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OVERVIEW OF COMMISSION’S KEY DECISIONS

TUESDAY, MAY 2, 2006

Agenda Review and Approval
The Commission voted unanimously, 20 - 0 in favor, to approve the agenda as presented. Following are the key agenda items approved for consideration:

- To Consider the Report on the Panhandle Windborne Debris Region Study.
- To Consider/Decide on Legal Issues and Petitions for Declaratory Statements.
- To Consider/Decide on Approval of Products and Product Approval Entities.
- To Consider/Decide on Chair's Discussion Issues/Recommendations.
- To Review and Update the Workplan.
- To Conduct a Supplemental Hearing on Rule 9B-1, Manufactured Buildings.
- To Consider/Decide on Accessibility Waiver Applications.
- To Consider/Decide on Accessibility and Code Administration TAC’s Reports/Recommendations.
- To Consider/Decide on Product Approval/Prototype Buildings/Manufactured Buildings Program, and Education Program Oversight Committees (POC’s) Report/Rec’s.
- To Hear an Update on the 2006 Legislative Session.
- To Consider/Decide on TAC Recommendations Regarding 2006 Glitch Amendments to the 2004 FBC.
- To Receive General Public Comment.
- To Discuss Commissioner Issues and Identify Proposed Agenda Items.
- To Review Committee Assignments and Issues for the Next Commission meeting—July 11 - 12, 2006 in Hollywood.

Review and Approval of the March 21 - 22, 2006 Minutes and Facilitator’s Summary Reports
Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 20 - 0 in favor to approve the March 21 - 22, 2006 Minutes and Facilitator’s Summary Report as presented.
Report on Panhandle Wind Borne Debris Study (Dr. Larry Twisdale, ARA and Peter Vickery, ARA)

Chairman Rodríguez provided the Commission with an overview of the Panhandle Windborne Debris Region project. The Chair noted that the 2005 Florida Legislature debated whether to revise the definition of the windborne debris region along the panhandle coast from Franklin County to the Alabama border and determined further study was warranted. It directed the Florida Building Commission to review the effects of Hurricane Ivan on damage caused by windborne debris and other data, and in conjunction with building officials from the impacted areas, to develop a recommendation for consideration by the 2006 Legislature.

On September 13, 2005 the Commission conducted the first workshop which was held at the Okaloosa County Airport, for the purpose of soliciting input from local building officials and other stakeholders in the Panhandle region of the State. At the conclusion of the workshop, there was consensus for the strategy of conducting a study on the treed environment effects and historical wind data effects, in order to provide additional data for consideration in developing recommendations to the Legislature.

It should be noted that although the building officials from the Florida Panhandle expressed support for the study, all but one agreed that changes were not warranted at this time to the definition of the windborne debris region of the Florida Panhandle region. The local building officials’ comments ranged from most damage was related to surge and not windborne debris, to the Panhandle is a unique environment that ASCE 7 does not adequately reflect, to extra windborne debris protection should be voluntary and not mandatory, to mandatory protection will increase the cost of already unaffordable housing in the region.

Subsequent to the Panhandle workshop, at the October 2005 meeting, the Commission voted unanimously to request budgetary authority to contract with a consultant to conduct an engineering based risk assessment of hurricane windborne debris protection options for the Panhandle in order to analyze the risks, costs, and benefits of windborne debris protection for the region. The research will focus on factors unique to the Panhandle region including treed areas inland of the coast, and consider historical wind data effects. The requested funding authorization was approved, and the consultant updated the Commission at our February 2006 meeting.

At the February 2006 Commission meeting, the consultant reported that the goal of the study is to perform wind tunnel tests for houses located in treed environments characteristic of the Florida Panhandle, and to develop computer models for analysis of wind borne debris protection effects for representative Panhandle houses. The consultant has subsequently: updated the windborne debris model; conducted validation simulations of Hurricanes Andrew, Charley, Ivan and Bonnie neighborhoods and compared results to physical data sets collected for those neighborhoods and storms, and; conducted simulations of ASCE 7, clear cut, lightly treed and medium treed terrain subdivisions to establish roofing debris data for individual house risk assessments that will be conducted in the final phase. To date, wind tunnel tests have been conducted, hurricane data has been analyzed, computer models modified and validated and subdivision level debris simulations have been conducted.
At the conclusion of the Panhandle Study update provided at the February 2006 meeting, the Commission voted unanimously to recommend that the Legislature remove the Panhandle Windborne Debris Region definition from law, thereby authorizing the Commission to adopt a new definition within the Code by rule.

The Chair noted that the Commission is committed to working with stakeholders to develop consensus on a new definition to be developed and adopted by rule into the Code. To this end, the Commission conducted a second Panhandle region workshop on February 16, 2006, where stakeholders were presented with an update on the research project’s status and the Commission’s recommendation to the Legislature. In addition, the Commission remains committed to working with stakeholders in a consensus based process once the Study is complete.

