

**EXISTING BUILDING INSPECTION WORKGROUP
TELECONFERENCE MEETING FROM TALLAHASSEE
PLEASE JOIN MY MEETING FROM YOUR COMPUTER, TABLET OR SMARTPHONE**

[HTTPS://GLOBAL.GOTOMEETING.COM/JOIN/533378925](https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/533378925)

UNITED STATES (TOLL FREE): 1 877 309 2073

ACCESS CODE: 533-378-925

**September 13, 2022
9:00 A.M.**

Minutes

EXISTING BUILDING INSPECTION WORKGROUP PRESENT:

James Schock, Chairman
Heather Anesta
William Bracken
Joseph Belcher
David Compton
Eric Stafford for Dr. Anne Cope
Jaime Gascon

John Gatlin
Jeffery Gross
Daniel Lavrich
Mark Mikkelson
Craig Parrino
Brad Schiffer
Brian Swope

EXISTING BUILDING INSPECTION WORKGROUP NOT PRESENT:

Dr. Angela Schedel

Michael Savage

STAFF PRESENT:

Mo Madani
Jim Hammers
Thomas Campbell

Justin Vogel
Sabrina Evans

MEETING FACILITATION:

The meeting was facilitated by Jeff Blair from Facilitated Solutions, LLC. Consultation, Process Design & Facilitation. Information at: facilitatedsolutions.org

Welcome

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Mr. Blair welcomed everyone to the meeting of the Existing Building Inspection Workgroup.

Roll Call:

Mr. Blair performed roll call for the Existing Building Inspection Workgroup. A quorum was determined with 12 members present at roll call.

Mr. Blair performed roll call for the Existing Building Inspection Workgroup's alternates. It was determined that 2 alternate members were present at roll call.

Commissioner Compton entered the meeting, making the quorum 13 members present.

Agenda Approval:

Commissioner Shock entered a motion to approve the agenda for today's meeting as posted. Mr. Stafford seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with a vote of 13 to 0.

Approval of minutes from July 14, 2022:

Mr. Belcher entered a motion to approve the minutes from July 14, 2022, as posted. Mr. Lavrich seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with a vote of 13 to 0.

Reviewing The Existing Building Inspection Workgroup's Workplan

Mr. Madani briefly reviewed the process of the Existing Building Inspection Workgroup's Workplan.

Mr. Gatlin entered the meeting, making the quorum 14 members present.

Preliminary Ranking of Key Recommendations:

Mr. Blair briefly provided an overview of the preliminary ranking of key recommendation process.

New and Revised Options for Ranking:

I. Procedural Recommendations (1)

Option A- New Option by Sergio Ascunce on Coastline Mapping. The Commission should include or facilitate the coastline maps for the entire state.

Jaime Gascon briefly provided an overview on Option A.

Comments/Reservations:

For further details on the comments and reservations, please see the attachment.

Ranking on Option A- New Option:

The EBIWG ranked Option A by Sergio Ascunce with a 3.43.

Clarifying Question:

Commissioner Compton asked Mr. Gascon several questions.

Mr. Jaime Gascon provided an answer to Commissioner Compton's questions.

II. Definitions Options (4)

Option A- Revised Option 1 by Jim Schock on dropping the term "Service Life":

Commissioner Jim Schock briefly provided an overview on Option A.

Ranking on Option A- Revised Option 1.

The EBIWG ranked Option A- Revised Option 1 by Jim Schock with a 3.36.

Option B- New Option by Tom Winant on Standard of Care. Use the ASCE 11-99 Guidelines for Structural Condition Assessment of Existing Buildings (1) as a standard for assessments for providing a reasonable standard of care.

Tom Winant briefly provided an overview on Option B.

Procedure Question/Comment:

Commissioner Schock asked a question.

Mr. Blair provided an answer to Commissioner Schock's question.

Mr. Belcher provided a comment agreeing with Commissioner Schock.

Mr. Blair provided a comment.

Ranking on Option B- New Option

The EBIWG ranked Option B by Tom Winant with a 3.43.

