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Options Ranking and Discussion Results

During the meeting, members were asked to develop and rank options, and following discussions and refinements, to propose specific refinements to address their reservations. The following scale was utilized for the ranking exercises:

<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>

Following are the options evaluated, the acceptability ranking of the options, member’s reservations regarding the options, and public comment:

OPTIONS EVALUATION WORKSHEET—BY CATEGORY

A. FLORIDA BUILDING CODE AND CODE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

1A. Seek Statutory authority for an "interim amendment" process in Chapter 553 for glitch and correlation amendments, and critical code changes that could be implemented in an expedited process using chapter 120.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Ranking 11/16/05</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>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):

- Critical code changes defined by proponent, may bypass process and create opportunities for additional code changes, creates another code cycle within the code cycle. Difficult to implement since “critical code changes” is too broad.
- We should not change the code once it is put in place.
- Either we define what a critical code change is or strike it.
- There is already an annual amendment opportunity, and with the triennial update, the process is sufficient.
- Already able to do local amendments.
STRAW POLL: eliminate critical code change from the proposal (2 prefer this option) or keep critical code change, with specific criteria that establish what a critical code change is (3 prefer this option).

Comments on Straw Poll:
- Not comfortable establishing critical code change definition, other processes are already in place to accommodate changes.
- Not good policy, definition of critical changes could change over time.
- Glitch, unanticipated effects of a change. Not a code change. Life safety issue, laws passed. Correlation issues.

Seek statute authority for an interim amendment process in chapter 553 that would utilize only chapter 120 requirements for adoption for, glitch and correlation amendments. Includes errata.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>Initial Ranking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/16/05</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2A. Develop/Require a coordinated code development/adopter schedule between the FBC and the FFPC, that provides sufficient time and strict deadlines to keep the Codes on the same adoption schedule. (A coordination effort would need to be initiated by FBC and DSFM).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>Initial Ranking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/16/05</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No comments.

3A. Develop a code adoption schedule that provides more time for the review and updating of the foundation (model) codes. (Note: the law was changed in 2005 to require 6 months after publication prior to implementation).

Members agreed that no action was needed on this option since adequate timeframes have already been implemented.

4A. When updating the FBC with the ICC, every Florida specific amendment should be required to explain why it is Florida specific, with explanatory material and rationale on why the ICC should be modified for Florida. (Already required by Rule 9B-3.050, on the code amendment submittal form).

Members agreed that no action was needed on this option since it is already required.
5A. **Develop/Require the ICC to serve as the foundation Code for the FBC, and the Commission would participate and propose all Florida Specific code amendments at the ICC, and if not accepted would sunset in Florida.** (Note: Commission rejected this in March of 2005, after the ICC Participation Workgroup process was completed).

<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>11/16/05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No comments.

6A. **Require the Commission to develop explanatory commentary for all Code amendments.** (Commission has existing authority in law, but decided to accomplish this through the Code amendment process). Policy change only:

<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>11/16/05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Members agreed this is a policy issue already decided by the Commission after a consensus building process (ICC Participation Workgroup).

7A. **All code amendments to the FBC must be required to strengthen, or at least not weaken, the existing FBC.** (Rule 9B-3.050 states amendments “must strengthen or improve”. This is also in Law, Chapter 553.73 (7)(a)).

Members agreed that no action was needed on this option since it is already required.

8A. **All Florida Specific amendments to the foundation code will sunset with subsequent updates of the Code.** (Would need to seek statutory authority for the automatic sunset provision; a 2005 law change requires the Commission to review and update all previous FBC amendments that are addressed by the updated foundation code).

<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>11/16/05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No comments.
9.A. Develop a publication schedule for all Code amendments and modifications that allows more time for public review in the process. (Currently law requires 45 day posting to the web before TAC’s consider, and TAC recommendations must be posted 45 days before the FBC considers recommendations. Then the Chapter 120 rule development process begins, with public hearings and additional noticing requirements. The Code can’t go into effect sooner that 6 months after the Code is made available).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>Initial Ranking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/16/05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No comments.