It should be noted, explained the Chair, that the Commission’s decision to proceed with this regional strategy, is consistent with State policy of recognizing that Florida is a diverse State geographically and climatically, and risks are not uniform throughout the State. On this basis, the Florida Building Code and National Engineering Standards consider requirements specific to different regions of the State, when and where appropriate, such as, the High Velocity Hurricane Zone (HVHZ) provisions of the Code specific to Miami-Dade and Broward counties in Southeast Florida, and variations of design wind speeds relative to proximity to Florida’s coasts. In addition, the Commission has always advised that Code should be developed by the Commission in a consensus process and not written into law.

The Chair reported that SB 1774 passed the Senate, and pending approval in the House, the Panhandle Windborne Debris Region exemption will be removed from law, and the Commission, as requested, will be authorized to designate the Panhandle Windborne Debris Region based on the ARA modeling. The Commission will be authorized to use only Chapter 120 requirements for rule adoption, and the rule must take effect no later than May 31, 2007.

The Chair noted the Panhandle Windborne Debris Region issue is an important regional issue, and the Commission has always been committed to providing access to those most impacted by an issue, and on this basis the Chair decided to call a special one-day Commission meeting to be held in the Panhandle region to discuss this issue so the Commission can implement the provisions as quickly as possible. The Chair explained that the process we will be as follows:

- A special one-day Commission meeting will be convened on June 19 or 21 depending on logistics—to receive final reporting by ARA on “end to end” results of the study and to decide on the designation of the wind borne debris region for the Panhandle, and
- The Commission will conduct a supplemental rule development workshop at the July meeting to integrate the wind borne debris region designation into the current 2006 Code amendment process, this will roll the Panhandle definition into the current Glitch Code rule development process, and
- The final hearing on the 2006 Code amendments will move to the August Commission meeting.
Chairman Rodriguez explained that at the March 2006 meeting, Dr. Twisdale and Dr. Vickery provided the Commission with an overview of results from Phase I of the Study, the Wind Tunnel Test. At the May 2006 meeting, Dr. Larry Twisdale and Dr. Kurt Gurley provided the Commission with additional results obtained to date on the Study and answer member’s questions.

CHAIR’S DISCUSSION ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Appreciation for Steve Corn
Chairman Rodriguez, on behalf of the Commission, expressed appreciation to Commissioner Steve Corn for his years of dedicated, professional, and selfless service on behalf of his profession, industry, the Commission, and the citizens of Florida. The Chair expressed that Steve has been a tremendous contributor to the Commission and will be missed. Commissioner Corn, in his role as the General Contractor representative has served since November 22, 1999.

B. Roofing TAC
The Chair explained that after reviewing a list of recommendations from industry and a large list of volunteers, as well as considering the ANSI representation requirements in Commission rule, requiring appointment of 11 members, three (3) of whom must be producers, three (3) consumers, and five (5) general interest, he was appointing the following individuals to serve on the Roofing TAC:

3 Producer members (contractors and manufacturers):
Chris Schulte as chair, Commissioner Schulte is a roofing contractor,
Billy Cone, Billy is a roofing contractor and chairs the Florida Roofing and Sheet Metal Association Code Committee, and
Buck Buchanan, Buck is a roof deck system specialist and product provider.

3 Consumer members (architects and engineers, building owners, and insurance):
Karen Warseck, Karen is an architect,
Jeff Burton, Jeff represents the insurance industry, and
Jimmie Buckner, Jimmie is an engineer.

5 General Interest members (government, academic, and general citizens):
Mark Zehnal, mark is a roofing specialist with the Miami-Dade County Code Compliance Office,
Morris Swope, Morris is a retired roofing contractor,
Jon Hamrick, Commissioner Hamrick represents public schools,
Doug Murdock, Doug is a building official from Gainesville, and
Nan Dean, Commissioner Dean will fill our third commissioner position on the TAC.

The Chair expressed that the Commission wishes to thank all of the individuals who expressed an interest in participating on the Roofing TAC, and although only eleven members could be selected, each of you are invited to attend and participate in the TAC’s open meeting process.
C. **TAC Chair Changes**
The Chair explained that as a result of Steve Corn’s resignation from the Commission, he was appointing Dale Greiner to serves as Energy TAC chair, Dale’s position as Chair of the Plumbing TAC will be filled by Randy Vann. The Chair indicated he will fill the other Commission member position to the Plumbing TAC once the Governor has made an appointment to replace Commissioner Corn.

Chairman Rodriguez noted that Doug Murdock has agreed to move from the Code Administration TAC to the Roofing TAC, and John O’Connor is appointed to the Code Administration TAC to replace Doug.

