



**FLORIDA
BUILDING
COMMISSION**

"STRONGER CODES THROUGH SCIENCE AND CONSENSUS"

Florida Department of
Business & Professional
Regulation

**FACILITATOR'S SUMMARY REPORT OF THE
JUNE 18, 2015
CODE COORDINATION AND IMPLEMENTATION
WORKGROUP MEETING III
CITRA, FLORIDA**

PROCESS DESIGN, CONSENSUS-BUILDING AND FACILITATION BY



CONSENSUS CENTER

**REPORT BY JEFF A. BLAIR
FCRC CONSENSUS CENTER
FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY**



jblair@fsu.edu
<http://consensus.fsu.edu>

*This document is available in alternate formats upon request to DBPR, Codes & Standards,
1940 North Monroe Street, Tallahassee, FL 32399-0772, (850) 487-1824.*

FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION
CODE COORDINATION AND IMPLEMENTATION WORKGROUP
JUNE 18, 2015 FACILITATOR’S MEETING SUMMARY REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS 1
TABLE OF ATTACHMENTS 1

I. PROJECT OVERVIEW AND SCOPE 2
II. MEETING SUMMARY OVERVIEW..... 3
III. WELCOME AND ATTENDANCE 3
IV. MEETING OBJECTIVES 4
V. REVIEW OF KEY ISSUES FOR WORKGROUP EVALUATION..... 4
VI. ACCEPTABILITY RANKING OF PROPOSED OPTIONS 5
VII. PUBLIC COMMENT 7
VII. WORKGROUP MEMBER COMMENTS AND ISSUES 7
IX. NEXT MEETING OVERVIEW AND ISSUES 8

ATTACHMENTS..... 9 - 26

1. MEETING EVALUATION RESULTS 9
2. WORKGROUP MEMBERSHIP..... 11
3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION..... 12
4. WORKGROUP MEETING AGENDA (JUNE 18, 2015) 13
5. KEY ISSUES 14
6. OPTIONS RANKING RESULTS..... 16

FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION
CODE COORDINATION AND IMPLEMENTATION WORKGROUP
JUNE 18, 2015 FACILITATOR'S SUMMARY REPORT



I. PROJECT OVERVIEW, SCOPE AND TIMETABLE

PROJECT OVERVIEW

Chairman Browdy recommended the convening of the Workgroup noting that with the delays experienced in adopting the *Florida Building Code Fifth Edition (2014)* it was apparent that there are regulatory requirements that constrain the Commission in being able to complete a code update in the most efficacious manner possible. Some of the statutory constraints include the requirement to coordinate with the adoption of the updated version of the *Florida Fire Prevention Code*, and the requirement to have the Florida Building Code published for 6 months after publication before it becomes effective. Other constraints include duplicative procedural requirements between the rulemaking requirements of Chapter 120, F.S and the code development requirements mandated by Section 553.73, F.S. Other considerations are the schedule for the IBC code updates, the NEC code schedule, and the schedule for other important reference documents that must be finalized before incorporation by reference into the Florida Building Code Rule. There are also other built-in time constraints that serve to delay the implementation of a code update cycle. The Commission should review all of the critical path milestones in the code development process and determine what should be done to make the process as efficient as possible.

In order to address the issue the Chair recommended that the Commission convene a *Code Coordination and Implementation Workgroup* to review and evaluate all of the regulatory requirements currently impacting the code development process (code update process), and to propose a legislative path for a more efficacious process and timetable for the implementation of the Florida Building Code update process. At the October 2014 meeting the Commission voted unanimously to convene a *Code Coordination and Implementation Workgroup* to review and evaluate all of the regulatory requirements currently impacting the code development process (code update process), and to propose a legislative path to a more efficacious timetable for the implementation of the Florida Building Code update process.

PROJECT SCOPE AND TIMETABLE FOR DELIVERY

The scope of the *Code Coordination and Implementation Workgroup* is as follows:

The initial scope of the *Code Coordination and Implementation Workgroup* will be to review and evaluate all of the regulatory requirements currently impacting the code development process (code update process), and to propose a legislative path to a more efficacious timetable for the implementation of the Florida Building Code update process going forward. It is expected that any recommendations for statutory changes, once approved by the full Commission, will be delivered to the 2016 Florida Legislature.

OVERVIEW OF WORKGROUP’S KEY ACTIONS AND DECISIONS

THURSDAY, JUNE 18, 2015

II. PLENARY SESSION SUMMARY AND OVERVIEW

At the June 18, 2015 meeting the Workgroup reviewed and evaluated a suite of proposed options to address key topics and associated issues and sub-issues. Specific key topics evaluated were as follows: acceptability ranking the initial list of options for evaluation for Florida specific amendments, and statutory timeline requirements including Code adoption requirements, Florida Fire Prevention Code and National Electrical Code (code printing and publication, errata, and the Code amendment process were ranked at the April 13, 2015 meeting). The seven overarching key topics for Workgroup evaluation are as follows: code printing and publication, errata, the Code amendment process, Florida specific amendments, statutory timeline requirements, adoption of standards and codes by reference, and Commission participation with the ICC code development process. The meeting participants agreed to send any additional options they would like evaluated to Jeff Blair by a date to be specified in advance of the next meeting.

(Attachment 1—Meeting Evaluation Results)

III. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

WORKGROUP MEMBER ATTENDANCE

The following Workgroup members attended the Thursday, June 18, 2015 meeting:

Dick Browdy (Chair), Steve Bassett, Jay Carlson, David Compton, Kevin Flanagan, Charles Frank, Darrell Phillips, Brad Schiffer, Jim Schock, Drew Smith, Brian Swope, and George Wiggins.

(12 of 14 Workgroup members attended)

(Attachment 2—Workgroup Membership)

Absent Members:

Tom Allen (ex-officio), and Steve Strawn.

Other Commissioners in Attendance:

Bob Boyer, Jeff Gross, Frederick Schilling, and Jeff Stone.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

A list of public participants is included as “Attachment 3” of this Report.

(Attachment 3—Public Participation)

DBPR STAFF PRESENT

Robert Benbow, Jim Hammers, April Hammonds, Mo Madani, and Drew Winters.