Option C- New Option by Heather Anesta on to ensure that the milestone inspections sufficiently determine the structural integrity of a building, the current wording of SB-4D 553.899(2)(a) and FBCB 2020 S2 Section 110.9.2(a) should be updated to enclose pre-defined phrases in quotations, and correct the term “load-bearing walls” to reflect the wording of the term as defined in FBCEB, as follows.(a) “Milestone inspection” means a structural inspection of a building, including an inspection of “load bearing elements”, as defined by FBCEB Chapter 2, and the “primary structural members” and “primary structural systems”, as defined in s. 627.706, Florida Statutes,...” This recommendation is also to update 553.899(7)(a) and FBCB Section 110.9.7.1 as follows, for consistent use of terms: 110.9.7.1. For phase one of the milestone inspection, a licensed architect or engineer authorized to practice in this state shall perform a visual examination of habitable and uninhabitable areas of a building, including the inspection of items described within Section 110.9.2(a) provide a qualitative assessment of the structural conditions of the building. If the architect or engineer finds no signs of substantial structural deterioration to any building components under visual examination, phase two of the inspection, as provided in Section 110.9.7.2, is not required. An architect or engineer who completes a phase EBIWG Options Ranking Exercise 5 one milestone inspection shall prepare and submit an inspection report pursuant to Section 110.9.8.

Heather Anesta briefly provided an overview on Option C.

Clarifying Question:

Mr. Bracken asked a question.

Mr. Blair and Ms. Anesta provided answers to Mr. Bracken’s question.

Ranking on Option C- New Option

The EBIWG ranked Option C by Heather Anesta with a 3.14.

Option D- New Option by Heather Anesta on (FBCB 2020 S2 passages provided as example below and mirrors the updates to SB-4D)To ensure that the milestone inspections sufficiently determine the structural integrity of a building, the current wording of SB-4D 553.899(2)(a) and FBCB 2020 S2 Section 110.9.2(a) should be updated to enclose pre-defined phrases in quotations, to only reference FBC Definitions, and correct the term “load-bearing walls” to reflect the wording of the term as defined in FBCEB, as follows.

(a) “Milestone inspection” means a structural inspection of a building, including an inspection of “load bearing elements”, “primary structural members”, and “primary structural systems” as defined by FBCEB Chapter 2, The FBC Existing Buildings Chapter 2 should then be updated to copy/paste the referenced definitions from FS 627.706, and to clarify the definition of “primary structural member” to include “and/or” as shown within the “Relevant Background Information” section of this Recommendation.

This recommendation is also to update 553.899(7)(a) and FBCB Section 110.9.7.1 as follows, for consistent use of terms:110.9.7.1. For phase one of the milestone inspection, a licensed architect or engineer authorized to practice in this state shall perform a visual examination of habitable and uninhabitable areas of a building, including the inspection of items described within Section 110.9.2(a) and provide a qualitative assessment of the structural conditions of the building. If the architect or engineer finds no signs of substantial structural deterioration to any building components under visual examination, phase two of the inspection, as provided in Section 110.9.7.2, is not required. An architect or engineer who completes a phase one milestone inspection shall prepare and submit an inspection report pursuant to Section 110.9.8.

Ranking on Option D- New Option

The EBIWG ranked Option D by Heather Anesta with a 3.71.

Comment:

Mr. Bracken asked Mr. Blair to provide background information in the workgroup comments.

Mr. Blair stated the staff can provide background information.

III. Timeframe for Inspections Options (4)

Option A- Replaces Consensus ranked Options 1 and 2 by Jim Schock on having only one initial timeline for the first milestone inspection of 30 years. This may be adjusted based on further UF research.

Jim Schock briefly provided an overview on Option A.

Ranking on Option A- Replaces Consensus ranked Options 1 and 2.

The EBIWG ranked Option A by Jim Schock with a 3.69.

Mr. Gatlin did not vote.

Option B – New Option by Sergio Ascunce on Section 110.9.4. If a milestone inspection is required under this section and the building’s certificate of occupancy was issued on or before July 1, 1992, for non-coastal buildings or July 1, 1997 for coastal buildings, the building’s initial milestone inspection must be performed before December 31, 2024 and every 10 years thereafter. If the date of issuance for the certificate of occupancy is not available, the date of issuance of the building’s certificate of occupancy shall be the date of occupancy evidenced in any record of the local building official.

Jaime Gascon briefly provided an overview on Option B.