The Chair stated that on behalf of the Commission, he would like to appreciate each of the individuals who have agreed to serve on the Commission’s TAC’s and POC’s, and to thank those members who are rolling-off for their dedicated service to the citizens of Florida.

E. **Temporary Building Foundation Issue**
Chairman Rodriguez noted that at the last legislative conference call the Commission voted to recommend that the Legislature defer action on any legislation related to the temporary building foundation issue, and the refer the issue to the Commission for development. The Chair expressed the Commission’s sincere appreciation to the Governor and the Governor’s office for their continued support of the Commission and the Commission process, in this instance exemplified by not supporting proposed temporary building foundation language being attached to the Commission’s bill(s), since this Code issue had not been evaluated and recommendations developed by the Commission.

F. **Workgroup Meeting Dates**
Chairman Rodriguez reviewed the meeting schedule for the Commission’s various workgroups. The schedule is as follows:
- Product Approval Validation Workgroup—May 3 - 4, and June 1, 2006 in Tampa.
- Termite Workgroup—May 18, 2006 in Tampa.

**Review and Update of Commission’s Workplan and Meeting Schedule**

**Commission Actions:**

**Motion**—The Commission voted unanimously, 16 - 0 in favor, to approve the updated workplan and meeting schedule as presented, with the exception of item 12 (2007 Code Update schedule) which was discussed separately, to reflect the Commission’s priorities.

*(Included as Attachment 2—Commission’s Updated Workplan)*
Supplemental Hearing on Rule 9B-1, Manufactured Buildings
Chairman Rodriguez noted that at the August 2005 meeting the Commission held a rule adoption hearing to implement proposed changes to the Manufactured Buildings Rule. The changes are intended to clarify the programmatic procedures of the Manufactured Buildings Program. These changes include refinements to the following sections of the Rule: Procedures; Definitions; Fees; Inspections & Insignias. The purpose of the supplemental hearing was to solicit public comment on proposed revisions to the fee structure. The Supplemental Hearing on Rule 9B-1, Manufactured Buildings, was opened, public comments requested, and the revised fee schedule read into the record. Following the hearing, the Commission took the following action:

Commission Actions:
Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 16 - 0 in favor, to notice the proposed changes reflecting the revised fees and to proceed with rule adoption for Rule 9B-1, Manufactured Buildings.

Consideration of Accessibility Waiver Applications
The Commission reviewed and decided on the Waiver applications submitted for their consideration.

Consideration of Applications for Product and Entity Approval
Commissioner Carson presented the committee’s recommendations for entities and Jeff Blair presented the committee’s recommendations for product approvals. The results of product and entity applications are found in the Product Approval POC report included as an attachment to the minutes.

Legal Issues

Petitions For Declaratory Statements
Following are the actions taken by the Commission on petitions for declaratory statements.

Second Hearings

DCA05-DEC-219 by Dr. Humayoun Farooq, PE, Al-Farooq Corporation
Motion—The Commission voted 20 – 0 in favor, to approve their previous action on the petition.

DCA06-DEC-014 by Kevin McGrath, P.E. for Four Seasons Solar Products, LLC
Motion—The Commission voted 22 – 0 in favor, to approve their previous action on the petition.

DCA06-DEC-067 by Joseph Hetzel, P.E., DASMA
Motion—The Commission voted 22 – 0 in favor, to approve their previous action on the petition.
DCA06-DEC-068 by Jack Glenn, CBO for Florida Home Builders Association

Motion—The Commission voted 21 – 0 in favor, to approve their previous action on the petition.

DCA06-DEC-072 by Diego Rivera for Diritec Corporation

Motion—The Commission voted 20 – 0 in favor, to approve their previous action on the petition.

First Hearings

DCA06-DEC-092 by Dennis Fischer, Building Official, City of Edgewater

This petition was deferred to the local appeal board.

DCA06-DEC-094 by James V. Miller, President, QMI Security Solutions

The POC tabled action on this Declaratory statement until the July 2006 meeting, requesting that the petitioner be present to provide clarification and answer concerns of the POC members.

Update on the 2006 Legislative Session

Jim Richmond updated the Commission on the status of proposed bill(s) supporting the Commission’s recommendations to the 2006 Legislature as well as other legislative issues of interest to the Commission, and answered member’s questions. Jim noted that SB 1774 passed the Senate, and pending approval in the House, the Legislature is providing the Commission with Glitch Amendment authority, removing the Exposure Category C definition and Panhandle Windborne Debris Region definition/exemption from law, and providing a prohibition for interpretations of the Accessibility Code.