10.A. Implement a schedule with strict timelines requiring Florida to adopt Federal regulations into the FBC. (This is already required for the Accessibility Code; would require a statutory change for any other part of the Building Code based on Federal regulations).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>Initial Ranking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/16/05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):
- This should be considered on a case by case basis, There are implications for Florida from changes in Fair Housing etc.
- Would we change our Code to match federal regulations?
- Florida adopt federal regulations?
- Changing water output requirements could change the Florida Plumbing Code.
- Cherry picking regulations is difficult to do.

11.A. Seek legislation that would require the Legislature to recognize the Florida Building Commission as the experts in code development, and require that all Building Code requirements be developed by the Commission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>Initial Ranking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/16/05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No comments.
12.A. **Require training and education on the Code and changes to the Code, for all building officials (administrators, reviewers, and inspectors).** (Existing law requires all licensing boards to establish a minimum number of CEU hours on the Code for license renewal).

Members agreed that no action was needed on this option since there is an existing statutory body charged with this task (Building Code Education and Outreach Council).

**Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):**
- Won’t fly with licensing boards.
- There is a council that decides these issues.
- Education Outreach Council is already in place.

B. **THE FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION**

1.B. **Seek legislative authority for the Commission to be granted additional enforcement authority over local jurisdictions to ensure consistent enforcement of the Code.** (Specific recommendations and criteria would need to be developed).

<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 11/16/05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):**
- FS 468 and local jurisdictions have authority.
- The Commission should not get involved in licensing issues.
- BCAIB is statewide.
- Unequal enforcement throughout the state.
- Would take another state agency to support this.

**Public Comment (11/16/05):**
Additional enforcement authority means what? A Super authority?

2.B. **The composition of the Commission should be evaluated and revised to reflect adequate representation for all stakeholder groups.** (A statutory change would be required, and specific details of the recommendations should be developed).

<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 11/16/05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Comments.
3.B. **Have a vice-chair position on the Commission.** (Chair has existing authority to establish and select a vice-chair per rule 9B-3.004(3)).

Members agreed that no action was needed on this option since there is already authority for the Chair to appoint a vice-chair.

**Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):**
The intent behind this proposal was for the Commission to choose a vice chair.

The **Commission shall elect a Vice Chair by super majority annually.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</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>Initial Ranking 11/16/05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):**
- This takes authority away from the Chair. Ultimate authority falls on the Chair. He should propose candidates that the Commission votes on. Leave it to the discretion of the Chair. Involve the Commission in the process.
- Would not like a polarizing issue.
- The Chair should have the authority to appoint the Vice Chair.

4.B. **Chair appoint a “Legislative Liaison Committee” comprised of Commissioners, who would serve to ensure that the legislative agenda of the Commission is directly represented. The Committee will decide on the best format for creating/serving as a liaison between the FBC and Florida Legislature. The Committee recommends that any rule changes required to implement this recommendations be initiated.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</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>Initial Ranking 11/16/05</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):**
- The Commission should speak on its own behalf.
- Individual Commissioners should represent the Commission.
- No format for a committee of the Commission to address the legislature.
- The Department represents the Governor and not the Commission.
- There is no procedure for this.
5.B. Recommend that the Legislature create a specific Senate and/or House committee related to the Florida Building Code. Commission members could make presentations on related issues.

<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>11/16/05</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):
- This stands a better chance than 11A above.
- The President of the Senate has rules to follow to make committees.
- Appropriate to have a place to be heard.

6.B. Commission’s TAC’s should be evaluated in regards to membership, attendance, and participation, and procedures established to provide accountability.
(This authority exists for the Chair in Rule 9B-3.004(2), and is done annually in consultation with TAC/POC chairs).

Members agreed that no action was needed on this option since this is already done annually by the Commission’s Chair.

7.B. Communication and distribution of information should be enhanced through special web access for Commission members. Timely dissemination of information.
(Develop a recommendation to DCA for implementation of specifics).

