

Florida Building Commission

Attachment to the May 16 - 18, 2001 Minutes

Facilitator's Report of the May 16 - 18, 2001 Commission Meeting

St. Augustine, Florida

Meeting Design & Facilitation By:



Report By Jeff A. Blair

**jblair@fau.edu
consensus.fsu.edu**

**Florida Building Commission
Attachment to the May 16 - 18, 2001 Minutes**

I. OVERVIEW OF COMMISSION'S KEY DECISIONS

WEDNESDAY, MAY 16, 2001

Rules of Procedure Ad Hoc Committee

The Committee reviewed and refined their initial policy recommendations for developing the Commission's code amendment process, and developed specific policy recommendations for staff to incorporate into a draft document for further Committee review. The Committee agreed to develop the code amendment process prior to developing recommendations on the additional topics for inclusion in the Commission's rules of procedure. In addition, The Ad Hoc Committee instructed staff to develop preliminary recommendations on each of the topical areas identified by the Committee.

Results of Committee actions are included as:

(Attachment 2)

THURSDAY, MAY 17, 2001

Education Training System Ad Hoc Committee

The Committee reviewed the Building Code Training Program Administrator selection committee's recommendations for selecting a contractor to negotiate with, based on the ITN process. The Committee unanimously recommended proceeding to negotiate with the University of Florida who was selected by the committee as the number one candidate. In addition, the Ad Committee did a prioritization ranking exercise for the development of advanced education modules. The proposed course topics were identified by the Committee at the April 2001 meeting.

Results of Committee actions are included as:

(Attachment 3)

Product Approval Ad Hoc Committee

The Committee discussed outstanding issues for inclusion in the draft rule and made unanimous recommendations on each of the issues. Staff was instructed to incorporate the remaining topics as well as comments on the draft and present a revised rule draft to the Committee at the July 2001 meeting. The Committee recommended that a 1 week window be provided for staff to accept written comments on the draft from interested stakeholders.

Results of Committee actions are included as:

(Attachment 4)

FRIDAY, MAY 18, 2001

COMMISSION PLENARY SESSION

Agenda Review and Approval

The Commission voted unanimously, 18 – 0 in favor, to approve the agenda as presented.

Review and Approval of April 10 - 11, 2001 Meeting Minutes

The Commission voted unanimously, 18 – 0 in favor, to approve the minutes as presented from the April 10 - 11, 2001 Commission meeting.

Public Comment

The Chair opened the floor for public comment, however, there were no members of the public who wished to speak.

Chair's Discussion Issues and Recommendations

Code dissemination and implementation date updates

Chairman Rodriguez indicated that the code has been delivered to Building Departments. The code is currently available for purchase through the Department of Community Affairs' website (by credit card only), and through Broward County, Miami-Dade County, and BOAF.

Commission Actions

Rule development workshops schedule

The Commission voted unanimously, 19 – 0 in favor, to initiate a concurrent rule development schedule for the required code updates, product approval, rules of procedure, education, and prototype building rules.

Rules for Promulgation (Rule development schedule start date)

- Code Refinements (i.e., Legislative, editorial, and correlating) July 9/10, 01
- Product Approval Aug. 27/28, 01
- Rules of Procedure Aug. 27/28, 01
- Education (Core transition) July 9/10, 01
- Prototype Buildings Aug. 27/28, 01

Rule Development Schedule (Will be modified as needed to comply with Ch. 120)

- Rule Development Workshops July 9/10, 01
- Rule Adoption Hearings Aug. 27/28, 01
- File for Rule Adoption September 2001
- Rule Adoption Complete October 2001

Legislative Session Key Issues Overview and Q & A

Suzanne Schmith reviewed the key issues affecting the Commission from the Legislative session and answered the Commission's questions.