Code Amendment Process Review Workgroup’s Report and Recommendations

Chairman Rodriguez noted that the Code Amendment Process Review Workgroup met for Phase I consideration in Tampa on April 19, 2006. The Chair explained that the Workgroup is tasked with a short-term (Phase I) scope and a long-term (Phase II) scope. The scope of the Workgroup in the short-term is to make a recommendation regarding the 2007 Code Update schedule. The long-term focus of the Workgroup will be to deliver recommendations to the Commission regarding proposed enhancements to the annual interim amendment and triennial code update processes. The Workgroup has developed a consensus recommendation regarding the 2007 Update schedule.

Jeff Blair reported that the Workgroup developed consensus recommendations and is recommending:
Proposed amendments to the 2006 I Codes with Florida amendments due date: 1/1/07
Printed Codes available to the public: 6/1/08*
Code Implemented 1/1/09 *

* Note: the Workgroup agreed on a 1/1/07 start date, and a 1/1/09 implementation date. Staff worked the schedule with the 1/1/07 start date, maintained all of the required timelines, correlated with the ICC document development schedule, and determined the Code could be implemented on 10/1/08 instead of 1/1/09 and still comply with the 6 month delayed implementation determined by the Workgroup. Staff is recommending an implementation date of 10/1/08, with printed codes available to the public on 4/1/08.

The Workgroup recommends that publication of the Florida Building Code, as required by law, be defined as a printed document available to the public.
The Workgroup recommends that Florida specific amendments will only be reconsidered if the issue has been amended/addressed in the I-Code update. Otherwise all other Florida specific amendments will be carried forward and not subject to an automatic reconsideration. (Note: this is required by law, Chapter 553.73(6) F.S.).

Following discussion and public comment, the Commission took the following actions:

**Commission Actions:**

- **Motion**—The Commission voted unanimously, 20 - 0 in favor, that publication is defined as a printed document available to the public, Florida specific amendments will only be reconsidered if the issue has been amended/addressed in the I-Code update, and the schedule for the 2007 Code update process will be as follows:

  Proposed amendments to the 2006 I Codes with Florida amendments due date: 1/1/07
  Printed Codes available to the public: 4/1/08
  Code Implemented 1/1/09.

**Committee Reports and Recommendations**

**Accessibility TAC**
Commissioner Gross presented the Committee’s report, which was accepted unanimously, 21 – 0 in favor. *(See Commission Minutes for Committee report)*

**Commission Actions:**

- **Motion**—The Commission voted unanimously, 20 – 0 in favor to invite FDOT to make a presentation on detectable warnings at the next TAC meeting.

- **Motion**—The Commission voted unanimously, 20 – 0 in favor forward TAC’s comments on hotel accessibility issues to the Sheraton Safari Hotel, and to explore the feasibility of conducting a charrette on pool access.

- **Motion**—The Commission voted unanimously, 20 – 0 in favor to send a letter to Building Officials regarding exceptions to vertical accessibility, and for staff to make a presentation at the BOAF meeting.
Code Administration TAC
Commissioner D’Andrea presented the Committee’s report, which was accepted unanimously, 21 – 0 in favor. (See Commission Minutes for Committee report)

Education POC
Commissioner Browdy presented the Committee’s report, which was accepted unanimously, 23 – 0 in favor. (See Commission Minutes for Committee report)

Commission Actions—Education POC:
Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 23 – 0 in favor, that in order for a course to be accredited, a minimum of 50% of the material must be code related.
Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 23 – 0 in favor, that Accreditors will not accredit courses for other accreditors who approve their courses.
Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 23 – 0 in favor, to approve the minimum criteria for instructor lead courses as presented.
Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 23 – 0 in favor, that Providers shall have 60 days to update existing advanced code courses that are affected by code changes to accommodate those changes from the date of their approval. Code updated courses shall be submitted for re-accreditation within that 60 day period but may continue to be offered during the interim.
Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 23 – 0 in favor, approve the consent agenda for recommended approval of courses.
Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 23 – 0 in favor, to approve the consent agenda for recommended approval of updated courses.
Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 23 – 0 in favor, to approve the consent agenda for recommended approval of fact sheets.
(See Commission Minutes for Committee report)

Product Approval/Prototype Building/Manufactured Buildings Programs Oversight Committee (POC)
Commissioner Carson presented the Committee’s report, which was accepted unanimously, 21 – 0 in favor. (See Commission Minutes for Committee report)

