

**FLORIDA BUILDING CODE  
SYSTEM ASSESSMENT  
SURVEY RESULTS SUMMARY**

**REPORT TO THE FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION**



**Report By Jeff A. Blair  
Florida State University**



**jblair@fsu.edu  
[http:// consensus.fsu.edu](http://consensus.fsu.edu)**

This document is available in alternate formats upon request to Dept. of Community Affairs,  
Codes & Standards, 2555 Shumard Oak Blvd., Tallahassee, FL 32399, (850) 487-1824.

## **BUILDING CODE SYSTEM ASSESSMENT SURVEY SURVEY RESULTS SUMMARY**

The survey ran from August 3, 2005 (first response received) through September 17, 2005.

There were 218 respondents to the survey.

### **Respondents represent the following segments of the System/Industry:**

- IT professionals
- Threshold inspectors
- Building officials (plans examiners, inspectors, administrators)
- Fire officials
- General contractors
- Building contractors
- Residential contractors
- Commission members
- DCA staff
- Local government code enforcement
- Architects
- Landscape architects
- Product and material manufacturers
- Product suppliers
- Truss manufacturer
- Training providers
- Specification writer
- Engineers (structural, mechanical, environmental, electrical)
- Plumbing contractor
- Electrical contractors
- Low voltage contractor
- Mechanical contractors
- Fire alarm contractor
- Roofing contractors
- Licensing administrators
- Attorneys
- Property/Home owners (consumers/citizens)
- Private providers
- Fence and deck contractor
- Home designers and drafting services
- Interior decorator
- Insurance industry
- Researchers
- Construction supervisors and project managers
- Association representatives
- Lobbyists

- Developers
- Local government representatives

### **Overview of Survey Design**

The survey was arranged to solicit input on the five key components of the Building Code System: the Code, the Commission, administration of the Code, compliance and enforcement (education), and product approval. In addition, comments were solicited for four key Building Code System programs: the Building Code Information System, the Manufactured Buildings Program, the Prototype Buildings Program, and the Private Provider System.

For each of the five components and four programs, respondents were asked to evaluate how well they were functioning on a 5-point scale, where 5 corresponds to very well and 4 through 1 for progressively less well. In addition, for each of the components and programs evaluated, respondents were requested to identify what is working well and what is not working well, and to offer their specific recommendations for enhancements.

## **SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESULTS**

### **FLORIDA BUILDING CODE SYSTEM**

*(3.4 Average)*

*How has the Florida Building Code System functioned generally since implementation of the 2001 Florida Building Code—from your perspective, on balance how well have the goals of the System been achieved? (Scored 3.4 out of a possible 5.0)*

#### *On balance, what is working well with the Building Code System?*

Cooperation and communication between system stakeholders/interest groups.

- Cooperation and communication between building and fire officials.
- The process has made an effort to be inclusive.
- There is attention given to the general needs of the public.
- Good staff.
- Commission conducts regularly scheduled and open meetings.
- Education of all of the stakeholders.
- Information is made available and in a timely manner.
- Online access to codes, products, and other system information.
- Having a uniform state-wide building code.
- Uniformity of interpretation and enforcement between jurisdictions.
- Limiting the need for local amendments adds to uniformity and consistency.
- Local building officials and other can participate in code development at the State level.
- Better built environment under the new Code.
- Wind load standards and material standards have improved the overall design, inspection, and construction quality within the State.
- Better hurricane protections such as uplift requirements, documented by the research conducted after the hurricanes of 2004 and 2005.

- Products are manufactured to higher standards to comply with the building code requirements.
- Product approval is accomplished in a reasonable time-frame.
- Ability to get non-binding interpretations and declaratory statements.
- Code is easier to use (i.e., Code is organized into chapters).