(Attachment 5)

Annual Commission Assessment and Workplan Prioritization Workshop

Jeff Blair reviewed the results of the Commission's survey and noted the strong support and commitment to the Commission's consensus building process. The Commission identified the following tasks that were assigned to the Commission by the Legislature and included them in the workplan as priority tasks:

- Define specific needs as related to the code amendment process
- Recommendations on a universal key for emergency elevator access
- Rehabilitation Code development

In addition the Commission was asked to rank those workplan tasks that are not required by the Legislature for a time certain delivery date.

The survey results, updated workplan and ranking results are included as attachment 6.

(Attachment 6)

Education Ad Hoc Report and Recommendations

Commissioner Browdy presented the committee's report and recommendations for Commission action. The Commission unanimously accepted the Committee's report by a vote of 19 – 0 in favor.

Commission Actions

Motion— To approve the ITN selection committee's recommendation for the Building Code Training Program Administrator and begin negotiations with the number one ranked responder (UF) to develop the Building Code Training Program Administration.

Adopted unanimously 19 – 0 in support.

Motion—Recommend legislative action to remove the equivalency exam requirement from 553. 841 (8), Florida Statute.

Adopted unanimously 19 – 0 in support.

Motion—Recommend to the Florida Building Commission that they approve the revised language in rule 9B-70.001.

Adopted unanimously 19 – 0 in support.

(Attachment 3)

Product Approval Ad Hoc Report and Recommendations

Chairman Rodriguez presented the committee's report and the Commission unanimously accepted the report by a vote of 21 – 0 in favor.

The Commission will accept written comments on the draft text of the Product Approval rule through close of business on May 25, 2001. Comments should be addressed to DCA.

(Attachment 4)

Rules of Procedure Ad Hoc Report and Recommendations

Commissioner D'Andrea presented the committee's report and the Commission unanimously accepted the report by a vote of 19 – 0 in favor.

(Attachment 2)

Manufactured/Prototype Building Ad Hoc Report and Recommendations

Commissioner Parrino presented the committee's report and the Commission unanimously accepted the report by a vote of 19 – 0 in favor.

(Attachment 7)

Accessibility TAC Report and Recommendations

Commissioner Richardson presented the committee's report and recommendations and the Commission unanimously accepted the report by a vote of 17 – 0 in favor.

Commission Actions

Motion—TAC will conduct a facilitated workshop to develop recommendations on possible modifications to Subsection 2 of Section 553.5112, F.S., specifying Accessibility Waiver Council representation.

Adopted unanimously 17 – 0 in support.

(Attachment 8)

Appointment of Accessibility TAC Members

Chairman Rodriguez appointed JR Harding and Commissioner Lipka to the Accessibility TAC. Commissioner Thorne has stepped down from the TAC, and was appreciated for his efforts on behalf of the TAC.

Special Occupancy TAC Report and Recommendations

Commissioner Thorne presented the committee's report and recommendations and the Commission unanimously accepted the report by a vote of 17 – 0 in favor.

Commission Actions

Motion—To adopt guidelines; all special occupancy provisions should be limited to construction standards only. This issue will be addressed at a workshop to held on June 18, 2001 from 9:00 – 5:30 at DCA.

Adopted unanimously 17 – 0 in support.

Motion—To locate elevators in the Special Occupancy TAC , since elevators are located within the Special Occupancy section of the Florida Building Code.

Adopted unanimously 17 – 0 in support.

(Attachment 9)

Appointment of Special Occupancy TAC Member

Chairman Rodriguez appointed Cam Fentriss to the Special Occupancy TAC.

Energy TAC Report and Recommendations

Commissioner Lipka presented the committee's report and recommendations and the Commission unanimously accepted the report by a vote of 18 – 0 in favor.

Adopted unanimously 18 – 0 in support.

(Attachment 10)

Additional Commission Actions

Motion—Request that the Courts issue a declaratory statement to determine whether or not the 20% disproportionate cost rule should apply to Florida vertical accessibility requirements.
Motion fails by a vote of 0 –20 against the motion.

Motion— Accessibility TAC should study the 20% disproportionate cost issue and make recommendations on the Florida vertical accessibility requirements.
Motion fails for lack of a second.