Ranking on Option B- New Option

The EBIWG ranked Option B by Sergio Ascunce with a 3.93.

Option C- New Option by Sergio Ascunce on Section 110.9.6. Within 180 days after receiving the written notice under Section 110.9.5, the condominium association or cooperative association must complete phase one of the milestone inspection. For purposes of this section, completion of phase one of the milestone inspection means the licensed engineer or architect who performed the phase one inspection submitted the inspection report by e-mail, United States Postal Service, or commercial delivery service to the EBIWG Options Ranking Exercise 7 local enforcement agency. A phase two report, if required, must be submitted within 180 days after submitting the phase one report.

Clarifying Question:

Mr. Bracken asked Mr. Gascon a question.

Mr. Gascon provided an answer to Mr. Bracken’s question.

Ms. Anesta asked Mr. Gascon a question.

Mr. Gascon provided an answer to Ms. Anesta’s question.

Ranking on Option C- New Option

The EBIWG ranked Option C by Sergio Ascunce with a 3.0.

Comments/Reservations to have an Alternate C:

For further details on the comments and reservations, please see the attachment.

Ranking on Alternate C

The EBIWG ranked Alternate C by Sergio Ascunce with a 3.71.

Comment:

Mr. Lavrich provided a comment.

Option D- New Option by Carmelo Giglio for structure within 3 miles of the coastline, require a 20-year milestone inspection and re-inspection every 7 years, as recommended by the Surfside Working Group. If this not achievable, then a 25-year milestone inspection and with re-inspection every 10 years is the maximum acceptable timeframe. As an alternate, we would support a 25-year milestone for all buildings to simplify the enforcement efforts for the building departments.

Carmelo Giglio briefly provided an overview on Option D.

Clarifying Question:

Ms. Anesta asked Mr. Giglio a question.

Mr. Giglio provided an answer to Ms. Anesta's question.

Mr. Lavrich asked Mr. Giglio a question.

Mr. Giglio provided an answer to Mr. Lavrich's question.

Ms. Anesta asked Mr. Giglio a question.

Mr. Giglio provided an answer to Ms. Anesta's question.

Ranking on Option D- New Option on supporting a 25-year milestone inspection for all buildings.

The EBIWG ranked Option D by Carmelo Giglio with a 2.57.

Comment:

Ms. Anesta provided a comment for clarity.

IV. Qualifications for Inspection Options (5)

Public Comment:

Thomas Sputo provided a comment.

Rick Logan, AIA Florida, provided a comment.

Option A- Replaces Consensus Ranked Options 1, 2, 3, and 4 by Jim Schock on Non-Threshold Buildings. Phase 1 and phase 2 milestone inspections may be completed by a Florida Professional Engineer or Architect. All Corrective action reports must be signed and sealed by the Professional engineer or Architect.

Jim Schock briefly provided an overview on Option A.

Ranking on Option A

The EBIWG ranked Option A by Jim Schock with a 3.50.

Option B- Replaces Consensus Ranked Options 1, 2, 3, and 4 by Jim Schock on Threshold Buildings. All phase 1 and 2 milestone inspections shall be performed by a Professional Engineer with either 10 years of verifiable experience involving structural design and inspections or a professional engineer with a Special Inspector designation issued by the Board of Professional Engineers. All Corrective action reports must be signed and sealed by the Professional engineer conducting the phase 2 inspection and the Special Inspector.

Jim Schock briefly provided an overview on Option B.

Comment:

Mr. Lavrich provided a comment.

Clarifying Question:

Ms. Anesta asked Commissioner Schock several questions.

Commissioner Shock provided answers to Ms. Anesta's questions.

Mr. Belcher asked Commissioner Schock a question.

Commissioner Shock provided answers to Mr. Belcher's question.

Ranking on Option B

The EBIWG ranked Option B by Jim Schock with a 1.93.

Comment:

Ms. Anesta provided a comment.

Mr. Lavrich stated that the issues have been resolved by DS 2014-061.

Option C- Replaces Consensus Ranked Options 1, 2, 3, and 4 by Jim Shock on Threshold Buildings: All phase 1 milestone inspections must be performed by a Florida Architect or Professional Engineer. All phase 2 inspections shall be performed by a Professional Engineer with either 10 years of verifiable experience involving structural design and inspections or a professional engineer with a Special Inspector designation issued by the Board of Professional Engineers. All Corrective action reports must be signed and sealed by the Professional engineer conducting the phase 2 inspection and the Special Inspector.