***On balance, what is not working well with the Building Code System?***

- Unenforceability of an enormous amount of legislation and rules.
- The fragmentation resulting from local government amendments.
- Inconsistency of interpretation and enforcement between local jurisdictions.
- Allowing local amendments to the Code.
- Conflicts between the building code and the life safety code and the fire codes, and no clear guidance for building officials for resolutions.
- Special interest groups continue to do an end run around the Florida Building Commission to the Florida Legislature. The Florida Legislature should leave the technical code amendment issues to the Commission.
- Florida specific amendments continue to grow in number and move the document away from the core national code text.
- Not keeping up with the latest standards.
- Constant delays in the code adoption process.
- The Code adoption process is too slow and cumbersome.
- There is no ability for the Commission or the SFMO to adopt an interim amendment to the Code in order to address critical issues.
- Need to communicate Code changes better.
- Not enough training is being offered to keep up with Code changes.
- Too much regulation and bureaucracy in the system.
- Product approval system and listings. Need to streamline and better integrate the HVHZ.
- Website is difficult to navigate, especially for product approvals.
- Timelines and communication problems.
- Lack of funding and training for local building inspectors.
- Contractors don't know and/or understand the Code.
- Coordination with professional licensing boards on education requirements.
- Permitting process is too complex, requiring too much paper work, and takes too long.
- Lack of integration of the HVHZ requirements.
- Need more definitive wind-borne debris boundaries.
- Lack of enforcement for unlicensed contractors.
- Lack of training and qualified inspectors in the State.
- Making decision for political instead of consensus and technical reasons.
- The process for comment on proposed code amendments needs improvement.

***Your general recommendations for enhancing the Building Code System.***

- Adopt a fixed schedule that can be met for the code adoption process. Include the appropriate time for appeals.
- Create an "interim amendment" process in the 553 that bypasses chapter 120 for critical code changes that should not wait until the next cycle.
- Don't allow local amendments and require uniform interpretation and enforcement of the Code.
- DCA should have more funding and staff to administer the system and enforce/ensure compliance.
- Better communication and dissemination regarding the Commission's work and Code changes should be prioritized and implemented.
- Encourage public participation and communicate to the public.
- Consider mandatory education to ensure proper enforcement of the Code.
- Require all construction professionals (design, build, and inspection functions) to take mandatory code classes in order to enforce, build and design Florida projects.
- Require training and licensure for construction supervisors.
- Require local jurisdictions to be responsible for their reviews and inspections.
- Require mandatory performance standards for local jurisdictions with State oversight and authority to enforce. Require accredited training program for plans examiners and inspectors.
- Commission should participate in code development at the national level, and adopt the I-Codes with as little modification as possible.
- Resolve conflicts between FBC and FFPC.
- Don't allow registered contractors to build in windborne-debris regions where there are special requirements.
- The system needs to be made more user friendly.
- Code language should be understandable to non-lawyers,
- Adopt a sunset provision for ALL Florida specific amendments to the Florida Building Code.
- Standardize all forms used between jurisdictions.
- Adopt the most stringent standards in the State for the entire State, and create a uniform code.
- The HVHZ should be expanded to include all coastal counties in the State.
- Provide a code commentary section for each code.
- Remove political influences.
- The Commission structure and representation should be evaluated.

## **FLORIDA BUILDING CODE AND CODE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS (3.2 Average)**

***How well is the Florida Building Code and Code development process working?  
(Scored 3.2 out of a possible 5.0)***

***What is working well with the Florida Building Code and Code the development process?***

- Communication between all segments of the system.
- Opportunity to provide input through the TAC process.
- Plenty of opportunity to participate in the code development process.
- Full spectrum of participation including the public.

- Process is clear, open, inclusive, and deliberative.
- The process is consensus oriented.
- Facilitated workgroup process used to build consensus.
- Amendments are made for Florida specific needs and conditions.
- Code amendments are made based on available information.
- Any interested party may submit proposed code amendments.
- Movement toward uniformity and consistency.
- The Code has improved the integrity of the built environment.
- Committees are focused and working well together.
- When there are problems they are addressed.
- Expedited process to allow quick code amendments to respond to hurricane damage observations.
- Elimination of local variations.
- Binding and non-binding interpretation process.