<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>11/16/05</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):
- Not required by law. The Fire TAC used the FTP site for accessing files.
- A web link for Commissioners to access draft materials.
- Could be a sunshine issue.
- Difficult to make travel arrangements prior to the meeting. Needs 2-3 weeks. Otherwise airline tickets cost more.
- See Rule 9B-3.
- Attorney’s recommendation is needed. Not able to talk Commissioner to Commissioner.
- Don’t want to release to the public because it is not final.
- Public perception could be an issue.

Public Comment (11/16/05):
- Everyone should have access. It would help with travel arrangements.
8.B. Provide a mechanism to disseminate and forward relevant Commission/Code information to building departments. (Develop a recommendation to DCA for implementation of specifics).

Members agreed that no action was needed on this option since all code relates issues are already on the FBC’s website.

Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):
• What is relevant code information?
• Every code issue is discussed on the web site now.
• Is available to everyone now.

9.B. Review and establish strict deadlines for adding agenda items to the web posted agenda for TAC meetings (more than 7 days). (Develop a recommendation to DCA for implementation of specifics).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Ranking 11/16/05</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>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No comments.

10.B. Develop a mechanism for the Commission to collaborate with agencies and stakeholders involved in the Building Code system (i.e., licensing boards). (Specific recommendations to the Legislature would need to be developed; the Building Code Education and Outreach Council is an example of one existing initiative).

Members agreed that no action was needed on this option since existing forums already exist.

Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):
• The existing vehicles are already meeting what is needed.
• Another council is not needed.
• Do not need another opportunity, there are already sufficient venues available.
11.B. Evaluate the public comment opportunities at Commission meetings (provide more opportunities). (Process currently provides public comment opportunity on each substantive issue on the agenda, in addition to general public comment opportunities provided at each meeting/day; this is an internal FBC policy implemented through the split plenary session format).

Members agreed that no action was needed on this option since opportunity is already provided for all substantive issues before the Commission.

Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):
• When the public comment takes place is important.
• Need opportunity to speak before the Commission votes.

Public Comment (11/16/05):
• The audience has plenty opportunities.

12.B. Evaluate the location of Commission meetings to ensure all regions are covered (Panhandle region should be included). (FBC policy; limited by resources and availability of accessible hotels rooms and meeting space, and State spending guidelines).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>Initial Ranking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/16/05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):
• Would like an effort to meet in the Panhandle. Would like the opportunity to not have to travel overnight.
• Money should not limit the location of the meetings.
• Finding accessible accommodations large enough for the Commission is difficult in some regions of the State.

C. LOCAL ADMINISTRATION OF THE FLORIDA BUILDING CODE

1.C. The Commission conduct an assessment to survey local building officials on their needs regarding administration of the Code (i.e., training and education needs, staffing, funding, etc.). (Implement by prioritizing in the FBC’s Workplan).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>Initial Ranking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/16/05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):
• Local issue. Administration is not in the code. Will create havoc.
• Third party providers dangling issues in front of building officials. How do we encourage local building departments to compensate planners?
• Distribute to various administrations to let them know what is happening.
• The purpose is not to grade departments. Find range of issues in various departments. Not binding.
• Covered in administrative section. Do not have funding or man power to do this.

2.C.  Commission should seek an oversight role of local jurisdictions related to ensuring consistent code enforcement and interpretation. (Specific recommendations to the Legislature would need to be developed. Binding interpretations authority has already been established in law for this issue).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>Initial Ranking 11/16/05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No comments.

3.C.  A DCA position (State Ombudsman office) be created to serve as a mediator and facilitate on issues between the State and local jurisdictions. Legislative authority/support. (Would require further development, and Legislation to accomplish).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>Initial Ranking 11/16/05</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):
• We are calling the State to get answers. Creating a place that departments could call regarding building code issues. DCA staff would do other things.
• Need someone with communication skills.
• This is not needed.
• There are people who are doing this already.
• Creating a process, mediator, for and against an issue mediated by one person.
• Other opportunities exist now. TACs, local building officials. Not appropriate venue for advocacy, a staff person without oversight by the Commission.
The DCA create a position who’s responsibility is to serve as an accessible liaison between the public and the agency on issues between the agency and the public. Non-binding, information officer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>Initial Ranking 11/16/05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No comments.