MEETING FACILITATION

The meeting was facilitated by Jeff Blair from the FCRC Consensus Center at Florida State University. Information at: <http://consensus.fsu.edu/>



CONSENSUS CENTER

PROJECT WEBPAGE

Information on the Florida Building Commission project, including agenda packets, meeting reports, and related documents may be found at the Commission Webpage. Located at the following URL: <http://floridabuilding.org/c/default.aspx> ; <http://consensus.fsu.edu/Code-Coordination/index.html>

IV. AGENDA REVIEW AND APPROVAL

The Workgroup voted unanimously, 12 - 0 in favor, to approve the agenda for the June 18, 2015 meeting as presented/posted. Following are the key agenda items approved for consideration:

- To Approve Regular Procedural Topics (Agenda and Facilitator's Summary Report/Meeting Minutes)
- To Review List of Options to Address Issues Regarding the Florida Building Code Development Process
- To Discuss and Evaluate Level of Acceptability of Proposed Options
- To Consider Public Comment
- To Identify Needed Next Steps: Information, Assignments, and Agenda Items for Next Meeting

Amendments to the Posted Agenda:

There were no amendments to the posted/presented Agenda.

(Attachment 4—June 18, 2015 Workgroup Agenda)

FACILITATOR'S SUMMARY REPORTS APPROVAL (APRIL 13, 2015)

The Workgroup voted unanimously, 12 – 0 in favor, to approve the April 13, 2015 Facilitator's Summary Report as presented/posted.

Amendments to Report:

None were offered

V. REVIEW OF KEY ISSUES FOR WORKGROUP EVALUATION

Jeff Blair reviewed the Workgroup's approved list of key topics and issues provided as pages 5 - 6 of the Agenda Packet. Jeff reviewed the list of issues and asked participants to determine whether any issues should be revised and/or added. Following a review of the approved list of key issues, questions and answers, public comment, and Workgroup discussion, the Workgroup agreed to retain the list of key topics and issues as presented. Following is summary of the list of the seven key topics reviewed and agreed to by the Workgroup:

Code printing and publication, Commission authority to issue errata, the Code amendment process (triennial, annual and glitch), Florida Specific amendments, statutory timeline requirements, adoption of standards and codes by reference, and Commission participation with the ICC code development process. The complete list of key issues and sub-issues is included as “Attachment 5”.

(Attachment 5—List of Key Issues)

VI. REVIEW, EVALUATION AND ACCEPTABILITY RANKING OF PROPOSED OPTIONS

Jeff Blair reviewed the initial list of options proposed by stakeholders to address each of the seven key topical issues within the Workgroup’s scope. A preliminary list of options was offered by participants between Meetings one, two and three, and other options were referred by the Commission. Jeff explained that the Workgroup would address each of the seven key issues in turn by topic, and that participants would be invited to propose any additional options and comment on existing options before the Workgroup members ranked them. Jeff explained that members would be asked to rank each proposed option in turn utilizing a four-point acceptability ranking scale where 4 = acceptable, 3 = minor reservations, 2 = major reservations, and 1 = unacceptable. Following discussion and refinement of options, members may be asked to do additional rankings of proposed options if requested by a *Workgroup* member. Members should be prepared to offer specific refinements to address their reservations. Once ranked, options with a 75% or greater number of 4’s and 3’s in proportion to 2’s and 1’s shall be considered consensus recommendations. The *Workgroup’s* consensus recommendations will be submitted to the Commission for consideration.

During the June 18, 2015 meeting the Workgroup discussed pros and cons, received public comment, and acceptability ranked options proposed for x of the eight key issues. The three key topical issues evaluated were code printing and publication, errata, and the Code amendment process. The Facilitator reviewed the list of options proposed prior to the meeting by topic and offered participants (public and members) an opportunity to offer additional options. All of the options proposed are included in the ranking results.

Following are all options ranked during the April 13, 2015 that have achieved a consensus level of support ($\geq 75\%$ in favor):

I. Code Printing and Publication

- Publish a fully integrated FBC for all code volumes (maintain the status quo). **[91% in favor]**

II. Errata

- Allow the Commission to issue errata only to correct scrivener’s errors or simple typographical errors without additional rulemaking to implement the adopted errata. The proposed errata will be reviewed by the TACs prior to Commission consideration. The Commission will require a 75% or greater voting threshold for approving errata. **[100% in favor]**

III. Code Amendment Process:

Triennial Code Update

- Maintain the 3-year code update cycle (maintain status quo). **[100% in favor]**

Annual Amendments

- Maintain status quo for annual amendments. **[100% in favor]**

Glitch Amendments

- Issue glitch amendments whenever needed (status quo) and continue to conduct a glitch cycle within (concurrent with) the code update cycle. **[100% in favor]**

Following are all options ranked during the June 18, 2015 that have achieved a consensus level of support ($\geq 75\%$ in favor):

IV. Florida Specific Amendments:

- All Florida specific amendments are brought forward for evaluation and a recommendation by the relevant TAC(s). **[100% in favor]**
- Maintain the current practice (status quo). **[83% in favor]**
- Provide statutory authority for the Commission to consider a cost/benefit analysis for ICC code amendments that are brought into the FBC by the adoption of the new base code through triennial updates for the Commission's evaluation regarding whether to accept or reject the amendments.
- **[83% in favor]**
- Provide additional scrutiny to proposed Florida Specific Amendments via the Commission adopting a "test" or "definition" as to what constitutes a Florida specific need. **[75% in favor]**

V. Statutory Timelines

Code Adoption Requirements:

- Require a minimum of 6 months between the effective date of a new Code and the starting date for submittal of proposed code changes for a new triennial Code update cycle. **[83% in favor]**

Florida Fire Prevention Code:

- Provide a statutory change that allows for concurrent rulemaking of the FFPC and the FBC. **[92% in favor]**
- Integrate the adoption of the Florida Fire Prevention Code with the Florida Building Code. Integrate the Fire Code cycle into the Building Code cycle. **[83% in favor]**

National Electrical Code:

- Electrical Code adoption should be consistent with the Base Code document date (status quo). **[75% in favor]**

Recommendations for Interagency Cooperation and Collaboration:

- Work with the DSFM to sync an accelerated code adoption cycle.
- Closer coordination between FBC and Florida Fire Code development.
- Ensure the SFMO and Florida Building Commission jointly adopt and publish an agreed to schedule for the adoption process of future FBC and FFPC editions.
- Ensure the Florida Fire Code Advisory Council meets jointly with the Fire TAC at least once every six months to review DEC statements issued by the other agency and potential issues of improved

coordination/cooperation between the FFPC/SFMO and FBC/Commission.