***What is not working well with the Florida Building Code and the Code development process?***

- Reduced number of active and participating members.
- Not enough time provided to TAC's for consideration. Tight timelines.
- Transition from 2001 to 2004 took too long and the process should be streamlined.
- Special interest groups continue to do an end run around the Florida Building Commission to the Florida Legislature. The Florida Legislature needs to leave the technical code amendment issues to the Commission.
- The process has become politicized, and consensus products get revised by the legislators.
- Interest groups should participate in the Commission's process and not use the legislative process.
- Special interest groups come unprepared, fail to participate, and then attack the process and work products.
- Florida specific amendments continue to grow in number and move the document away from the core national code text.
- Constant delays in the code adoption process.
- There is no ability for the Commission or the SFMO to adopt an interim amendment to the code in order to address critical issues.
- Time requirement for development and implementation is too long.
- Code document is unwieldy and difficult to maneuver.
- Code changes made based on emotional and political, and not technical reasons.
- Lack of attention paid to rulemaking procedures and confusion on language under consideration.
- Lack of knowledge, proper interpretation, and education on code requirements.
- FBC being based on the ICC.
- Lagging behind the ICC process.
- Most of the code development has been done before comments are taken.
- There is not enough time allowed for public to review proposed amendments.
- Staff is burdened with an unrealistic work load.

- Declaratory statement process takes too long for the petitioner to get results.

### **What are your specific recommendations to enhance the Florida Building Code and the Code development process**

- Adopt a fixed schedule that can be met for the code adoption process. Include the appropriate time for appeals under Chapter 120.
- Create an "interim amendment" process in the 553 that bypasses chapter 120 for critical code changes that should not wait until the next cycle.
- Create a special streamlined code adoption process for glitch and correlation issues.
- When the base code is modified there should be an explanatory commentary.
- Mandatory education on the code.
- More training for all users and aspects of the code.
- More dissemination of information and make system more user-friendly.
- Keep amendment to Florida specific.
- Adopt a sunset provision for ALL Florida specific amendments to the Florida Building Code.
- Adopt statutory language which spells out that building code changes cannot be done thru Florida Law but instead must be deferred to the Commission process.
- Windborne debris region definition should be applied consistently throughout the State.
- Simplification of code language/wording is needed.
- Develop a process for posting proposed code amendments and provide time for review and consideration.
- The Commission should be a part of the development process at the National level to represent Florida and the Florida specific concerns.
- Implement and mandate training and education for administrators, plans reviewers, and inspectors.

### **FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION (3.3 Average)**

#### ***How well is the Florida Building Commission functioning?***

***(Scored 3.3 out of a possible 5.0)***

#### ***What is working well with the Florida Building Commission?***

- The Commission is doing a good job of managing a myriad of complex tasks ranging from code development, product approval, declaratory statements, to building consensus with varying competing interests.
- A great deal is accomplished at each meeting.
- A good cross representation of stakeholders representing the full range of interests.
- They seek input on issues under consideration, and this survey is an example.
- Dedicated group focused on the big picture and important issues.
- Thorough and thoughtful evaluation of issue and options.

- Facilitated meetings are key to success.
- Consensus-building and a good process.
- Regularly scheduled well organized meetings, with an open and inclusive process.
- Developed and maintain a better and stronger building code.



### ***What is not working well with the Florida Building Commission?***

- Need better dissemination of information to the public.
- Ensuring adequate training courses are developed and available.
- Understaffed and resourced, and forced to do too much in too short a time frame.
- Due to staffing and time issues can not deal with all of the issues that need to be addressed.
- Commission should focus on big picture and defer discussion to committees.
- Lack of communication, and self-serving interests.
- Too bureaucratic in size and scope.
- Code changes occur too often.
- Members seem uninformed and rely on the work of TAC's without adequate evaluation.
- Structure of the meeting limits input and discussion and serves special interests.
- Influences and control by legislatures, lobbyists, and special interest groups.
- Should rely on national code and standards development.
- Code change process should be more responsive to public debate, and the information should be available sooner.
- Not enforcing and overseeing local jurisdictions.
- Not enough power to enforce.