Commission Actions:
Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 18 – 0 in favor, to approve Force Engineering & Testing, Inc. as a test laboratory.
Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 18 – 0 in favor, to approve IRT-ARCON, Inc. as a test laboratory.
Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 18 – 0 in favor, to approve Testing Evaluation Laboratories, Inc. as a test laboratory.
Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 21 – 0 in favor, to extend ARA’s contract for Prototype Building Administrator for one more year.
Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 21 – 0 in favor, to extend A&A’s contract for Product Approval Administrator for one more year.
Consider Proposed 2006 Glitch Amendments to the 2004 FBC and TAC Recommendations
At the February 2006 meeting, the Commission voted unanimously to consider only amendments related to hurricane provisions, glitch, and standards updates and correlation issues, during the 2006 annual interim amendment process—2006 Glitch Amendments.
At the March 2006 meeting, the Commission voted unanimously to adopt the proposed Glitch Code Amendment review process. Jeff will review the process with us before we begin to consider proposed amendments to the 2004 Code, but before he does I would like to reiterate a few key points regarding the Commission’s adopted Glitch Amendment consideration process:

First, only Commission members may pull amendments from the consent agendas for individual consideration, there will be no automatic courtesy pulls resulting from public comment.

Second, amendments pulled from the “no recommendation to approve” and “does not meet glitch” agendas must have discussion by the Commission on why they are a glitch modification, since the Commission voted unanimously that all amendments considered during the 2006 annual interim amendment process must meet the “glitch criteria”.

Third, all Commission members should be prepared to vote:
1. In favor of the consent agenda “TAC recommends approval as submitted meets glitch criteria”,
2. Against approval of the consent agenda “not recommended to approve by TAC”, (a negative roll call vote).
3. Against approval of the consent agenda “does not meet glitch criteria (TAC recommended approval)”, (a negative roll call vote).

It is important that if a Commissioner can not vote as recommended above, each of you must determine which, if any amendments to pull for individual consideration, so you are able to vote for each of the three consent agendas as approved by the Commission.

Jeff Blair reviewed the process with the Commission and the Commission took the following actions:

Commission Actions:
Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 22 – 0 in favor, to adopt the standing motion to approve as presented.
(Included as Attachment 3—Commission’s Adopted Standing Motion to Approve)

The Commission reviewed the TAC’s recommendations on each of the proposed amendments for the 2006 Annual Interim Amendment/Glitch process, considered written comments, provided an opportunity for public comment, and voted on each of the proposed amendments. At the conclusion of reviewing amendments the Commission took the following action:
Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 22 – 0 in favor, to adopt their package of recommendations consistent with the Commission’s action on each of the proposed Glitch Code amendments, and to hold a supplemental rule development workshop on proposed Glitch Code Amendments at the July 2006 Commission meeting.
**Commission Member Comment/Issues**
Chairman Rodriguez invited members of the Commission to address the Commission. Commissioner Bassett requested that DCA return to using paper instead of web/electronic based Commission documents.

**Commission Member Agenda Items**
Chairman Rodriguez invited Commission members to propose issues for the Commission’s next (July 2006) meeting. No Commission members offered any agenda items.

**General Public Comment**
Chairman Rodriguez invited members of the public to address the Commission on any issues under the Commission’s purview. No members of the public offered general public comment except to express a collective “Good Job!”.

**Adjourn**
The Commission voted unanimously, 22–0 in favor, to adjourn the meeting at approximately 6:50 PM.

**Staff Assignments**
ATTACHMENT 1
MEETING EVALUATION RESULTS
May 2 - 3, 2006—Orlando, Florida

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

1. Please assess the overall meeting.

9.42__ The background information was very useful.
9.31__ The agenda packet was very useful.
9.63__ The objectives for the meeting were stated at the outset.
9.68__ Overall, the objectives of the meeting were fully achieved.
9.57__ Accessibility Waiver Applications.
9.42__ Requests for Declaratory Statements.
9.68__ Approval of Products and Product Approval Entities.
9.78__ Chairs Issues and Recommendations.
9.68__ Commission’s Workplan and Meeting Schedule Update.
9.63__ TAC, POC, Committee, and Workgroup Reports and Recommendations.
9.68__ Update on the 2006 Legislative Session.
9.42__ Consideration of the Panhandle Windborne Debris Region Study Results.
9.63__ Supplemental Hearing on Rule 9B-1, Manufactured Buildings.
9.63__ Decision on TAC Recommendations Regarding 2006 Glitch Amendments to the 2004 FBC.

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

9.57__ The members followed the direction of the Facilitator.
9.68__ The Facilitator made sure the concerns of all members were heard.
9.73__ The Facilitator helped us arrange our time well.
9.73__ Participant input was documented accurately.

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

9.52__ Overall, I am very satisfied with the meeting.
9.68__ I was very satisfied with the services provided by the Facilitator.
9.52__ I am satisfied with the outcome of the meeting.