- To assist with cooperation and coordination, have the FFPC rule adoption hearings occur at the same locations and date as the Florida Building Commission meetings.
- Utilize the Florida Building Commission web based system to submit, track and publish proposed/adopted amendments to the FFPC. (SFMO would still administer the FFPC, but the system would be shared.)
- Ensure both the SFMO FFPC and DBPR FBC web pages, that display the codes, have direct links to the partner codes, DEC statements and informal interpretations.
- Ensure the SFMO FFPC informal interpretations web page has the same quality as the BOAF Informal Interpretation page with a search friendly index.
- Ensure both the SFMO FFPC informal interpretation web page links to the SFMO informal interpretation web page and vice versa.

The complete ranking results and listing of options is included as “Attachment 6”.

(Attachment 6—Ranking Results)

VII. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Members of the public were offered an opportunity to provide comment during each of the Workgroup’s substantive discussion agenda items. Following is a summary of the general public comment.

Public Comments:

- No additional public comments were offered.

VIII. WORKGROUP MEMBER COMMENTS AND ISSUES

Workgroup members were invited to offer any general comments to the Workgroup, or identify any issues or agenda items for the next Workgroup meeting.

Workgroup Member Comments:

- Chairman Browdy: thanked the stakeholders for their participation in the process and willingness to work with the Commission to build consensus on issue of importance to the construction industry and citizens of Florida.

IX. NEXT WORKGROUP MEETING OVERVIEW AND ISSUES

The next Workgroup meeting, scheduled for **August X**, 2015, will focus on further evaluation and ranking of options to address the seven key topical issues being evaluated by the Workgroup. During the meeting members will be asked to review the existing suite of ranked options and invited to propose any additional project relevant options for *Workgroup* consideration. Once ranked, options with a 75% or greater number of 4's and 3's in proportion to 2's and 1's shall be considered consensus recommendations. The *Workgroup's* consensus package of recommendations will be submitted to the Commission for consideration.

ASSIGNMENTS

- Jeff Blair will draft a facilitator's summary report of the meeting.
- Jeff Blair will send participants the list of options proposed to date with a request for participants to return to him a list of any additional options for evaluation relevant to each key issue. The revised list of options will be compiled without attribution and will serve as the next iteration of the Workgroup's *Options Evaluation Worksheet*. The discussions and ranking will only occur during Workgroup meetings and members should not discuss the options with other members in any format (verbal, written, electronic, etc.).
- The next Workgroup meeting date is **August X, 2015**, and the exact location will be provided to participants as soon in advance of the meeting as possible.

ADJOURNMENT

The Chair thanked Workgroup members and the public for their attendance and participation, and adjourned the meeting at 4:50 P.M. on Thursday, June 18, 2015.

ATTACHMENT 1
CODE COORDINATION AND IMPLEMENTATION WORKGROUP
MEETING EVALUATION RESULTS

JUNE 18, 2015—CITRA, FLORIDA

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

Number of Respondents: 9 of 12 Members present completed meeting evaluations.

1. OVERALL MEETING ASSESSMENT.

- 9.8 The background information was very useful.
- 9.8 The agenda packet was very useful.
- 9.8 The objectives for the meeting were stated at the outset.
- 9.8 Overall, the objectives of the meeting were fully achieved.

2. MEMBERS LEVEL OF AGREEMENT THAT THE MEETING OBJECTIVES WERE ACHIEVED.

- 9.8 Review of Options to Address Issues Regarding Florida Building Code Development Process.
- 9.8 Clarification and Discussion of Proposed Options.
- 9.9 Acceptability Ranking of Proposed Options to Address Key Issues.

3. HOW WELL THE FACILITATOR HELPED THE MEMBERS ENGAGE IN THE MEETING.

- 9.3 The members followed the direction of the Facilitator.
- 9.8 The Facilitator made sure the concerns of all members were heard.
- 9.7 The Facilitator helped us arrange our time well.
- 9.8 Participant input was documented accurately in Facilitator's Report (previous meeting).

4. MEMBERS LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE MEETING.

- 9.8 Overall, I am very satisfied with the meeting.
- 9.9 I was very satisfied with the services provided by the Facilitator.
- 9.8 I am satisfied with the outcome of the meeting.

5. HOW WELL THE NEXT STEPS WERE COMMUNICATED.

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

6. WHAT MEMBERS LIKED BEST ABOUT THE MEETING.

- Good discussion.
- Coffee and water.

7. COMMENTS REGARDING HOW THE MEETING COULD HAVE BEEN IMPROVED.

- Meet at the same hotel as the Commission meeting.

8. OTHER GENERAL COMMENTS.

- Good job Jeff!

COMMENTS ON SPECIFIC AGENDA ITEMS

None were offered.

PUBLIC-MEETING EVALUATION AND COMMENT RESULTS

None were offered.

ATTACHMENT 2
WORKGROUP MEMBERSHIP

| WORKGROUP MEMBERSHIP | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| MEMBER | AFFILIATION |
| Dick Browdy | Florida Building Commission (FBC) |
| Tom Allen (ex officio) | ICC Code Process |
| Steve Bassett | Building Professionals: Mechanical Contractors |
| Jay Carlson | Building Professionals: General Contractors |
| David Compton | Design Professionals: Engineers |
| Kevin Flanagan | Building Professionals: Electrical Contractors |
| Charles Frank | Division of State Fire Marshal |
| Darrell Phillips | Education Facility Professionals: Public Education |
| Brad Schiffer | Design Professionals: Architects |
| Jim Schock | Building Officials |
| Drew Smith | Building Professionals: Home Builders |
| Steve Strawn | Building Product Manufacturers |
| Brian Swope | Building Professionals: Roofing and Sheet Metal Contractors |
| George Wiggins | Building Officials of Florida (BOAF) |
| DBPR PROJECT STAFF | |
| Chris Burgwald | Administrative |
| Jim Hammers | IT |
| April Hammonds | FBC Legal Counsel |
| Mo Madani | Technical Manager |
| Jim Richmond | Executive Director |
| FACILITATOR | |
| Jeff Blair | FCRC Consensus Center at Florida State University |