### ***What are your specific recommendations to enhance the functioning of the Florida Building Commission?***

- Should meet more frequently.
- More debate and analysis of technical amendments should occur (i.e., the ICC process).
- More time should be allowed on the agenda to discuss and evaluate issues in greater detail, and with more public input.
- Important information about the Code and Commission decisions should be readily available on the website. Be sure that information and agendas that are on the website are the material and agenda that will be discussed at the meeting.
- On-line information.
- Commission positions should be appointed by their respective interest groups.
- Provide and stick to term-limits for members.
- Need to evaluate the representation, size, and structure of membership, and include interests that are not represented.
- Consider an elected chair with a limited term, and having an alternate chair.
- Need to meet more often in other parts of the State.
- Ensure that process and decisions have the general good of consumers at heart.
- Eliminate political and special interests altering consensus decisions.
- Limit scope and authority to Florida specific amendments to the ICC.
- More focus on training and education is needed.
- Have un-facilitated meetings with massive public input including determining what is on the agenda.
- Processes should not be created and used without prior review.

- Formal process to address the Commission and receive feedback from them.
- Chair's issues should be listed on the agenda.
- Seek authority to oversee and control local jurisdictions enforcement and interpretation of the Code.

## **LOCAL ADMINISTRATION OF THE FLORIDA BUILDING CODE (3.0 Average)**

***How well is the local administration of the Florida Building Code functioning?  
(Scored 3.0 out of a possible 5.0)***

***What is working well with the local administration of the Code?***

- Implementation.
- Accessibility.
- Education and outreach efforts.
- The State-wide Code has forced jurisdictions to communicate with each other.
- Local jurisdictions efforts to provide education.
- Enforcement is becoming more consistent.
- Building officials are better educated and more professional.
- Jurisdictions are more aware of Code changes.
- Timely and thorough inspections.
- Appropriate documentation is now required.
- Smaller jurisdictions are improving and becoming more professional.
- Very good cooperation between Building and Fire Departments.
- Good cooperation and communication through BOAF.
- Locals still have the ability to make decisions.
- Binding interpretations by the Commission to ensure fairness and consistency.

***What is not working well with the local administration of the Code?***

- Local amendments should be absolutely necessary and require a high threshold for making changes, such as life-safety issues.
- There is a wide variance in the competency and capability of local departments to interpret the code and attain uniform enforcement. There is a lack of technical competency of many of the enforcement personnel from plans reviewers to inspectors.
- Time pressure that is placed upon inspectors. They often are not given sufficient time to properly perform each inspection.
- Lack of funding, staffing, and training of local building departments and personnel.
- No liability/responsibility or consequences for local jurisdictions who are not properly enforcing the Code.
- Takes too long to get building permits.
- Inconsistent enforcement and interpretation of the Code.
- Lack of understanding of the product approval process.

- Lack of dissemination of accurate information.
- State laws that hamper local jurisdictions (i.e., windborne debris region definitions).
- Local political manipulation.
- Unreasonable and arbitrary enforcement of the Code.
- Plans processing time and lack of supervision.

***What are your specific recommendations to enhance the local administration of the Code?***

- More education and outreach is needed.
- Implement a standardized permitting process.
- Authority for oversight of local building authorities should be sought by the Commission with ability to ensure and enforce compliance with all provisions of the Code and law.
- Audit the competency of the local building authorities and require appropriate certification of their inspectors.
- Make local building authorities liable for errors and omissions on inspections performed, and force them to carry liability insurance.
- Eliminate local administration and implement a standardized process.
- Improve coordination, cooperation, and communication across jurisdictions.
- Provide power for local jurisdictions to enforce licensing law violations.
- A better and more timely appeal process should be developed.
- Review required inspections to ensure that all needed aspects are covered.

**CODE COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT THROUGH EDUCATION AND TRAINING**  
(3.0Average)

***How well is code compliance and enforcement through education and training working?***  
(Scored 3.0 out of a possible 5.0)

***What is working well with code compliance and enforcement?***

- Improved knowledge of the Code by design, enforcement, and construction professionals.
- Local Building Officials understanding how to implement and educate plan reviewers and inspectors, and enforcing the code.
- Higher standards of construction.
- Training and continuing education is being required and tracked.
- Having the Code on-line.
- Training is available at the local level, and is of a higher quality.
- Has helped to discipline licensed individuals who do not comply with the Code.
- The Florida Building Code and Commission have increased emphasis on, and opportunities for continuing education and training related to building codes.