4.C. The Commission should collaborate with licensing boards to develop and require education on the Code and tie back to licensure for enforcement.
(The law requires all licensing boards to establish a minimum number of CEU hours on the Code for license renewal, and 2005 Legislation created the Building Code Education and Outreach Council).

Members agreed that no action was needed on this option since the existing structure handles this issue.

Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):
• Some boards decided they were compliant with 0 hours.
• Boards are independent.

5.C. Encourage the development of training and education on the Code for job site supervisors and specialty subcontractors and tradesman who perform labor.
(Would require legislation to make mandatory; FBC could initiate a coordinated training and education effort if it is considered a priority).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>Initial Ranking 11/16/05</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):
• Can’t require unlicensed persons to take training.
• Creating licensure requirements is not within Commission’s authority.
• Courses exist for superintendents (FHBA, etc. trade associations).
• We are not in the business of creating courses, requiring and selling them.
6.C. **Require additional training and education for all building code system participants with oversight by local boards within their jurisdictions.**

Members agreed that no action was needed on this option and it is an aspect of 5.C.

**Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):**
- Establishes requirements for specialty trades.
- Already required by some local jurisdictions.

7.C. **Provide specific requirements in the Code to enhance enforceability of standards for products.** (Requires prioritization by the Commission, and implementation through the Code development process).

Members agreed that no action was needed on this option.

8.C. **Develop/Require building officials to attend training on all binding interpretations. Provide Commission funding to implement this provision.** (Requires Legislation).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Ranking 11/16/05</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>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):**
- Transportation.
- This is not necessary.
- On the web site.
- Flow chart should be developed.

**Encourage BOAF to provide training educational seminars related to binding interpretations.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Ranking 11/16/05</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>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No comments.
9.C. **FBC’s Code Administration TAC should be convened to take a proactive approach to reviewing and developing recommendations related to Code administration.**

(Would require Commission prioritization as a policy decision, with clear objectives established).

<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 11/16/05</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No comments.

10.C. **Reconvene the Roofing Subcommittee.** (Would require Commission prioritization as a policy decision, with clear objectives established. The Group meets as needed, and is currently considering enhancements to the FRC).

Members agreed that no action was needed on this option since the subcommittee may be convened at any time.

**Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):**
- Should we create a roofing TAC? In light of the recent hurricanes.
- Rick is considering this.
- The roofing subcommittee meeting currently is looking at the residential code.

**Commission should creates a Roofing TAC.**

<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 11/16/05</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):**
- Would need funding.
- Don’t want an “ombudsmen” between the Structural TAC and Roofing TAC.
- Problems with meetings, members.
- Finances.
- Subgroup, ad hoc, need more formal establishment roofing subgroup.
D. CODE COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT—EDUCATION AND TRAINING

1.D. Comprehensive effort should be initiated to coordinate and collaborate with all of the agencies involved (Commission, DBPR, licensing boards, etc.) on education and training requirements.

(FBC has had previous efforts initiated by the Education TAC; this role was transferred to the Building Code Education and Outreach Council. Would require specific recommendations to determine implementation strategy).

Members agreed that no action was needed on this option since existing forums already exist.

Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):
- The legislature created a Council.
- Commission participates in the Council.

2.D. Develop/Require training and education for all participants who implement the Code (Job site supervisors and specialty subcontractors and tradesman who perform labor).

(Would require legislation to make mandatory; FBC could initiate a coordinated training and education effort).

Members agreed that no action was needed on this option since previous action addressed this issue.

The Commission recommends to the Legislature that additional specialty licensure categories related to structural and building envelope installations be created in the state.