**ATTACHMENT 3
MEETING PARTICIPATION**

| PUBLIC PARTICIPATION | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| NAME | AFFILIATION |
| Tony Apfelbeck | Fire/Building Officials |
| Lee Arsenault | Contractors |
| Doug Buck | FHBA (Building Contractors) |
| Sal Delfino | <i>(Not Identified)</i> |
| Bill Dunbaugh | Building Officials |
| Neil Burdich | BOAF |
| Joe Eysie | Florida Natural Gas Association (FNGA) |
| John Farinelli | Code Consultants |
| Cam Fentriss | Code Consultants |
| Susan Ferris | WMA |
| Jaime Gascon | Miami-Dade County |
| Julius Halas | DSFM |
| Jennifer Hatfield | FPSA (Pool and Spa Contractors) |
| Shar Hingson | FFMIA |
| Alfredo Ramirez | <i>(Not Identified)</i> |
| Casia Sinco | DSFM |
| Karl Thompson | State Fire Marshal |
| Dwight Wilkes | Code Consultant |
| Douglass Wood | <i>(Not Identified)</i> |
| Mark Zehnal | FRSA (Roofing and Sheet Metal Contractors) |
| Al Zichella | Developers/Commercial Contractors |

ATTACHMENT 4
JUNE 18, 2015 MEETING AGENDA

FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION
CODE COORDINATION AND IMPLEMENTATION WORKGROUP
JUNE 18, 2015—MEETING III
IFAS—PLANT SCIENCE RESEARCH AND EDUCATION UNIT
2556 WEST HIGHWAY 318—CITRA, FLORIDA 32113

MEETING OBJECTIVES

- To Approve Regular Procedural Topics (Agenda and Facilitator’s Summary Report/Meeting Minutes)
- To Review List of Options to Address Issues Regarding the Florida Building Code Development Process
- To Discuss and Evaluate Level of Acceptability of Proposed Options
- To Consider Public Comment
- ✓ To Identify Needed Next Steps: Information, Assignments, and Agenda Items for Next Meeting

MEETING AGENDA—THURSDAY, JUNE 18, 2015

All Agenda Times—including Adjournment—are Approximate and Subject to Change

| | | | |
|-----------------|------------|--|----------------|
| 12:30 PM | A.) | WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS | Browdy |
| | B.) | AGENDA REVIEW AND APPROVAL (June 18, 2015) | Blair |
| | C.) | REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF FACILITATOR’S SUMMARY REPORT AND MEETING MINUTES (April 13, 2015) | Blair |
| | D.) | REVIEW OF KEY ISSUES FOR EVALUATION REGARDING THE FLORIDA BUILDING CODE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS | Blair/ CCIW |
| | E.) | IDENTIFICATION, DISCUSSION AND EVALUATION OF OPTIONS IN TURN | CCIW/ Blair |
| ~2:30 PM | | BREAK | |
| | E.) | IDENTIFICATION, DISCUSSION AND EVALUATION OF OPTIONS IN TURN (CONTINUED) | CCIW |
| | F.) | GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT | Blair |
| | G.) | NEXT STEPS: AGENDA ITEMS, NEEDED INFORMATION, ASSIGNMENTS, DATE AND LOCATION | Blair |
| ~5:00 PM | H.) | ADJOURN | |

ATTACHMENT 5

KEY ISSUES FOR WORKGROUP EVALUATION

I. Code Printing/Publication

Publishing a fully integrated Florida Building Code (Florida specific amendments integrated into the adopted I-Codes version), or publishing Florida specific amendments as a supplement.

II. Errata

Authority to issue errata and publication of the same.
A clear definition of what constitutes an errata.

III. Code Amendment Process

Triennial Update

Including a review of the 3-year update cycle

Annual Amendments

Glitch Amendments

IV. Florida Specific Amendments

Statutory requirements for what is carried forward and how they are reviewed by TACs and Commission.

V. Statutory Timeline Requirements

- Selection of I-Codes version for FBC Update (timelines and requirements).
- Selection of NEC version for FBC Update (timelines and requirements).
- Incorporation of FFPC (timelines and requirements).
- TAC review and public comment (timelines and requirements).
- Glitch amendment (timelines and requirements).
- Chapter 120 rule adoption process (timelines and requirements).
- The Florida Building Code shall take effect no sooner than 6 months after publication of the updated code (timelines and requirements).

Recommendations from Commission Process Review Ad Hoc Committee (2009)

Committee recommended that the Commission recommend to the Florida Legislature eliminating the statutory requirement for the Commission to wait six months after publication of the latest I-Code Edition before selecting the same as the foundation code for the Florida Building Code for future Code Editions.

VI. Adoption of Standards and Codes by Reference

National Electrical Code (NEC)

Florida Fire Prevention Code (FCPC)

All other relevant standards and codes adopted by reference

VII. Commission Participation With the ICC Code Development Process

Referred to the Workgroup by the Commission at their December 12, 2014 meeting.

(Note: An *ICC Participation Workgroup* process was conducted by the Commission in 2004, and the Commission made a policy decision not to participate in the ICC, instead relying on BOAF participation).

A discussion of whether the Commission should participate in the I-Code development process (FBC I-Code participation evaluation) was also considered during the *Building Code System Assessment Process* (BCSA) that delivered recommendations to the Commission in December of 2012.

OTHER RELATED TOPICS SUGGESTED BY MEMBERS WITH RELATED PREVIOUS COMMISSION ACTIONS

Local Technical Amendments

The issue is that local technical amendments are sometimes adopted by local jurisdictions without a demonstrated need, and the resultant impact to the consistency of state-wide implementation of the Florida Building Code (including interpretation and enforcement of the Code).

Building Code System Uniform Implementation Evaluation Workgroup (2013)

The Commission recommended and the Legislature implemented statutory clarification that local technical amendments should be clearly defined in Chapter 553, F.S., and local technical amendments should only be enacted when they fully comply with the provisions in Section 553.73 (4)(b)(1.-10.), F.S. governing adoption of local technical amendments. A definition of the term “*local technical amendment*” was added by the Legislature as Chapter 553.71 (6), F.S., as follows: “Local Technical Amendment” means an action by a local governing authority that results in a technical change to the Florida Building Code and its local enforcement.

Consistency in Code Interpretation

The issue is the need for a consistent and uniform implementation (interpretation and enforcement) of the Florida Building Code state-wide.