Jim Schock briefly provided an overview on Option C.

Ranking on Option C

The EBIWG ranked Option C by Jim Schock with a 2.07.

Ms. Anesta and Mr. Lavrich stated they have the same comment from Option B.

Option D- New Option by Brad Schiffer on when an Architect or Professional Engineer is required, they can be a team of professionals with an Architect or Professional Engineer acting as a Registered Design Professional in Responsible Charge. All work and reports must be signed and sealed by the appropriate, qualified team member.

Brad Schiffer briefly provided an overview on Option D.

Ranking on Option D

The EBIWG ranked Option D by Brad Schiffer with a 3.21.

Comments/Reservations:

For further details on the comments and reservations, please see the attachment.

Option E- New Option by Heather Anesta on (FBCB 2020 S2 passages provided below and mirrors the updates to SB-4D) To ensure that the milestone inspections sufficiently determine the structural integrity of a building, the current wording of SB-4D 553.899(2) and FBCB 2020 S2 Section 110.9.2 should be reorganized to provide the description of an inspector as its own term, “milestone inspector”, referencing the purpose of the “milestone inspection”, and update such references within the remainder of the text, as follows:

EBIWG Options Ranking Exercise 10 (a) “Milestone Inspector” means a licensed architect or engineer authorized to practice in this state and capable of performing the “milestone inspection” for the purposes of attesting to the life safety and adequacy of the structural components of the building, by determining if substantial structural deterioration is present as defined herein, and, to the extent reasonably possible, determining the general structural condition of the building as it affects the safety of such building, including a determination of any necessary maintenance, repair, or replacement of any structural component of the building. In accordance with Section 110.9, the Milestone Inspector must develop the Phase 1 and/or Phase 2 milestone inspection plan(s) in order to fulfill the purpose of the “milestone inspection”, and perform the Phase 1 and/or Phase 2 on-site inspections in order to achieve the milestone inspection’s purpose. (ab) “Milestone inspection” means a structural inspection of a building, including an inspection of loadbearing walls and the primary structural members and primary structural systems, as those terms are defined in s. 627.706, Florida Statutes, by a Milestone Inspector as defined herein. The purpose of such inspection is to determine if there is substantial structural deterioration as defined herein, in accordance with Section 110.9.7, and is not to determine if the condition of an existing building is in compliance with the Florida Building Code Building or the fire safety code. (bc) “Substantial structural deterioration” means substantial structural distress that negatively affects a building’s general structural

condition and integrity. The term does not include surface imperfections such as cracks, distortion, sagging, deflections, misalignment, signs of leakage, or peeling of finishes unless the licensed engineer or architect performing the phase one or phase two inspection determines that such surface imperfections are a sign of substantial structural deterioration in accordance with Section 110.9.7. *Subsequently, the below passages can also be updated to simply say “Milestone Inspector” and reference the “milestone inspection” definition: 110.9.6. Within 180 days after receiving the written notice under Section 110.9.5, the condominium association or cooperative association must complete phase one of the milestone inspection. For purposes of this section, completion of phase one of the milestone inspection means the Milestone Inspector who performed the phase one inspection submitted the inspection report by e-mail...* 110.9.7. A milestone inspection consists of two phases: 110.9.7.1. For phase one of the milestone inspection, a Milestone Inspector shall perform a visual examination of habitable and uninhabitable areas of a building, including the inspection of items described within Section 110.9.2(b) and provide a qualitative assessment of the structural conditions of the building. If the Milestone Inspector finds no signs of substantial structural deterioration to any building components under visual examination, phase two of the inspection, as provided in Section 110.9.7.2, is not required. A Milestone Inspector who completes a phase one milestone inspection shall prepare and submit an inspection report pursuant to Section 110.9.8. 110.9.7.2. A phase two of the milestone inspection must be performed if any substantial structural deterioration is identified during phase one. A phase two inspection may involve destructive or nondestructive testing at the Milestone Inspector’s direction. The inspection may be as extensive or as limited as necessary to fully assess areas of structural distress in order to confirm that the building is structurally sound and safe for its intended use and to recommend a program for fully assessing and repairing distressed and damaged portions of the building. When determining testing locations, the Milestone Inspector must give preference to locations that are the least disruptive and most easily repairable while still being representative of the structure. A Milestone Inspector who completes a phase two milestone inspection shall prepare and submit an inspection report pursuant to Section 110.9.8. 110.9.8. Upon completion of a phase one or phase two milestone inspection, the Milestone Inspector who performed the inspection must submit a sealed copy of the inspection report with.