4. What progress did you make?

9.47__ I know what the next steps following this meeting will be.
9.31__ I know who is responsible for the next steps.
5. **Member’s Written Evaluation Comments.**

- The Chair did a fantastic job, and so did Jeff Blair!
- Excellent! Facilitation and established accepted procedures enabled the Commission to effectively deal with a large work load.
- Good job!
- Members followed facilitator’s direction all the way to the end of the process.
- Seats and tables were too closely spaced for this type of meeting.
- Last minute subversion of any TAC (at 6:20 PM) is just plain wrong! The TAC’s work very hard and need the respect and consideration of the Commission.
- Need to revisit the entire code change glitch process to better define parameters of what constitutes a Florida specific change.
ATTACHMENT 2

COMMISSION’S UPDATED WORKPAN AND MEETING SCHEDULE

(Adopted Unanimously May 2, 2006)

2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Hotel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 24, 25 &amp; 26</td>
<td>Cmsn</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>Rosen Plaza Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 14, 15 &amp; 16</td>
<td>Cmsn</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>Radisson Mart Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 9, 10 &amp; 11</td>
<td>Cmsn</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>Rosen Centre Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 27, 28 &amp; 29</td>
<td>Cmsn</td>
<td>St Petersburg</td>
<td>St. Petersburg Hilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 22, 23 &amp; 24</td>
<td>Cmsn</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>Don Shula Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 10, 11 &amp; 12</td>
<td>Cmsn</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>Rosen Centre Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 5, 6 &amp; 7</td>
<td>Cmsn</td>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td>Embassy Suites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Hotel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 23, 24 &amp; 25</td>
<td>TACs</td>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td>Embassy Suites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 6 &amp; 7</td>
<td>Cmsn</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>Rosen Plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 20, 21 &amp; 22</td>
<td>Cmsn</td>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td>Embassy Suites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1, 2, 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>Cmsn</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>Sheraton Safari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 19 or 20</td>
<td>Cmsn</td>
<td>Panhandle Region</td>
<td>Seminole Hard Rock Hotel &amp; Casino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 10, 11 &amp; 12</td>
<td>Cmsn</td>
<td>Ft Lauderdale</td>
<td>Don Shula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 21, 22 &amp; 23</td>
<td>Cmsn</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>Embassy Suites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 9, 10 &amp; 11</td>
<td>Cmsn</td>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td>Embassy Suites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 12, 13, &amp; 14</td>
<td>TACs</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>Double Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 4, 5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>Cmsn</td>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td>Embassy Suites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Based on experience developing the 2004 FBC, TAC meetings are scheduled separately from the Commission meeting for January and December to review proposed Code amendments for the Glitch Cycle and 2007 FBC Update respectively. Commission meeting set for 2 weeks after those TAC meetings. Scheduling set to avoid a week long Commission meeting at those workplan task points and to avoid back to back week meeting.

2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Hotel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 5, 6 &amp; 7</td>
<td>Cmsn</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 12, 13, 14 &amp; 15</td>
<td>TACs</td>
<td>Cmsn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 26, 27 &amp; 28</td>
<td>Cmsn</td>
<td>Cmsn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 7, 8 &amp; 9</td>
<td>Cmsn</td>
<td>Cmsn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 25, 26 &amp; 27</td>
<td>Cmsn</td>
<td>Cmsn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 20, 21 &amp; 22</td>
<td>Cmsn</td>
<td>Cmsn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 8, 9 &amp; 10</td>
<td>Cmsn</td>
<td>Cmsn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 3, 4 &amp; 5</td>
<td>Cmsn</td>
<td>Cmsn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Hotel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 28, 29 &amp; 30</td>
<td>Cmsn</td>
<td>Cmsn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 17, 18 &amp; 19</td>
<td>Cmsn</td>
<td>Cmsn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 5, 6 &amp; 7</td>
<td>Cmsn</td>
<td>Cmsn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 23, 24 &amp; 25</td>
<td>Cmsn</td>
<td>Cmsn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 25, 26 &amp; 27</td>
<td>Cmsn</td>
<td>Cmsn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 13, 14 &amp; 15</td>
<td>Cmsn</td>
<td>Cmsn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 8, 9 &amp; 10</td>
<td>Cmsn</td>
<td>Cmsn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION 200 WORKPLAN
(A. – H. Ranked by Commission Survey; 1 - Other Tasks)

2005 Tasks Carried Forward:

A. Amend Product Approval Rule 9B-72, 2004
   Rule effective 1/01/06
   Updated website implementing the revised rule replaces previous site 2/27/06
   Note: Applications will not be accepted between January 1 and February 13

1. Hurricane Damage Investigations

   2005 Hurricanes
   Staff report to HRAC on damages of Hurricane Dennis 8/22/05
   Reports to HRAC by Miami-Dade, Broward and Palm Beach Counties on damages of Hurricane Wilma 12/7/05
   Identification of research needs 3/21/06