Building Code System Uniform Implementation Evaluation Workgroup (2013)

1) The Florida Building Commission developed the Florida Building Code to be implemented uniformly throughout the State with the exception of the HVHZ; (2) The Commission through its established processes continually addresses current relevant issues and model code updates; (3) The Florida Building Commission’s *Building Code System Uniform Implementation Evaluation Workgroup* has determined that there are significant disparities within the State in Code enforcement, permitting requirements and associated fees; (4) All regulatory agencies and licensees engaged in the process of implementing the Florida Building Code are required to implement the Florida Building Code and it's associated processes; (5) Local technical amendments should be clearly defined in Chapter 553, F.S., and local technical amendments should only be enacted when they fully comply with the provisions in Section 553.73 (4)(b)(1.-10.), F.S. governing adoption of local technical amendments; (6) the Building Code System should be continuously monitored and evaluated for enhancements to the System relative to achieving the goal of uniform implementation and interpretation of the Code while preserving the Code’s foundations of local administration and enforcement.

ISO Ratings (ISO’s Building Code Effectiveness Grading Schedule (BCEGS))

The issue is that some jurisdictions are not able to achieve the highest ISO ratings since the adopted edition of the Florida Building Code does not generally incorporate the latest I-Code edition as the foundation code for the FBC.

Building Code System Assessment Process (2011)

Recommended convening a workgroup/process to ensure that the ISO recognizes the Florida Building Code for equivalent points for BSEGS (provide equal credits to the I-codes).

Status: The recommendation was referred to the *Building Code System Uniform Implementation Evaluation Workgroup (2013)*. The Workgroup did not take formal action on the issue, lacking participation from the insurance industry.

ATTACHMENT 6

ACCEPTABILITY RANKING OF PROPOSED OPTIONS RESULTS

ACCEPTABILITY RANKING EXERCISE OVERVIEW

During the meeting(s) members and stakeholders will be asked to review existing proposed options and invited to propose any additional project relevant options for *Workgroup* consideration. A preliminary list of options was proposed by stakeholders, and other options were referred by the Commission. During meetings members will be asked to rank the options for acceptability. In addition, following discussion and refinement of options, members may be asked to do additional rankings of proposed options if requested by a *Workgroup* member. Members should be prepared to offer specific refinements to address their reservations.

Once ranked, options with a 75% or greater number of 4s and 3s in proportion to 2s and 1s shall be considered consensus recommendations. The *Workgroup's* consensus recommendations will be submitted to the Commission for consideration.

The following scale will be utilized for the ranking exercises:

| | | | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|--------------------------|
| ACCEPTABILITY RANKING SCALE | <i>4= Acceptable, I agree</i> | <i>3= Acceptable, I agree with minor reservations</i> | <i>2= Not Acceptable, I don't agree unless major reservations addressed</i> | <i>1= Not Acceptable</i> |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|--------------------------|

KEY TO SYMBOLS

| SYMBOL | MEANING OF SYMBOL |
|--------|-------------------------|
| Ⓢ | Proposed Option |
| ⓐ | Consensus Ranked Option |

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING/RANKING PROPOSED OPTIONS

| Effective Options are SMART | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| CRITERIA | EXPLANATION |
| S SPECIFIC | It is detailed enough so that anyone reading the <i>Option</i> will know what is intended to be accomplished. |
| M MEASURABLE | The end result can be identified in terms of quantity, quality, acceptable standards, etc. You know you have a measurable <i>Option</i> when it states in objective terms the end result or product. |
| A ATTAINABLE | The <i>Option</i> is feasible. Are there resources available, or likely to become available for implementing the <i>Option</i> ? |
| R RELEVANT | The <i>Option</i> is relevant to the Commission's mission, purpose and charge. |
| T TIME-FRAMED | There are milestones with a specific date attached to the completion. |

I. CODE PRINTING AND PUBLICATION

OPTIONS RANKED ACHIEVING CONSENSUS WITH A $\geq 75\%$ LEVEL OF SUPPORT

© 1.) Publish a fully integrated FBC for all code volumes (maintain the status quo). **[91% in favor]**

| | <i>4=acceptable</i> | <i>3=minor reservations</i> | <i>2=major reservations</i> | <i>1=not acceptable</i> |
|------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| <i>Ranked 04/13/15</i> | 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

OPTIONS RANKED NOT ACHIEVING $\geq 75\%$ LEVEL OF SUPPORT

Publish fully featured integrated Code in electronic version free to the user. **[55% in favor]**

| | <i>4=acceptable</i> | <i>3= minor reservations</i> | <i>2=major reservations</i> | <i>1= not acceptable</i> |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| <i>Identified and Ranked 04/13/15</i> | 1 | 5 | 5 | 0 |

Publish the Florida Code electronically by using the appropriate I Codes as the base and create a hyperlink or other best technique to insert the Florida modifications in each Chapter, Section or throughout the code in use (whichever works best). The hyperlink text would show the modification(s) made to the base Code. (Rationale: This provides a fully integrated code while allowing designers and other code users the ability to use the base I codes for projects outside of Florida.) **[55% in favor]**

| | <i>4=acceptable</i> | <i>3=minor reservations</i> | <i>2=major reservations</i> | <i>1=not acceptable</i> |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| <i>Identified and Ranked 04/13/15</i> | 1 | 5 | 1 | 4 |

Integrate Building, Residential, Existing and Energy Codes, and use supplements for Mechanical, Plumbing, Gas and Electrical Codes. **[45% in favor]**

| | <i>4=acceptable</i> | <i>3=minor reservations</i> | <i>2=major reservations</i> | <i>1=not acceptable</i> |
|------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| <i>Ranked 04/13/15</i> | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 |

Publish a fully integrated FBC using a third party publisher (not ICC). **[9% in favor]**

| | <i>4=acceptable</i> | <i>3=minor reservations</i> | <i>2=major reservations</i> | <i>1=not acceptable</i> |
|------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| <i>Ranked 04/13/15</i> | 1 | 0 | 5 | 5 |

Consider changing the base code from the I-Codes. (ANSI consensus standards development is not required for development of I-Codes.) **[9% in favor]**

| | <i>4=acceptable</i> | <i>3=minor reservations</i> | <i>2=major reservations</i> | <i>1=not acceptable</i> |
|------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| <i>Ranked 04/13/15</i> | 1 | 0 | 0 | 10 |

MEMBERS' DECIDED NOT TO RANK THESE OPTIONS SINCE THE TOPICS WERE COVERED BY OTHER RANKED OPTIONS OR THE ISSUE IS OTHERWISE RESOLVED

- Publish Florida Amendments as a supplement.
- Publish Florida Amendments as a supplement with exception.*
 *Exception: Where Florida technical amendments cannot be easily inserted or understood for design and enforcement purposes, otherwise provide supplements to parts of the codes. For example certain wind provisions may require integration.
 (Intent: Publish amendments to the greatest extent possible without degrading usability of the code(s).)