Heather Anesta briefly provided an overview on Option E.

Ranking on Option E

The EBIWG ranked Option E by Heather Anesta with a 3.29.

Commissioner Compton left the meeting making the quorum 13 members present.

V. Inspection Standards/Checklist Options (9)

Public Comment:

Rick Logan, AIA Florida, provided a comment that AIA Florida supports options standardizing Milestone Inspection Requirements.

- **Option A- Replaces Consensus Ranked Options 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 by Jim Shock on Inspections Criteria. Request the Legislature give the Florida Building Commission rule-making authority to establish a minimum Building Safety Inspection Program and add it to the Florida Building Code for Existing Buildings which may be amended using the existing Local Technical Amendment process providing it does not reduce the baseline requirements. (Such Technical amendments should not be subject to the existing sunset provisions of the Law). In addition to Inspector Qualifications, Reporting, and Definitions the baseline requirements shall address the following:**
 - **Through rule-making the commission shall establish a Building Safety Inspection program. They may use but not limited to Miami-Dade and Broward programs (excluding Electrical) as guidance document as well as other appropriate information. EBIWG Options Ranking Exercise 15**
 - **Reporting documents shall be standardized and be adaptable to electronic reporting**
 - **Provide an overall condition assessment such as Good, Fair, Poor; along with the ability to provide a descriptive narrative and Photographs.**
 - **Include but not limited to the following inspection areas:**
 - **Load bearing walls**
 - **Primary structural Members**
 - **Primary structural systems**
 - **Structural components of means of egress**
 - **Roofing,**
 - **Balcones,**
 - **Post Tension Slabs and Anchorage**
 - **Caulking, Curtain Walls, Window installation, Flashing and Building Cladding,**
 - **Foundations investigating excessive settlement or ground subsidence etc.**
 - **Review of existing construction documents, permits and inspection records check for non-approved changes,**
 - **Review of Maintenance records**

- **Inspection of any flood protective measures such as seawalls or flood proofing provisions.**

Jim Schock briefly provided an overview on Option A.

Comments/Reservations:

For further details on the comments and reservations, please see the attachment.

Clarifying Question:

Mr. Gascon asked Commissioner Schock some questions.

Commissioner Schock provided answers to Mr. Gascon's questions.

Procedure Question/Comment:

Mr. Bracken asked Mr. Blair several questions.

Mr. Blair and Commissioner Schock provided an answer to Mr. Bracken's questions.

Clarifying Question:

Ms. Anesta asked Commissioner Schock a question.

Commissioner Shock provided an answer to Ms. Anesta's question.

Comment:

Mr. Campbell provided a comment.

Ms. Anesta provided comments.

Commissioner Shock provided comments.

Mr. Blair provided comments.

Clarifying Question:

Ms. Anesta asked Commissioner Schock a question.

Commissioner Shock provided an answer to Ms. Anesta's question.

Mr. Blair and Commissioner Schock provided comments.

Procedure Question/Comment:

Ms. Anesta asked Mr. Blair several questions.

Mr. Blair answered Ms. Anesta's questions.

Ranking on Option A

The EBIWG ranked Option A by Jim Schock with a 3.62.

Comments/Reservations:

For further details on the comments and reservations, please see the attachment.

Option B- New Option by Jim Shock on Minimum Adoptive Ordinance. This option is based on the same process used when the commission place mandatory flood requirements into the Florida Building Code and provided a sample minimum flood ordinance which could be adopted and modified to reflect any higher standards the Jurisdiction wished to adopt. Example: you may require structural members, load bearing walls, structural systems, roofs and balconies as mandatory and water intrusion items as higher standards which may be adopted locally. This allows for smaller less populated jurisdictions to adopt according to their needs.