<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 11/16/05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):
- Need 15 year time plan to implement.
- Not able to implement.
- State issues with testing, licensing.
- Would require listing all subcontractors on permit.
- Issue not related to building code scope. Out of field.
- Not needed.
- Many responsibilities of various persons involved, unnecessary.
Commission encourage development of training and education opportunities for job site supervisors and subcontractors who participate in the construction of the structure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>Initial Ranking 11/16/05</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):
- There is no need to develop anything if you cannot require people to take it.
- Recommend to Legislature to require training/licensure.
- It encourages new classifications of licensure.

3.D. Develop/Require coordination and cross-training between building and fire officials on the respective codes.
(Joint Building Fire TAC is working to coordinate; FBC could develop courses on overlaps; legislation would be required to make mandatory).

Members agreed that no action was needed on this option.

Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):
- Huge coordination problem. Conflict can’t be resolved. It’s a problem. Need coordinated code. Fire code has existing, labor, unions, different base codes.
- If goes to the legislature, building code will lose. Building code subservient to fire marshal.
- People do not want their authority to be “usurped”.

Commission encourages coordination and cross-training between building and fire officials on the respective codes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>Initial Ranking 11/16/05</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.D. Revise the education system to encourage and support participation in trades and construction labor. Develop apprenticeship programs and training working with VoTechs. (Would require detailed recommendations through a stakeholder consensus-building process, with funding, and legislation to implement).

Members agreed that no action was needed on this option since it would be impossible to implement and is outside the Commission’s purview.
5.D. **Develop/Require training for all disciplines related to changes to the Code.**

(Law requires all licensing boards to establish a minimum number of CEU hours on the Code for license renewal).

*Members agreed that no action was needed on this option.*

6.D. **Work with universities to develop quality training courses on the accessibility code and the Building Code.** (Would require legislation to make mandatory; FBC could initiate a coordinated training and education effort if considered a priority).

*Members agreed that no action was needed on this option.*

**Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):**
- Universities should develop courses and conduct training.
- Engineers said training was a waste of time.
- Trades people have a different level of training.
- No action.

7.D. **Develop/Require qualifications for trainers and criteria for materials taught. Ensure proper qualifications and quality courses are developed and taught.**

(FBC would need to prioritize and initiate through Education POC in cooperation with licensing boards).

*Members agreed that no action was needed on this option, handled by licensing boards.*

**Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):**
- Licensing board require courses.

8.D. **Develop Hazard mitigation training to provide for insurance discounts for homeowners who participate. Educate homeowner on what they need to do when a hurricane comes and how to prepare for storm events.**

(FBC would need to prioritize and conduct joint initiative with public service entities).

*Members agreed that no action was needed on this option, outside Commission’s purview.*

**Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):**
- Not in the realm of the Commission.
9.D. Develop/Require builders to implement a quality control program for construction of homes with government oversight. (Would require a consensus-building process to develop recommendations, and subsequent legislative authority to implement).

<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>11/16/05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):
- Qualitative issues are market driven.
- Quality is subjective and consumer driven.
- Consumer decision.

10.D. Provide consumer education related to the use of hiring unlicensed contractors, and provide penalties for hiring unlicensed contractors. (FBC would need to prioritize and initiate project in conjunction with the respective licensing boards).

Members agreed that no action was needed on this option since this is handled by DBPR.

Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):
- DBPR has taken on this issue.
- No action needed, outside FBC’s scope.
- Done at local level. Building officials, enforcement issue. Not building code issue.

11.D. Provide education and outreach to unlicensed contractors.
(FBC would need to prioritize and initiate project in conjunction with the respective licensing boards).

Members agreed that no action was needed on this option since this is handled by DBPR.

Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):
- Where do we find them?
- This is a DBPR issue.

12.D. Provide penalties for contractors who do not close out permits and allow permits to expire. (Requires statutory authority, and a consensus-building process to develop specific recommendations).