II. ERRATA

OPTIONS RANKED ACHIEVING CONSENSUS WITH A ≥75% LEVEL OF SUPPORT

OPTION MODIFIED BY WORKGROUP DURING THE 4/13/15 MEETING

© 1.) Allow the Commission to issue errata only to correct scrivener’s errors or simple typographical errors without additional rulemaking to implement the adopted errata. The proposed errata will be reviewed by the TACs prior to Commission consideration. The Commission will require a 75% or greater voting threshold for approving errata. **[100% in favor]**

| | <i>4=acceptable</i> | <i>3=minor reservations</i> | <i>2=major reservations</i> | <i>1=not acceptable</i> |
|------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| <i>Ranked 04/13/15</i> | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

MEMBERS' DECIDED NOT TO RANK THESE OPTIONS SINCE THE TOPICS WERE COVERED BY OTHER RANKED OPTIONS OR THE ISSUE IS OTHERWISE RESOLVED

- Allow the Commission to issue errata and publication. Provide clear definition of what constitutes errata.
- Seek authority to issue errata only to clarify the intent of code amendments. Errata should include the ability to adopt the latest edition dates of adopted codes and standards into the adopted Code.

**III. THE CODE AMENDMENT PROCESS:
1.) TRIENNIAL, 2.) ANNUAL, 3.) GLITCH**

1.) TRIENNIAL CODE UPDATE

OPTIONS RANKED ACHIEVING CONSENSUS WITH A ≥75% LEVEL OF SUPPORT

© 1.) Maintain the 3-year code update cycle (maintain status quo). [100% in favor]

| | <i>4=acceptable</i> | <i>3=minor reservations</i> | <i>2=major reservations</i> | <i>1=not acceptable</i> |
|------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| <i>Ranked 04/13/15</i> | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

MEMBERS’ DECIDED NOT TO RANK THESE OPTIONS SINCE THE TOPICS WERE COVERED BY OTHER RANKED OPTIONS

- Maintain one comprehensive 3-year code update cycle, with no Glitch amendment.
- Consider/Evaluate a 5-year code update cycle.
- Maintain one comprehensive 3-year code update cycle, skipping a cycle to realign. (Proposed 4/13/15)

2.) ANNUAL AMENDMENTS

OPTIONS RANKED ACHIEVING CONSENSUS WITH A ≥75% LEVEL OF SUPPORT

© 1.) Maintain status quo for annual amendments. [100% in favor]

| | <i>4=acceptable</i> | <i>3=minor reservations</i> | <i>2=major reservations</i> | <i>1=not acceptable</i> |
|------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| <i>Ranked 04/13/15</i> | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

MEMBERS’ DECIDED NOT TO RANK THESE OPTIONS SINCE THE TOPICS WERE COVERED BY OTHER RANKED OPTIONS OR THE ISSUE IS OTHERWISE RESOLVED

- Utilize the Annual Amendment Process to update the FBC to the latest reference codes and standards adopted into the Code.
- Limit annual amendments to update standards and emergencies based on natural disasters
- Issue two annual amendment cycles after the triennial code update is completed.

3.) GLITCH AMENDMENTS

OPTIONS RANKED ACHIEVING CONSENSUS WITH A ≥75% LEVEL OF SUPPORT

© 1.) Issue glitch amendments whenever needed (status quo) and continue to conduct a glitch cycle within (concurrent with) the code update cycle. (The two proposed options (A and B) were combined during the 4/13/15 meeting) **[100% in favor]**

| | <i>4=acceptable</i> | <i>3=minor reservations</i> | <i>2=major reservations</i> | <i>1=not acceptable</i> |
|------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| <i>Ranked 04/13/15</i> | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

IV. FLORIDA SPECIFIC AMENDMENTS

OPTIONS RANKED ACHIEVING CONSENSUS WITH A ≥75% LEVEL OF SUPPORT

© 1.) All Florida specific amendments are brought forward for evaluation and a recommendation by the relevant TAC. **[100% in favor]**

| | <i>4=acceptable</i> | <i>3= minor reservations</i> | <i>2=major reservations</i> | <i>1= not acceptable</i> |
|---|---------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| <i>Initial Ranking and added 06/18/15</i> | 9 | 3 | 0 | 0 |

© 2.) Provide statutory authority for the Commission to consider a cost/benefit analysis for ICC code amendments that are brought into the FBC by the adoption of the new base code through triennial updates for the Commission’s evaluation regarding whether to accept or reject the amendments.

[83% in favor]

| | <i>4=acceptable</i> | <i>3= minor reservations</i> | <i>2=major reservations</i> | <i>1= not acceptable</i> |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| <i>Initial Ranking 06/18/15</i> | 7 | 3 | 1 | 1 |

© 3.) Maintain the current practice (status quo). **[83% in favor]**

| | <i>4=acceptable</i> | <i>3= minor reservations</i> | <i>2=major reservations</i> | <i>1= not acceptable</i> |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| <i>Initial Ranking 06/18/15</i> | 6 | 4 | 2 | 0 |

© 4.) Provide additional scrutiny to proposed Florida Specific Amendments via the Commission adopting a “test” or “definition” as to what constitutes a Florida specific need. **[75% in favor]**

| | <i>4=acceptable</i> | <i>3= minor reservations</i> | <i>2=major reservations</i> | <i>1= not acceptable</i> |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| <i>Initial Ranking 06/18/15</i> | 4 | 5 | 2 | 1 |

OPTIONS RANKED NOT ACHIEVING $\geq 75\%$ LEVEL OF SUPPORT

Provide that all Florida Specific Amendments (FSA) are carried forward for each Code update cycle. (Eliminate the sunset provision; FSAs would have to be proactively removed). **[17% in favor]**

| | <i>4=acceptable</i> | <i>3= minor reservations</i> | <i>2=major reservations</i> | <i>1= not acceptable</i> |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| <i>Initial Ranking 06/18/15</i> | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 |