3. Recommendations for Report to 2006 Legislature
   Consider preliminary recommendations to Legislature 10/12/05
   Approve recommendations to Legislature 12/07/05
   Report transmitted to Legislature 2/08/06

6. 2004 FBC Glitch Amendments/2006 Annual Interim Amendments:
   Amendment submittal cutoff 12/1/05
   Post on website (45 days minimum) 12/2/05
   TAC’s consider proposals to develop recommendations 1/23-26/06
   1/30-31/06
   2/1/06
   Appoint Correlation Committee to Assist Staff 2/07/06
   Post TAC recommendations on website (45 days min) 2/15/06
   Commission considers in Rule Development Workshop (RDW) 5/2-3/06
   Commission meeting in the panhandle on Panhandle WBD region 6/19 or 20/06
   Supplemental RDW on Panhandle WBD region designation 7/12/06
   Rule adoption hearing (if requested) and filing with DOS authorized 8/23/06
   Effective date of glitch amendments (Rule requires min 3 mo after adoption) 12/1/06
   Effective date of Panhandle Wind Borne Debris region designation 3/1/07
   (Note: Law requires 6 month delay between adoption and implementation)
10. **Florida Building Code System Review and Triennial Report to the Legislature**

   Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium On-line Survey  
   Aug & Sept 2005
   On-line Survey due date  
   Sept. 9, 2005
   Present preliminary survey results to Commission  
   October 2005
   Convene Workgroup  
   Aug 2005
   Public input hearing  
   Aug 2005
   Workgroup meeting  
   10/11/05
   Workgroup meeting  
   11/16/05
   Workgroup’s recommendations to the Commission  
   12/07/05
   Commission recommendations to Legislature (first triennial report)  
   See Task 3

11. **Revise Rule 9B-3.004 to Allow Alternates for Committee Members**

   Rule development workshop  
   8/06
   Rule adoption hearing  
   10/06
   Rule effective  
   1/07

12. **2007 Update to the Florida Building Code – 2007 FBC**

   **Code Amendment Process Review Work Group Recommendation:**
   Design of Update Process  
   Apr-May 06
   2006 International Codes published and available to the public  
   3/1/06
   Supplement version of 2006 FBC amendments available  
   9/1/06
   Replacement pages version of 2006 FBC amendments available  
   11/1/06
   7/10/06
   Joint Fire TAC/Fire Code Advisory Council review 2006 I Codes to 2008 FFPC  
   10/06
   Correlation committee review of Florida specific amendments overlap with 2006 I Codes  
   10/06
   Proposed amendments to the 2006 I Codes with Florida amendments due date  
   1/1/07
   Florida Specific amendment overlaps with 2006 I Codes, local amendments and 2008 FFPC correlation submitted as amendment proposals by staff  
   1/1/07
   Proposed amendments posted to the Web by (45 day min before TAC review)  
   1/15/07
   Commission selects 2006 I Codes as foundation for 2007 FBC  
   10/11/06
   45 day comment period ends  
   2/28/07
   TACs review proposed Florida amendments, current Florida amendments and current Local amendments and make recommendations  
   3/12-15/07
   TAC recommendations posted to web (45 day min before Commission review)  
   4/13/07
   45 day comment period ends  
   5/27/07
   Commission considers TAC recommendations on proposed amendments via a Rule Development Workshop  
   6/26&27/07
   Rule Adoption Hearing  
   8/22/07
   File Rule adopting the 2007 FBC  
   9/14/07
   Printed Codes available to the public  
   4/1/08
   Code implemented  
   1/1/09
(Note: Law requires the Commission not select a new edition of the base codes for updating the FBC earlier than 6 months after they are in print and available to the public and the updated FBC not be implemented until 6 months after publication.)

12.5 Glitch Amendments to the 2007 Florida Building Code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Printed 2007 Codes available to the public</td>
<td>4/1/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code implemented</td>
<td>10/1/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule development workshop</td>
<td>6/25/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule adoption hearing</td>
<td>8/27/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File Rule and post Supplement to website</td>
<td>9/5/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glitch Rule effective</td>
<td>9/27/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 FBC effective</td>
<td>10/1/08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: Expedited Glitch Amendment authority pending passage of legislation 2006.)