Motion—Table further discussion on the 20% disproportionate cost and vertical accessibility issue.
Approved unanimously 20 – 0 in support.

Motion—DCA should provide all TAC members with a free copy of the Florida Building Code if it is financially feasible based on DCA’s budget and funding.
Approved unanimously 19 – 0 in support.

Consideration of Accessibility Waiver Application

The Commission reviewed and decided on the Waiver applications submitted for their consideration.

Review Results of Workplan Tasks Prioritization Exercise

Review Committee Assignments and Issues for May’s Commission Meeting

- Approval of updated workplan
- Product Approval Ad Hoc Committee
- Education Training Ad Hoc Committee
- Rules of Procedure Ad Hoc Committee
- Prototype/Manufactured Buildings Ad Hoc Committee
- Special Occupancy TAC
- Accessibility TAC facilitated workshop
- Accessibility Council and Waivers
- Chair appoints Privatization Task Group members
- Pool Safety Ad Hoc (tentative)

Staff Assignments

Staff was requested to send electronic copies of Product Approval documents to stakeholders who request them.

ATTACHMENT 1

Meeting Evaluation Summary FLORIDA BUILDING Commission

How Well Did the Commission Achieve the Meeting Objectives?

	<i>Circle One</i>		<i>Good</i>	<i>Poor</i>	
Chair’s Discussion Issues and Recommendations	5 4 3 2 1	17	1		4.94
Legislative Session Key Issues Overview	5 4 3 2 1	15	3		4.83
Commission Assessment and Workplan Review Workshop	5 4 3 2 1	13	5		4.72
Accessibility Waiver Applications	5 4 3 2 1	10	2	5	1 4.11
Education Ad Hoc Report and Recommendations	5 4 3 2 1	17	1		4.94
Product Approval Ad Hoc Report and Recommendations	5 4 3 2 1	15	3		4.83
Rules of Procedure Ad Hoc Report and Recommendations	5 4 3 2 1	15	3		4.83
Mfg./Prototype Building Ad Hoc Report and Recommendations	5 4 3 2 1	15	2	1	4.78
Accessibility TAC Report and Recommendations	5 4 3 2 1	14	3	1	4.72
Special Occupancy TAC Report and Recommendations	5 4 3 2 1	14	3	1	4.72
Energy TAC Report and Recommendations	5 4 3 2 1	15	2	1	4.78
Staff Reports/Discussions/Recommendations	5 4 3 2 1	14	3	1	4.72

Rate the Following Aspects of the Meeting?

Clarity of the meeting purpose and plan	5 4 3 2 1 <u>14 4</u> 4.78
Background information was helpful	5 4 3 2 1 <u>10 8</u> 4.56
Agenda packet was helpful	5 4 3 2 1 <u>14 4</u> 4.78
Balance of structure and flexibility	5 4 3 2 1 <u>13 4 1</u> 4.78
Group involvement and productivity	5 4 3 2 1 <u>11 6 1</u> 4.56
Facilitation	5 4 3 2 1 <u>14 4</u> 4.78
Facility	5 4 3 2 1 <u>14 4</u> 4.78

Comments:

-Would like to see if we can get a procedure that will guide the commission on the accessibility criteria.

What Did You Like Best About the Meeting?

- Good location.
- Good facility.
- Facility was excellent.
- The legislative overview, especially the summary.

How Could the Meeting Have Been Improved?