Jim Schock briefly provided an overview on Option B.

Ranking on Option B

The EBIWG ranked Option B by Jim Schock with a 2.69.

Comment:

Mr. Gascon provided a comment.

Ms. Anesta agreed with Mr. Gascon's comment.

Commissioner Schock provided a comment.

Option C- New Option by Bruce Wingfield on Phase 2. Require the use of scientific testing protocols for Phase 2 inspections in addition to visual inspection techniques for determining the structural integrity of a building. NDT Protocols for existing buildings are as follows for Phase 2:

- 1. ASTM F1869 – Chloride test for concrete**
- 2. ASTM C876 (half-cell) – Scan of concrete at a depth of 6” to measure rebar deterioration**
- 3. ASTM C1153- Thermography**
- 4. ASTM D8231 modified – Electronic Leak Detection of membrane roofing**
- 5. AAMA 511 – Pressure Testing of Fenestrations**
- 6. ASTM D4580 – Delam roller for Stucco and Concrete.**

Bruce Wingfield stated he didn't need to comment.

Clarifying Question:

Mr. Bracken asked Mr. Wingfield a question.

Mr. Wingfield provided an answer to Mr. Bracken's question.

Ms. Anesta asked Mr. Wingfield a question.

Mr. Wingfield provided an answer to Ms. Anesta's question.

Ranking on Option C

The EBIWG ranked Option C by Bruce Wingfield with a 3.08.

Public Comment;

Thomas Winant provided a comment, then tabled his comment.

- **Option D-New Option by Brad Schiffer on Ensure Existing Plans/Resources Access.**
 - **House in building departments (AHJ), so resources/plans are available when needed for inspections, etc.**
 - **Avoid duplication of researching available construction documents.**
 - **Updating the documents if remodeled.**

Brad Schiffer briefly provided an overview on Option D.

Ranking on Option D

The EBIWG ranked Option D by Brad Schiffer with a 3.38.

Comments/Reservations:

For further details on the comments and reservations, please see the attachment.

Option E- New Option by Frank Pelly on as part of an inspection of waterfront (not beachfront) buildings, fitting the criteria, located on waterways, (generally canals and the intercostal waterway) an inspection shall be performed of the seawall or tidal flood barrier. A tidal flood barrier is defined as; any structure or shoreline feature including, but not limited to, Banks, Berms, Green-Grey Infrastructure, Seawalls, Seawall Caps, upland stem walls, or other infrastructure that impedes tidal waters from flowing onto adjacent property or public right-of-way and located within or along a Tidally Influenced Area. This definition is not meant to include Rip-Rap, derelict erosion control structures, or permeable earthen mounds that do not provide an impermeable water barrier to tidal flooding.

Ranking on Option E

The EBIWG ranked Option E by Frank Pelly with a 2.00.

Option F- New Option by Tom Winant on a minimum encourage a load test (“insitu load test”) on each structure.

Tom Winant briefly provided an overview on Option F.

Clarifying Question:

Mr. Blair provided a comment

Ms. Anesta provided a comment.

Mr. Gascon asked a question.

Mr. Blair provided a comment.

Commissioner Shock provided a suggestion.

Mr. Gascon provided a comment.

Ranking on Option F

The EBIWG ranked Option F by Tom Winant with a 2.77.

Comments:

Mr. Lavrich provided a comment.

Option FF- New Option by Tom Winant on requiring a load test (“insitu load test”) on each structure.

Ranking on Option FF

The EBIWG ranked Option FF by Tom Winant with a 1.15.

Option G- New Option by Heather Anesta on To ensure that the milestone inspections address buildings that are exposed to saltwater at an earlier age (25 years), the Legislature should consider revising the 25-year milestone inspection requirement in SB-4D 553.899(3) and FBC 2020 S2 110.9.3 to apply to buildings that are located between the uppermost water table’s saltwater interface boundary and the coastline as defined by s. 376.031, rather than a 3-mile offset of the coastline. If acceptable, the Legislature should charge FDEP, USGS, and/or Other Agencies with compiling the existing saltwater interface line maps within PDF and ArcGIS, and publish a statewide map as soon as possible. The building officials and building owners can then use the maps to easily locate the affected buildings. See the figures from ArcGIS and SFWMD within the Relevant Background Information section at the end of this recommendation for screenshots of the existing maps.