- Educational courses are being developed, and more information is reaching the building industry.
- Offering advanced training courses for design professionals.
- Private trainers/providers have created a workable clearinghouse for education and training.

- The various associations (building officials, trades, etc.) are doing a good job of promoting understanding of the Code by educating code officials, contractors, and design professionals on the various code requirements and practices.
- The emphasis on education in order to have an informed industry is the key to minimizing the need for punitive enforcement.
- More consistent enforcement of the Code due to education.

***What is not working well with code compliance and enforcement?***

- DCA is under funded.
- Local jurisdictions are underfunded.
- The Florida Building Commission was initially too heavy-handed in its efforts to supersede the roles of licensee regulatory boards and this caused significant and counterproductive resistance that still exists today.
- The educational system to teach the Code is not working very well because the quality of the seminars and the knowledge of the trainers is not sufficient. More scrutiny should be placed in choosing the providers.
- Trainers should have qualifications to train.
- Architects, engineers and code officials are not well trained in the new code.
- The educational seminars have been very weak and boring, and are too rudimentary.
- Should require more training on the Code for construction and design professionals.
- Need more advanced and comprehensive training designed to increase the knowledge base.
- Training seems designed to get the required credits, and not to be meaningful.
- Uneven success. Areas do well where there is good local support from the elected officials.
- Some local jurisdictions do not prioritize and budget for training.
- There are still many design and construction professionals who do not know the Code and rely on building officials to ensure code compliance.
- Interpretation of the code still varies too much from municipality to municipality.
- There is not enough enforcement.
- There is a lack of communication regarding the requirements and availability of training opportunities.
- Enforcement is inconsistent.
- Unpermitted and unlicensed activities needs to be addressed.
- Poor quality workmanship is not being addressed.
- There is not sufficient enforcement.
- Training on a complicated code takes building officials out of the field.
- Coordination between building and fire officials.

***What are your specific recommendations to enhance code compliance and enforcement, including education and training?***

- Comprehensive effort should be initiated to coordinate and collaborate with all of the agencies involved (Commission, DBPR, licensing boards, etc.) on education and training requirements, and dealing with unlicensed activities.
- State oversight of local enforcement should be developed and funded to ensure consistency and compliance with the Code.
- There should be a training program designed to bring young people into the industry and to train new entrants.
- Requiring certified residential and general contractors to be re-tested every three years, and to take state-certified classes retraining on the code, and updating code changes every year.
- Need to support training initiatives including the Education Council.
- Training on the Code and Code changes should be available at least six months before code changes are implemented.
- Engineers, and architects should be required to take the same continuing education as building examiners and inspectors, in addition to their own programs.
- Video training courses on the various codes should be developed and made available.
- Should develop and provide low cost on-line training to ensure training is accessible and affordable.
- Public relations campaign to increase awareness about the Code and education. An informed consumer can demand better quality and compliance with the Code.
- Develop some hands-on training courses in addition to the standard class room format.
- Eliminate the continuing education requirements.
- Develop State sponsored training on the Code.
- Each year determine the key code issues/problems, and require training on these issues for design professionals.
- Use state universities to design and deliver well designed high quality training.
- Raise state required education standards per ISO standards. Mandate that local jurisdictions hire enough inspectors to keep the number of inspections performed by one individual to a reasonable number so that inspectors have time for studying code, mentoring and other necessary activities to ensure well trained enforcement officers.
- Develop a monograph on the code and use for education requirements.
- Prioritize enforcement instead of code changes.
- Need to increase funding and the educational requirements for all stakeholders in the process.
- Association and private sector should develop and conduct training, eliminate state developed/required modules.
- Establish a Florida Building Inspector and Administration College, similar to the state fire college.
- Code administration personnel should participate in joint training sessions with builders, contractors and designers. If all of the affected parties participate at the same time, many problem areas will come to light and joint solutions may result.
- The Code should be available to all at no cost.