- Sound system was inadequate.
- Sound system does not project distinctly the statements/comments of legal staff.
- More Polish guys. (2)

ATTACHMENT 2

RULES OF PROCEDURES AD HOC COMMITTEE REPORT

Committee Objectives

- Review amendment process recommendations
- Identify additional issues for developing code amendment process
- Provide guidance on each of the identified topics for the code amendment process

Overview

The Committee reviewed and refined their policy recommendations for developing the Commission's code amendment process and developed specific policy recommendations for staff to incorporate into a draft document for further Committee review. The Committee agreed to develop the code amendment process prior to developing recommendations on the additional topics for inclusion in the Commission's rules of procedure. In addition, the Ad Hoc Committee instructed staff to develop preliminary recommendations on each of the topical areas listed below:

- Code amendment process
- Review IBC amendment cycle and link FBC process as closely as possible/legal
- Process for amending rules
- State agency issues for consideration by FBC: special process.
- Public comment & window/timelines (consistent with 120 Sunshine)
- State Fire Marshal: FBC coordination
- Declaratory Statement
- Filter criteria for annual / vs. triennial review
- TAC review timeline guidelines/process for consideration/determination of issue
- Meeting organization/process protocols

Committee Actions:

Additional Amendment Topics

The Committee identified the following additional code amendment topics:

1. Defining "specific needs" as articulated by the Legislature. (limitations on subjects for amendments.

Action: Committee agreed to workshop this topic.

2. Linking FBC code amendment process to model code update process.

Action: Review international code amendment dates and link Florida Building Code update cycle as appropriate/allowable. The dates should be linked to allow the least amount of time between the two update cycles (IBC/FBC). In addition the FBC will review approved code update amendments, and not every proposed amendment.

Approved 5 – 0.

Model Code Update Process

The Committee discussed the model code update process and identified three possible options.

The Committee agrees that the Commission may adopt new base codes in whole.

Action: Legal will review the three options and provide the Committee with guidance relative to the legality and viability of the options.

Approved 5 – 0.

Options for reviewing amendments:

1. The FBC will only review Florida specific amendments to the base code for inclusion in the next edition of the Code (3 year cycle). The FBC will accept the remainder of the IBC approved updates without utilizing the amendment process.
2. Review international code amendments as they are adopted for inclusion(3 year cycle) in the Florida Building Code. The Commission will review each amendment from the IBC as adopted throughout the three year cycle.
3. Incorporate latest model code edition with existing Florida specific amendments and only revisit any code conflicts or specific requests/challenges to amendments. (For the three year cycle).

Recommendations on Additional Topics for the Code Amendment Process

☐ **Interested party standing.**

Any interested party per Chapter 120.

☐ **Consent agenda**

Will utilize if allowable.

☐ **Amendments to modifications by TAC or FBC**

TAC or FBC will provide modified fiscal impact statements for any modifications to proposed amendments.

☐ **Fiscal impact criteria: what constitutes accurate?**

Statements accepted by TAC/FBC will constitute accurate unless challenged.

☐ **45 day notice – simultaneous TAC, FBC review/approval of amendments**

Not legal per statute requirements.

☐ **Who initiates yearly amendments?**

Any interested party per Chapter 120.

☐ **Coordination issues between FBC/SFM.**

Updates/Amendments will be reviewed by the Joint TAC for correlation between the FBC and NFPA 101.

☐ **Criteria for consideration of annual technical amendments**

Declaratory statements, interpretations, urgency, state agency regulations, and changes to law

Action: Committee approved the above policy recommendations for staff refinements.

Approved 5 – 0.

ATTACHMENT 3

EDUCATION AD HOC REPORT

MAY 17, 2001

Members present: Dick Browdy, John Calpini, Dan Shaw, Frank Quintana, Peggy Harris and Christ Sanidas.

Meeting began at 8:10

Dick Browdy reviewed the April Ad Hoc Report.

Motion: Approve the April Education Ad Hoc Report. Vote: 6-0, Dan Shaw, second by John Calpini.

Status Report

Charles Hickey, DCA staff, reported that the Transition/Core training was received from the University of Florida. The Department is waiting for a contract notice (click license) that is to be posted on the Building Code Information System for Training Providers to accept when registering on the system. When this notice is posted the Department can go live with the site.

Discussion:

- Qualifications of Training Providers and Instructors were discussed. Ila Jones described some of the qualifications necessary to be an instructor.
- Discussion on who will approve providers and instructors in the future.
- Discussion on what constituted a public vs. private provider.
- There was discussion on whether there are enough providers in place to accomplish the training.

