominal space.
- CPVC is used for hot water, will not have drain waste in pipe.
- Temperature effect.
- Water distribution or waste removal?
- Outside the scope of the work group.
- Prohibits the practice of the plumber, advise the plumbing TAC with recommendation.
- Pipe sleeving shall be of non-cellulose material. Termites tunnel through ¼ inch foam wrap etc.
- Should extend 6 inches below the slab.
- Should meet with Plumbing TAC on the sleeving issue, corrosion, termite issues.
- People do not want to wait a long time for hot water.
- Insulating water distribution systems, need thermal.

The Workgroup agreed that the Structural TAC should review all noncellulosic materials used in construction (i.e., rigid foam insulation, insulated concrete forms (ICF), above and below grade).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Ranking</th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2= major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/18/06</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Members Comments and Reservations (5/18/06):**
- Joint meeting with Structural TAC and Termite Work Group.
- 2007 code submittals due January 1, 2007
- Will be reviewed by the Structural TAC.
ATTACHMENT 1

TERMITE WORKGROUP

May 18, 2006—Tampa, Florida

Meeting Evaluation Results

*Average rank using a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 means totally disagree and 10 means totally agree.*

1. Please assess the overall meeting.

9.71 The background information was very useful.
9.00 The agenda packet was very useful.
9.57 The objectives for the meeting were stated at the outset.
9.42 Overall, the objectives of the meeting were fully achieved.
9.28 Overview of Workgroup Charge and Scope.
9.57 Presentation on Formosan Termites in Florida.
9.42 Presentation on Existing Control Efforts in Florida and Nationally.
9.14 Review of Proposed Modifications to Section 1816.1 and R320.1 and Related Definitions.
9.00 Adoption of Package of Recommendations to the Commission.

2. Please tell us how well the Facilitator helped the participants engage in the meeting.

9.50 The members followed the direction of the Facilitator.
9.50 The Facilitator made sure the concerns of all members were heard.
9.50 The Facilitator helped us arrange our time well.
9.50 Participant input was documented accurately.

3. What is your level of satisfaction with the meeting?

9.50 Overall, I am very satisfied with the meeting.
9.83 I was very satisfied with the services provided by the Facilitator.
9.50 I am satisfied with the outcome of the meeting.

4. What progress did you make?

8.83 I know what the next steps following this meeting will be.
8.83 I know who is responsible for the next steps.

5. Member’s Written Evaluation Comments.

• Good meeting.