***How well is the product evaluation and approval process working for State approval?  
(Scored 2.9 out of a possible 5.0)***

***What is working well with the Product Approval system?***

- There has been a continual effort to identify and address issues, and to develop consensus on refinements to the system.
- The system for state approval.
- Clear criteria for approval, ease of application using the on-line system, prompt replies to inquiries.
- On-line access to the system.
- New and better products are being approved and construction quality has improved.
- Third party administrator has improved the process.
- Once all the required steps are completed, the approval process is very quick.
- This system provides a good basis for enforcement agencies to make important code determinations at both the plan review and the inspection level.
- Recognition and separation between good, better and marginal products.
- Improved public safety through long term use of improved products and methods in the construction industry.

***What is not working well with the Product Approval system?***

- Difficulty in finding specific approved systems.
- Website is difficult to navigate.
- Approved products from one manufacturer will have good information on installation details and requirements, while other similar manufacturers are approved with nothing to assist the inspectors in the field in determining true compliance.
- Lack of integration of product approval in Miami-Dade County with the State approval.
- Product substitutions that do not comply with the Code are made and not detected.
- The process is too time consuming for the submitter, reviewer, and local jurisdiction.
- The approval system is too complicated, inefficient, time consuming, and expensive.
- Documentation needs to be simplified and a product approval mark needs to be mandated for the products.
- Review is not technical enough and better documentation should be required.
- Inconsistent requirements and oversight for the four compliance methods.
- Significant education needs to be passed along to all users involved in the process.
- Local jurisdictions often do not have the resources to ensure local product approval is done correctly.
- Rule making process is too complicated.
- Difficult to get new and innovative products approved.
- Inconsistent approval/denial for similar products.
- Inconsistent requirements at the local level.
- Delays the building permit approval process.

- System should be more rigorous with an emphasis on safety.
- Commission needs to enforce deadlines.
- The system is an unfunded mandate.

***What are your specific recommendations to enhance the Product Approval system?***

- Better search capability for locating approved products.
- Make the web site more user friendly.
- Need to provide a liaison to assist submitters with the approval process.
- Commission should approve products on a consent agenda, staff and POC have already done the needed review.
- Commission needs information earlier in the process.
- Require state approval and do not allow local approval.
- Installation of products should be evaluated for efficacy.
- Do not require product approval, let the market and consumers decide on what products to use.
- Improve the ability for building officials to determine whether a product is appropriate and whether product substitutions are appropriate.
- Need education on the product approval system.
- Need more resources and trained staffing to support the system.
- Need more teeth to enforce compliance and prevent fraud.
- Enforce consistency between jurisdictions.
- Rely on existing evaluation services and abandon the State system.

**BUILDING CODE INFORMATION SYSTEM**

***(3.3 Average)***

***How well is the BCIS functioning?  
(Scored 3.3 out of a possible 5.0)***

***What is working well with the BCIS?***

- Enhanced communication, and good information available in a timely manner.
- Allows public to stay informed on Commission activities.
- Having information available on-line and accessible.
- Ability to download the Code.
- Ability to collect and store information electronically and eliminate excess paper.

***What is not working well with the BCIS?***

- Very few people are aware that the system exists.
- Some important items missing from the site.



- System is too complicated, not well organized, and not user friendly.
- System is difficult to access.
- Product approval system is difficult to maneuver, confusing, and time consuming to use.
- Out dated information is left on the site while current information is missing.
- Budget constraints have delayed system enhancements.
- There is a large amount of information that is referenced rather than provided.

***What are your specific recommendations to enhance the BCIS?***

- Provide adequate funding and staffing for the system.
- Continue upgrades to make system more user friendly.
- Improve the search capability functions of the system.
- Create a more sophisticated cross referencing system.
- Need to publicize the system to the public/consumers, and design and construction professionals.
- Simplify opening page with more attention to naming of sites and locations.
- Consistent naming of documents with dates and notation of revisions.
- Provide all of the referenced codes and standards on line on the BCIS system.