Members agreed that no action was needed on this option since this is outside FBC’s scope.
Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):
• Local level. Administrative chapters.
• Local building department issue.
• Outside scope of the Commission.
• Flooded with permits, at the final inspection, contractors were gone. Owner responsible.
• Chapter 1 local level, outside the scope of the Commission.

E. PRODUCT APPROVAL SYSTEM

The Ad Hoc voted unanimously that all recommendations related to Product Approval, are directed toward the POC and related Workgroups, and are offered to support existing efforts.

1.E. Recommendation to POC that Develop a streamlined Commission approval process with consent agendas.
(Refer to POC to develop recommendations for FBC implementation).

<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 11/16/05</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):
• Procedure is onerous, to read every product application.
• Do with consent agendas.
• POC should develop an implementation plan.
• Get an AG opinion.

2.E. Recommend that the POC establish strict cut-off dates for review, and require the list of products posted to the website to be the same list the POC reviews. Changes to the final posted list must be made by the POC at the meeting, and not the administrator prior to the meeting.
(Refer to POC to develop recommendations for FBC implementation).

<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 11/16/05</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):
• Wireless connection to the server would provide the report to the public at the time it is available to the committee.
• The effort to get applications approved, not following rules provided.
• There is no approval until the Commission meets.
3.E. **Recommendation to POC to Eliminate the conditional approval status.**
(Refer to POC to develop recommendations for FBC implementation).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>Initial Ranking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):**
- Conditional status is necessary.
- Necessary, small issues that can be corrected and approved.
- If do not meet conditions, will be denied.

4.E. **Recommend to POC that validation to be a technical review.**
(Refer to POC to develop recommendations for FBC implementation).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>Initial Ranking</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**No comments.**

5.E. **Recommendation to POC that Quality assurance program inspections should be conducted every two years (instead of annually).** (Refer to POC to develop recommendations and FBC implementation by rule change).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>Initial Ranking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):**
- Would like to confer with manufacturers.

6.E. **Recommendation to POC to develop and implement an accelerated revocation process for noncompliant product approvals.** (FBC is required to follow Chapter 120 procedures for licensing).

*Members agreed that no action was needed on this option since POC is already working on this.*
Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):
- Product failure, allows damage to occur in the 120 process.
- We need to be able to revoke the product during revocation process.

Support POC’s effort and support appropriate recommendation to the legislature to implement revocation process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Ranking 11/16/05</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>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.E. Recommendation to POC to Develop checklists indicating what information is required for application submittal and validation. (Refer to POC to develop recommendations for FBC implementation).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Ranking 11/16/05</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>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):
- Recommend the POC with the administrator to develop this.
- Was in rule for local approval.

8.E. Recommendation to POC to Develop a process with criteria for grading and disciplining A & E validators and evaluators and notify appropriate boards, regarding those that continue to have problems with their submittals (i.e., a three strike system).
   Similar process for certification agencies to notify accreditors.
(Refer to POC to develop recommendations for FBC implementation).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Ranking 11/16/05</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>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):
- Valid idea. How to implement?
- Agree with concept. What criteria will need to decided.
- Don’t like grading.
- Need to define and work out details.
9.E. **Recommendation to POC to Identify and standardize which compliance options may be selected for the different product categories.**
(Refer to POC to develop recommendations for FBC implementation; legislation is required).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>Initial Ranking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/16/05</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No comments.

10.E. **Recommendation to POC to Develop clear and consistent criteria for each compliance method, with a fill-in-the-blank as-you-go application to facilitate.**
(Refer to POC to develop recommendations for FBC implementation).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>Initial Ranking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/16/05</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):
- POC is dealing with this. Many products and product types. Compliance options?
- Part of an ongoing process

11.E. **Recommendation to POC to Require uniformity of information posted to the website for all compliance methods used for product approval.**
(Refer to POC to develop recommendations for FBC implementation).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>Initial Ranking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/16/05</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No comments.