Heather Anesta briefly provided an overview on Option G.

Ranking on Option G

The EBIWG ranked Option G by Heather Anesta with a 2.77.

Commissioner Swope did not vote.

Option H- New Option by Heather Anesta on (FBCB 2020 S2 passages provided below and mirror the updates to SB-4D) To ensure that the milestone inspections sufficiently determine the structural integrity of a building, the current wording of SB-4D

553.899(7)(a)&(b) and FBCB 2020 S2 110.9.7.1 and 110.9.7.2 need to be updated to trigger a Phase 2 inspection when there are building conditions which will inherently prevent or obstruct an Inspector from reasonably assessing if there is Substantial Structural Deterioration utilizing the Phase 1 visual, qualitative inspection, as described below.

110.9.7. A milestone inspection consists of two phases: 110.9.7.1. For phase one of the milestone inspection, a licensed architect or engineer authorized to practice in this state shall perform a visual examination of habitable and nonhabitable areas of a building, including the major structural components of a building, and provide a qualitative assessment of the structural conditions of the building. If the architect or engineer finds no signs of substantial structural deterioration to any building components under visual examination, phase two of the inspection, as provided in Section 110.9.7.2, is not required. If any of the below conditions are present at the start of or over the course of the initial phase one inspection, then a phase two inspection per Section 119.9.7.2 is required.

a. Absence of complete as-built plans

b. Existing Structural Conditions which differ from and/or overload the original Structural Design Intent

c. Discovery of Structural Design Defects

d. Undocumented, Unsealed, and/or Unpermitted Prior Repairs

e. Undocumented interior/exterior cladding/paint conditions prior to most recent application/installation

f. Discontinuity of Load Path

g. Repairs which require substantial shoring

An architect or engineer who completes a phase one milestone inspection shall prepare and submit an inspection report pursuant to Section 110.9.8. 110.9.7.2. A phase two of the milestone inspection must be performed if any substantial structural deterioration is identified during phase one and/or any of the items listed in 110.9.7.1 are present. A phase two inspection may involve destructive or nondestructive testing at the inspector's direction. The inspection may be as extensive or as limited as necessary to fully assess areas of structural distress in order to confirm that the building is structurally sound and safe for its intended use and to recommend a program for fully assessing and repairing distressed and damaged portions of the building. When determining testing locations, the inspector must give preference to locations that are the least disruptive and most easily repairable while still being representative of the structure. An inspector who completes a phase two milestone inspection shall prepare and submit an inspection report pursuant to Section 110.9.8. 110.9.8. Upon completion of a phase one or phase two milestone inspection, the architect or engineer who performed the inspection must submit a sealed copy of the inspection report with a separate summary of, at minimum, the material findings and recommendations in the inspection report to the condominium association or cooperative

association, and to the building official of the local government which has jurisdiction. The inspection report must, at a minimum, meet all of the following criteria:

- (a) Bear the seal and signature, or the electronic signature, of the licensed engineer or architect who performed the inspection.**
- (b) Indicate the manner and type of inspection forming the basis for the inspection report.**
- (c) Identify any substantial structural deterioration, within a reasonable professional probability based on the scope of the inspection, describe the extent of such deterioration, and identify any recommended repairs for such deterioration.**
- (d) State whether unsafe or dangerous conditions, as those terms are defined in the Florida Building Code, were observed. EBIWG Options Ranking Exercise 18**
- (e) Recommend any remedial or preventive repair for any items that are damaged but are not substantial structural deterioration.**
- (f) Identify and describe any items requiring further inspection.**
- (g) Identify which, if any, conditions listed in Section 110.9.7.1 were present (phase one and phase two), and how they were addressed and/or remedied (phase two).**

Heather Anesta briefly provided an overview on Option H.

Comment:

Commissioner Schock provided a comment.

Ranking on Option H

The EBIWG ranked Option H by Heather Anesta with a 2.17.

Comment:

Mr. Bracken provided a comment.

Ms. Anesta provided a comment and a suggestion.

Commissioner Schock provided a comment and suggestion.

Ms. Anesta and Mr. Blair provided comments and suggestions.