Eliminate the statutory exemption for sunsetting of Florida Building Code “amendments or modifications related to state agency regulations.” **[8% in favor]**

| | <i>4=acceptable</i> | <i>3= minor reservations</i> | <i>2=major reservations</i> | <i>1= not acceptable</i> |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| <i>Initial Ranking 06/18/15</i> | 0 | 1 | 5 | 6 |

Adopt statutory language that sunsets statutory technical changes to the Florida Building Code every six (or X) years. **[8% in favor]**

| | <i>4=acceptable</i> | <i>3= minor reservations</i> | <i>2=major reservations</i> | <i>1= not acceptable</i> |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| <i>Initial Ranking 06/18/15</i> | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4 |

Provide additional scrutiny to proposed Florida Specific Amendments, in meeting the requirements of FS 553, by requiring a staff recommendation as to if the submitted amendment qualifies as meeting a Florida specific need (all amendments are still reviewed by the TACs). **[0% in favor]**

| | <i>4=acceptable</i> | <i>3= minor reservations</i> | <i>2=major reservations</i> | <i>1= not acceptable</i> |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| <i>Initial Ranking 06/18/15</i> | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 |

MEMBERS’ DECIDED NOT TO RANK THESE OPTIONS SINCE THE TOPICS WERE COVERED BY OTHER RANKED OPTIONS OR THE ISSUE IS OTHERWISE RESOLVED

- Ensure Florida Specific Amendments have Florida specific need.

V. STATUTORY TIMELINE REQUIREMENTS

CODE ADOPTION REQUIREMENTS

OPTIONS RANKED ACHIEVING CONSENSUS WITH A $\geq 75\%$ LEVEL OF SUPPORT

© 1.) Require a minimum of 6 months between the effective date of a new Code and the starting date for submittal of proposed code changes for a new triennial Code update cycle. **[83% in favor]**

| | <i>4=acceptable</i> | <i>3= minor reservations</i> | <i>2=major reservations</i> | <i>1= not acceptable</i> |
|---|---------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| <i>Initial Ranking and added 06/18/15</i> | 8 | 2 | 2 | 0 |

OPTIONS RANKED NOT ACHIEVING ≥75% LEVEL OF SUPPORT

Maintain status quo for TAC and Commission review process (45 day/45 day review process).

[67% in favor]

| | <i>4=acceptable</i> | <i>3= minor reservations</i> | <i>2=major reservations</i> | <i>1= not acceptable</i> |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| <i>Initial Ranking 06/18/15</i> | 4 | 4 | 4 | 0 |

After TAC review and recommendations publish TAC comments/recommendations on BCIS for 30 days before FBC consideration (instead of 45 days). **[67% in favor]**

| | <i>4=acceptable</i> | <i>3= minor reservations</i> | <i>2=major reservations</i> | <i>1= not acceptable</i> |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| <i>Initial Ranking 06/18/15</i> | 4 | 4 | 4 | 0 |

Proposed amendments shall be published on BCIS for 30 days before consideration by TAC (instead of 45 days). **[50% in favor]**

| | <i>4=acceptable</i> | <i>3= minor reservations</i> | <i>2=major reservations</i> | <i>1= not acceptable</i> |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| <i>Initial Ranking 06/18/15</i> | 3 | 3 | 5 | 1 |

Due to the extensive industry input into the Code adoption process eliminate the requirement to adopt the Code using the Chapter 120, F.S. rule process. **[42% in favor]**

| | <i>4=acceptable</i> | <i>3= minor reservations</i> | <i>2=major reservations</i> | <i>1= not acceptable</i> |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| <i>Initial Ranking 06/18/15</i> | 2 | 3 | 6 | 1 |

The Florida Building Code shall take effect no sooner than 3 months after publication of the updated code, and 6 months after completion of on line draft code. (Intent: Both conditions would apply resulting giving code users the necessary 6 month lead time for training and education.) **[42% in favor]**

| | <i>4=acceptable</i> | <i>3= minor reservations</i> | <i>2=major reservations</i> | <i>1= not acceptable</i> |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| <i>Initial Ranking 06/18/15</i> | 2 | 3 | 6 | 1 |

Maintain the 6-month I-Codes publication requirement (maintain status quo). Commission shall wait six months after publication of the latest I-Code Edition before selecting the same as the foundation code for the Florida Building Code for future Code Editions.* **[17% in favor]**

| | <i>4=acceptable</i> | <i>3= minor reservations</i> | <i>2=major reservations</i> | <i>1= not acceptable</i> |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| <i>Initial Ranking 06/18/15</i> | 1 | 1 | 8 | 2 |

* This is no longer a requirement.

The FBC shall take effect no sooner than 3 months after publication.

Reduce the 6-month availability requirement to 3 months (do to recent training changes). **[17% in favor]**

| | <i>4=acceptable</i> | <i>3= minor reservations</i> | <i>2=major reservations</i> | <i>1= not acceptable</i> |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| <i>Initial Ranking 06/18/15</i> | 0 | 2 | 5 | 5 |

Provide a minimum of 60 days for TAC review and public comment. 60day/60 day review cycle.

[0% in favor]

| | <i>4=acceptable</i> | <i>3= minor reservations</i> | <i>2=major reservations</i> | <i>1= not acceptable</i> |
|---|---------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| <i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i> | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 |

MEMBERS' DECIDED NOT TO RANK THESE OPTIONS SINCE THE TOPICS WERE COVERED BY OTHER RANKED OPTIONS OR THE ISSUE IS OTHERWISE RESOLVED

- Commission Process Review Ad Hoc Committee (2009) recommended that the Commission recommend to the Florida Legislature eliminating the statutory requirement for the Commission to wait six months after publication of the latest I-Code Edition before selecting the same as the foundation code for the Florida Building Code for future Code Editions.
- Remove any time constraints on use of the I Code base document. Start the review process as soon as the base code is issued.

FLORIDA FIRE PREVENTION CODE

OPTIONS RANKED ACHIEVING CONSENSUS WITH A $\geq 75\%$ LEVEL OF SUPPORT

© 1.) Provide a statutory change that allows for concurrent rulemaking of the FFPC and the FBC.