14. Panhandle Hurricane Ivan Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshop in Panhandle to review studies</td>
<td>9/13/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission approved consensus recommendation from workshop to conduct Panhandle windborne debris study</td>
<td>10/12/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hire contractor to conduct Panhandle windborne debris study Phase I (study initiation data development for models)</td>
<td>10/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtain budget amendment</td>
<td>11/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiate Phase II (modify models and conduct simulations)</td>
<td>12/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission receives preliminary report from researchers</td>
<td>2/07/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public hearing and decide recommendation to Legislature at Commission meeting</td>
<td>2/07/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with Panhandle Building Officials</td>
<td>2/16/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation to the Legislature (In Annual Report)</td>
<td>2/24/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor preliminary report presentation on study at Commission meeting</td>
<td>3/22/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor presentation on study at Commission meeting</td>
<td>5/3/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Commission meeting and contractor presentation in Panhandle</td>
<td>6/19 or 21/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor final written report due</td>
<td>7/30/06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: Law takes effect July 1, 2006)
15. **Exposure Category C Study**
   - Assign to Hurricane Research Advisory Committee: 8/24/05
   - Committee considers at meeting: 12/07/05
   - Recommendations to Commission: 12/07/05
   - Commission decides to have Structural TAC review: 12/07/06
   - Structural TAC reports to Commission: 2/07/06
   - Public hearing and Commission decides on recommendation to Legislature: 2/07/06
   - Recommendation to the Legislature (Addenda to Annual Report): 2/24/06
   - Initiate amendment of Code as directed by 2006 Legislature

19. **Standards for Hospice Facilities**
   - Standards development by ACHA: Jul-Nov 2005
   - Proposed Code Amendments considered in glitch amendment process: (See Task 6)
NEW 2006 TASKS:

1. **Establish Legislative Liaison Process**
   - Chairman establishes process for 2006 Legislative session 2/07/06
   - Telephone calls throughout session 3/13/06
   - Telephone calls 4/03/06
   - Telephone calls 4/17/06

2. **Develop and Implement an Accelerated Revocation Process for Noncompliant Product and Entity Approvals**
   - POC take public comment and begin discussion 3/06
   - Recommendation to Commission 7/06

3. **Review and Address Code Administration Needs of Local Governments and Measures to Improve Uniform and Effective Enforcement of the Code**
   - Assessment survey 7/06
   - Report to Code Administration TAC 10/06
   - Code Administration TAC Review and Develop Recommendations 10/06-12/06
   - Recommendations to Commission 12/06

4. **Develop Product Validation Criteria for Methods of Demonstrating Compliance with Code**
   - Meeting 2/7/06
   - Meeting 5/3&4/06
   - Meeting 6/1/06
   - Meeting **CANCELED** 7/10/06
   - Recommendations to Commission 7/12/06

5. **Develop Window Labeling and Default Installation Criteria**
   - Appoint Work Group 2/22/06
   - Meeting 5/31/06
   - Meeting **TBD 5/31**
   - Recommendation to Commission 8/23/06

6. **Evaluate Termite Protection Requirements**
   - Appoint Workgroup 3/06
   - Meeting 5/17/06
   - Recommendations to Commission 7/12/06
7. **Evaluate Code Update, Amendment, Interpretation and Coordination with FFPC and with Model Base Codes Editions**
   - Appoint Workgroup: 3/22/06
   - Meeting on 2007 FBC Update: 4/19/06
   - Recommendation to Commission: 5/3/06
   - Annual Interim Amendment Assessment: 4/06-6/06
   - Report to Commission (on assessment): 7/12/06
   - WG Meeting: 7/13/06
   - WG Meeting: TBD 7/13
   - Recommendation to Commission: 8/23/06
   - Public Hearing on the Recommendation: 8/23/06
   - Finalize Recommendations for Report to Legislature: 10/11/06

8. **Assess Transition to IECC as Base for Florida Energy Code**
   - Appoint Workgroup: 2/22/06
   - Hire Consultant to develop code comparisons: 3/06
   - Meeting: 6/22/06
   - Meeting: TBD 6/22
   - Recommendation to Commission: TBD 6/22

9. **2006 Legislature’s Assignments**
ATTACHMENT 3

COMMISSION’S ADOPTED STANDING MOTION TO APPROVE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE 2004 FLORIDA BUILDING CODE

Move to recommend approval of the proposed amendments by the Florida Building Commission (as presented by the TAC’s) based on the following findings:

A. The amendment has a reasonable and substantial connection to the health, safety, and welfare of the general public; and,

B. The amendment does not degrade the effectiveness of the Code and either strengthens or improves the Code or provides for innovation or new technology by allowing equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction; and,

C. The Amendment does not discriminate against products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities; and,

D. The Amendment has the following fiscal impact:

1. The fiscal impact of enforcement imposed upon local government is as indicated by TAC’s review.
2. The fiscal impact of compliance imposed upon property and building owners is as indicated by TAC’s review.
3. The fiscal impact of compliance imposed upon industry is as indicated by TAC’s review.

E. The Amendment’s benefits noted with regard to fiscal impact and efficacy outweigh the costs imposed.

F. The Amendment addresses a Florida-specific need.

G. Commission Criteria: The amendment addresses hurricane response issues, corrects glitches, or updates standards.