**MANUFACTURED BUILDINGS PROGRAM**

***(3.3 Average)***

***How well is the Manufactured Building Program functioning?  
(Scored 3.3 out of a possible 5.0)***

***What is working well with the Manufactured Building Program?***

- The standards have improved the strength and durability of products available.
- Tie down and pier installation guidelines.
- Purchasing of insignias, electronic sending of plans, and monitoring reports are working very well.
- The relationships of the Third Party Agencies and the manufacturers has greatly improved, and there is a better understanding of roles in relation to enforcement of the Code.

***What is not working well with the Manufactured Building Program?***

- There is a gap in enforcement of the program when it comes to sales of used manufactured buildings, for those who want to use them for Occupancies other than approved, and the altering of buildings without permits.
- State should be able to require that certain products can not be used in the manufactured buildings.
- Local jurisdictions do not understand the process.

- State has no control over dealers and illegal installations.

***What are your specific recommendations to enhance the Manufactured Building Program?***

- Create a licensing system for manufactured buildings sold in Florida.
- Do not permit in coastal high hazard areas.
- Education on the system for local jurisdictions.
- More funding for an additional staff member.
- Statutory authority to regulate dealers.

**PROTOTYPE BUILDINGS PROGRAM**

***(3.1 Average)***

***How well is the Prototype Building Program functioning?  
(Scored 3.1 out of a possible 5.0)***

***What is working well with the Prototype Building Program?***

- Prototype construction methods have worked well in flood and storm surge prone areas of Florida and should be encouraged.
- Outsourcing of the program.

***What is not working well with the Prototype Building Program?***

- Many local departments still insist on performing full reviews for full fee on every application.
- Very few people know about this system.
- Outreach and publicity for the system has been lacking.
- The system is not being utilized as designed.

***What are your specific recommendations to enhance the Prototype Building Program?***

- Require local jurisdictions to approve their use.
- Should market to homebuilders instead of commercial users.
- Eliminate this program if use of the program does not increase measurably.

**PRIVATE PROVIDER SYSTEM**

***(3.0 Average)***

***How well is the Private Provider System functioning?  
(Scored 3.0 out of a possible 5.0)***

### ***What is working well with the Private Provider System?***

- Timely reviews and inspections.
- Eases delays from overtaxed local inspection jurisdictions.
- Shorter lead times for inspections, more responsive customer service, less bureaucratic in nature and interface.
- Provides an option for those with time constraints.
- The statute is very clear and easy to administer.

### ***What is not working well with the Private Provider System?***

- Privatization of public services is not working in the State.
- Providers, just because they are architects or engineers, are not always qualified to review plans and conduct inspections.
- Lack of training and understanding.
- Some professionals are not sufficiently engaged in the actual details of the process to provide adequate oversight of the activities of all of their personnel.
- Lack of coordination with local jurisdictions.
- Conflict of interest for the provider and their client.
- Undermines code enforcement and protections for the consumer.
- Program needs more oversight to ensure compliance.
- It is difficult to conduct sufficient audits to ensure efficacy.
- It has driven up the cost of code enforcement by creating private demand for a limited supply of inspectors, while failing to provide a means to recruit, train and utilize new personnel.
- Local jurisdictions do not cooperate with private providers.
- Lack of adequate quality assurance.
- Difficult for local jurisdictions to communicate with the private providers.

### ***What are your specific recommendations to enhance the Private Provider System?***

- Require better coordination and communications with local jurisdictions.
- Providers should have appropriate qualifications for work reviewed and inspected.
- The private providers actually performing the work must all be licensed rather than allowing licensed personnel to supervise unlicensed personnel in performing as private providers.
- Require proper oversight and quality assurance of employees by the providers.
- Need to publicize that this option is available.
- Improve the quality assurance aspects of the system.
- Have the private providers work directly for the building department. The owner may request a private provider and the building official will choose from an approved list and assign the private provider to the project.
- Require local jurisdictions to cooperate with the providers and obey the law.
- Provide proper resources for all local jurisdictions so private providers are not needed.
- Allow building code administrators to function as private providers.