Option I- New Option by Heather Anesta on Develop a new Chapter (Chapter 18) within the FBCEB 2020 as a Supplement, to include the FBCB 110.9 information as well as universal baseline guidance and minimum requirements for mandatory milestone

inspections. The Chapter should define common terminology, condition ratings, and minimum requirements applicable to all building sizes and construction materials relative to mandatory milestone inspections. Within this recommendation, it is proposed to call the new Chapter, “FBCEB Chapter 18 Guideline for Mandatory Milestone Inspections”, and to include the below Sections at a minimum:

Section 1801 Purpose & Scope

Section 1802 Definitions, Symbols, and Notations

Section 1803 General Requirements

Section 1804 Structural Integrity

Section 1805 Phase 1 Milestone Inspection Minimum Requirements

Section 1806 Phase 2 Milestone Inspection Minimum Requirements

Section 1807 Referenced Standards

Heather Anesta briefly provided an overview on Option I

Ranking on Option I

The EBIWG ranked Option I by Heather Anesta with a 3.00.

VI. Local Governments/report Submittal Options (2)

Option A- Replaces Consensus Ranked Options 1 and 2 by Jim Schock Phase 1 Milestone Inspection Report. Information to be included in the Phase 1 report:

- **Name of the Condo or Coop entity along with contact information**
- **Name and contact information of the licensed individual(s) conducting the survey**
- **Provision for signature and seal of the licensed individual conducting the survey**
- **General condition rating and any specific detail observations along with any recommendations for each inspection categories listed in the inspection criteria**
- **Optional area for other notes and comments**
- **Date(s) survey was conducted**
- **Date of report**
- **The final phase 1 report must be submitted to the Jurisdiction for record purposes and to establish if a need for further action is necessary. EBIWG Options Ranking Exercise 20**
- **The report must provide instruction if a Phase 2 inspection is required and if the need is of such a critical nature that it is time sensitive.**
- **The report must provide an overall qualitative structural assessment of the building.**

Jim Schock briefly provided an overview on Option A.

Ranking on Option A

The EBIWG ranked Option A by Jim Schock with a 3.85.

Option B- Replaces Consensus Ranked Options 1 and 2 by Jim Schock on Phase 2 Milestone Inspection Report. Information to be included in the Phase 1 report:

- **Name of the Condo or Coop entity along with contact information**
- **Name and contact information of the licensed individual(s) conducting the survey**
- **Provision for signature and seal of the licensed individual conducting the survey**
- **References cited under Phase I report for follow up**
- **Date of report**
- **Identify the damage and describe the extent of the repairs needed along with repair recommendations**
- **Area(s) requiring added inspection as well as results of any testing**
- **Manner and type of inspections performed**
- **Optional area for other notes and comments**
- **Graded urgency of each recommended repair**
- **Date(s) inspection was conducted**
- **State if it is unsafe or dangerous condition**
- **Identify any needs for additional inspections**
- **Submit a corrective action report after repairs are made.**

Jim Schock briefly provided an overview on Option B.

Comments/Reservations:

For further details on the comments and reservations, please see the attachment.

Ranking on Option B

The EBIWG ranked Option B by Jim Schock with a 3.77.

Identification and Discussion of next steps:

Mr. Blair briefly provided details of the next steps and upcoming meeting dates.

Motion:

Mr. Lavrich moved to adopt the Workgroup's package of consensus ranked options for inclusion in the Workgroup's Recommendations to the Florida Building Commission. Mr. Belcher seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with a vote of 13 to 0.

Workgroup Members and Staff Comment:

Ms. Anesta stated she can provide a revised Option H in Section 5 today.

Ms. Anesta asked the staff a question.

Mr. Vogel provided an answer to Ms. Anesta's question.

Mr. Madani asked a question.

Mr. Blair provided an answer to Mr. Madani's question.

Public Comment:

Mike Silvers, FRSA, asked Mr. Blair a question.

Mr. Blair provided an answer to Mr. Silvers' question.

Mike Silvers FRSA, provided a comment.

Lawrence Murphy, City of Sarasota, thanked the staff and workgroup for having this meeting and stated it was very productive.

Adjourn:

There being no further business before the workgroup, Chairman Schock adjourned the meeting at 12:02 p.m.