[92% in favor]

| | <i>4=acceptable</i> | <i>3= minor reservations</i> | <i>2=major reservations</i> | <i>1= not acceptable</i> |
|---|---------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| <i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i> | 11 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

© 2.) Integrate the adoption of the Florida Fire Prevention Code with the Florida Building Code. Integrate the Fire Code cycle into the Building Code cycle. **[83% in favor]**

| | <i>4=acceptable</i> | <i>3= minor reservations</i> | <i>2=major reservations</i> | <i>1= not acceptable</i> |
|---|---------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| <i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i> | 6 | 4 | 0 | 2 |

OPTIONS RANKED NOT ACHIEVING $\geq 75\%$ LEVEL OF SUPPORT

Adopt the ICC Fire Code with the Building Code using joint TAC and Fire Advisory Council recommendations. **[17% in favor]**

| | <i>4=acceptable</i> | <i>3= minor reservations</i> | <i>2=major reservations</i> | <i>1= not acceptable</i> |
|---|---------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| <i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i> | 1 | 1 | 3 | 7 |

MEMBERS' DECIDED NOT TO RANK THESE OPTIONS ON THE BASIS THAT THEY SUPPORT THEM AS RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INTERAGENCY COOPERATION/COLLABORATION (DBPR AND DFS)

- Work with the DSFM to sync an accelerated code adoption cycle.
- Closer coordination between FBC and Florida Fire Code development.
- Ensure the SFMO and Florida Building Commission jointly adopt and publish an agreed to schedule for the adoption process of future FBC and FFPC editions.
- Ensure the Florida Fire Code Advisory Council meets jointly with the Fire TAC at least once every six months to review DEC statements issued by the other agency and potential issues of improved coordination/cooperation between the FFPC/SFMO and FBC/Commission.
- To assist with cooperation and coordination, have the FFPC rule adoption hearings occur at the same locations and date as the Florida Building Commission meetings.
- Utilize the Florida Building Commission web based system to submit, track and publish proposed/adopted amendments to the FFPC. (SFMO would still administer the FFPC, but the system would be shared.)
- Ensure both the SFMO FFPC and DBPR FBC web pages, that display the codes, have direct links to the partner codes, DEC statements and informal interpretations.
- Ensure the SFMO FFPC informal interpretations web page has the same quality as the BOAF Informal Interpretation page with a search friendly index.
- Ensure both the SFMO FFPC informal interpretation web page links to the SFMO informal interpretation web page and vice versa.

MEMBERS' DECIDED NOT TO RANK THESE OPTIONS SINCE THE TOPICS WERE COVERED BY OTHER RANKED OPTIONS OR THE ISSUE IS OTHERWISE RESOLVED

- Create a “Binding Interpretation” process for the FFPC.*
- Eliminate the statutory provisions in Section 633.206, F.S. adopting a “Uniform Fire Safety Standards” for certain occupancies. (This Uniform rule create a significant source of conflict and source of confusion for coordination with the FBC and even the core FFPC.)*

**Note: outside the purview of the Workgroup's scope of review and Commission's authority.*

National Electrical Code

OPTIONS RANKED ACHIEVING CONSENSUS WITH A ≥75% LEVEL OF SUPPORT

© 1.) Electrical Code adoption should be consistent with the Base Code document date (status quo). [75% in favor]

| | <i>4=acceptable</i> | <i>3= minor reservations</i> | <i>2=major reservations</i> | <i>1= not acceptable</i> |
|---|---------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| <i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i> | 4 | 5 | 2 | 1 |

OPTIONS RANKED NOT ACHIEVING ≥75% LEVEL OF SUPPORT

Provide authority requiring the Commission to adopt the latest NEC edition into the FBC. [25% in favor]

| | <i>4=acceptable</i> | <i>3= minor reservations</i> | <i>2=major reservations</i> | <i>1= not acceptable</i> |
|---|---------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| <i>Initial Ranking</i> <i>06/18/15</i> | 2 | 1 | 6 | 3 |

MEMBERS’ DECIDED NOT TO RANK THESE OPTIONS SINCE THE TOPICS WERE COVERED BY OTHER RANKED OPTIONS OR THE ISSUE IS OTHERWISE RESOLVED

- The current issues with the NEC could be handled by using the authority currently granted in law to update the electrical and all other nationally recognized consensus standards adopted by reference.

VI. ADOPTION OF STANDARDS AND CODES BY REFERENCE

- Ⓐ.) Utilize the Annual Amendment Process to update to the latest editions of codes and standards adopted into the Code.
- Ⓑ.) Utilize the Glitch process to update to the latest editions of codes and standards adopted into the Code (NEC and FFPC).
- Ⓒ.) Allow update of standards by errata or any of the allowed update, glitch or cycle updates.
- Ⓓ.) Provide authority for the adoption of the latest edition of standards that will be become available prior to the final adoption of the FBC.
- Ⓔ.) Adopt latest standards by reference in conjunction with the latest code update with review by technical committees.

Ⓢ F.) Adopt latest standards by reference without review by technical committees under limited conditions only determined by Commission exception.*

*Exception: When an updated standard is substantially changed or modified the revised standard may only be adopted thru the normal 3 year Triennial Update of the Code. Determination of “substantially changed or modified” must be conducted by a designated Commission Workgroup.

VII. FBC PARTICIPATION WITH THE ICC CODE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

Ⓢ A.) Maintain the status quo. ICC develops the base code, and the Commission amends as needed through development of the FBC.

Ⓢ B.) Revise statutory language to encourage participation in the I Code process (Florida has not been very successful at the I Code process in my opinion this needs to change before we can get to using an integrated code).

Ⓢ C.) Allow Commissioners to participate fully in the I-Code process (including expression opinions), and address Sunshine issues by noticing Code hearings.

Ⓢ D.) Participate in the ICC Code Development Process for specific Florida Modifications or changes in the ICC base codes that impact Florida.

(Intent: For the benefit of Florida and other areas of the country that may benefit from Florida modifications, advocate those changes for adoption into the ICC family of codes. This will not only ratify the important Florida modifications for Florida’s use on a long term basis, but will also highlight the need for such base code changes in the building industry far beyond our border.)

Ⓢ E.) Create a Florida International Code TAC to coordinate all other TAC modifications and submit and present them into the ICC process.

Ⓢ F.) Each Commissioner should attend at least one session of the ICC Code Action Hearings as an observer. This should convince any and all that the system for adopting the code and changes in Florida is superior resulting in a better code by addressing the concerns affecting the citizens of Florida. (Maintain status quo).