12.E. **Recommendation to POC to Educate the public on the product approval system and website.**

Members agreed no action is needed because of existing efforts by Education POC and others.
**Recommend to POC to Label products with the product approval number.** ((Refer to POC to develop recommendations for FBC implementation; may require legislative authority for labeling if not accomplished through the Code).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>Initial Ranking 11/16/05</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):**
- Producing leaflets in education on all aspects of code. Includes handout on product approval for distribution through the building departments.
- Create label or engrave product with approval number.
- POC is looking at the issue.

**F. BUILDING CODE INFORMATION SYSTEM**

1.F. **For Product Approval: Once a product is approved do not allow manufacturer to make additional changes to the application.** (Refer to POC to develop recommendations for FBC implementation).

Members agreed that no action was needed on this option and to refer to POC.

2.F. **Recommend Education POC implement a campaign to make the public and all system participants aware of the BCIS and the information contained within the site.** (Recommend to DCA).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>Initial Ranking 11/16/05</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):**
Refer to the Education POC

3.F. **Implement refinements to the system to make it more user friendly and accessible (Especially in regards to the Product Approval System).** (Currently in development).

Members agreed that no action was needed on this option since this is already under development.
4.F. Simplify the web pages by removing the DCA information wrapped around each of the pages. (Recommend to DCA).

<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>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initial Ranking
11/16/05

No comments.

G. MANUFACTURED BUILDINGS PROGRAM

1.G Recommend POC Implement a system to ensure that alterations and attachments to approved buildings are required to comply with the Code. (Recommend that an education program be developed by the POC).

<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>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initial Ranking
11/16/05

No comments.

2.G. Support POCs existing efforts to design the system to identify and resolve problems related to the program and the product. (Refer to POC to develop specific recommendations).

<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>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initial Ranking
11/16/05

No comments.

3.G. Support efforts by Education POC to Implement an education and training program/campaign to clarify and publicize the roles and responsibilities of the various system participants (i.e., permitting, inspection, installation, etc.) (Recommend that an education program be developed by the POC).

<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>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initial Ranking
11/16/05

Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):
- There are serious issues such as plumbing, etc.
4.G. **Recommend Product Approval POC to develop a list of approved uses for the fees collected from the program (i.e., training on the program).** (Refer to POC for recommendations to the Commission).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Ranking 11/16/05</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>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):**
- Recommended fees be lowered.

**H. PROTOTYPE BUILDINGS PROGRAM**

1.H. **Encourage Product Approval POC implement a campaign to market and publicize the program and identify the program’s uses and limitations.** (Recommend that an education program be developed by the POC).

*Members agreed that no action was needed on this option since this has been done in the last contract update.*

**Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):**
- Reevaluate scope of contract.
- More relevant to public sector, he has more success with tract builders.
- He has not explored design professionals who market state approved plans.

**I. PRIVATE PROVIDER SYSTEM**

1.I. **Seek statutory authority to require that private providers can only be used if they do a turn-key operation (responsible for all aspects of permitting, inspection, and approval).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Ranking 11/16/05</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>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):**
- Would be like a building department, requires legislation.
- Limits use of local authority having jurisdictions.
- Would not be able to hire it out.
- Circumvents consensus of private provider workgroup process.
2.I. **Recommend to the Legislature that the program be eliminated.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>Initial Ranking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/16/05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):**

- Contrary to existing law, circumvents existing building departments ability to use the system.

3.I. **Recommend to the Legislature that local building departments receive sufficient funding to properly perform their duties and responsibilities.**

*Members agreed that no action was needed on this option since this is not under FBC’s purview.*

**Member’s Comments and Reservations (11/16/05):**

- Building departments lose personnel to private providers who pay higher.
- No action, not within purvey or scope of Commission.
- Local issue.

**Additional Issue:**

The Florida Building Commission recommends to the legislature that the authority for sizing of private sewage systems be governed by definitions provided in the Florida Building Code.

[Requires legislative change.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>Initial Ranking</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/16/05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Ad Hoc Committee voted unanimously, 6 – 0 in support, to adopt the package of recommendations for submittal to the Commission.