Invitation to Negotiate (ITN), for the Building Code Training Administrator.

Dick Browdy reviewed the process for the selection of the best responder to the ITN.

The selection committee consisted of Michael Ashworth, Chair, Dick Browdy, Ila Jones, Michael Conrad and Charles Hickey. Jim Richmond from the General Council's office was present but was not a voting member.

Dick Browdy read a May 15, 2001, Memorandum from Ila Jones (attached). The Memorandum indicated that University of Florida's Rinker School of Building Construction had been the highest-ranking responder.

Motion: To approve the ITN selection committee's recommendation for the Building Code Training Program Administrator and begin negotiations with the number one ranked responder (UF) to develop the Building Code Training Program Administration. Vote 6-0, adopted, Peggy Harris, second by Diana Richardson.

Report on Funding for the equivalency exam

Ila Jones provided a memorandum on possible program funding for additional core course testing. Ms. Jones indicated that it would cost approximately \$250,000 to develop five

additional core equivalency exams. She also indicated that Florida State, Center for Professional Development had completed a questionnaire that indicated that out of 3000 responders that only 10 would consider taking an equivalency exam to obtain their core credits.

Motion: Recommend legislative action to remove the equivalency exam requirement from 553. 841 (8), Florida Statute. Vote 5-0, approved, Dan Shaw, second by Peggy Harris.

Legislative Update

Ila Jones reported that the legislature approved funding for the delivery of training for the following:

- 1) \$250,000 -- Miami-Dade Community College
- 2) \$250,000 -- Jacksonville Community College
- 3) Request for funding for the Construction Coalition from the Residential Construction Mitigation Program (RCMP).

Changes to Rule 9B-70.001

Reviewed the proposed rule that would make the 5 technical code training courses equivalent to the administrative core course.

Motion: Recommend to the Florida Building Commission that they approve the revised language in rule 9B-70.001. Vote: 5-0, approved, Peggy Harris, second by Diana Richardson.

Advanced Module Recommendations/Ranking

The Ad Hoc performed a ranking exercise to establish priorities for advance module development. See page 3.

Ad Hoc approved the Roles and Responsibilities chart with one correction.

The Ad Hoc asked staff to provide written guidance for instructors relative to the core transition courses.

Raul Rodriguez from Miami-Dade, Office of Code Compliance suggested that the staff and/or the Ad Hoc work with the Department of Business and Professional Regulation in the development of the revised exams for the 2001 Florida building Code to ensure proper code references and reference books. The Ad Hoc agreed.

Meeting adjourned at 10:14 am.

Ranking Exercise Results for Advanced Education Modules

Ranking Scale:

- 5** **Wholehearted Support**
- 4** **Could be Better**
- 3** **Okay, Has +/-**
- 2** **Poor, Serious Concerns Must be Addressed**
- 1** **Oppose, (Over My dead Body)**

Option/ Issues	Rank	5	4	3	2	1	Raw Score
Accessibility	1	16	5	0	0	0	100
Wind Design	2	15	6	0	0	0	99
Product Approval	3	18	2	0	0	0	98
Life Safety	4	13	5	3	0	0	94
Administration	5	13	5	2	1	0	93
Prototype Buildings	6	10	5	7	0	1	92
Roofing	7	11	7	1	0	0	86
Pools/Spas	8	12	4	2	0	0	78
Termite Provisions	9	6	7	6	0	1	77
State Regulations	10	3	7	9	3	0	76
Energy Conservation	11	7	3	6	2	1	70
Special Buildings	12	0	1	14	7	0	60
Hazardous Substances	12	1	4	10	4	1	60
Historic Preservation	14	0	4	13	1	2	59
Core – Advanced	15	0	0	4	4	7	27

ATTACHMENT 4

Product Approval Ad Hoc Committee Committee Report

May 17, 2001

Attendees

Raul Rodriguez

Dick Browdy

Steve Corn

Nick D'Andrea

Craig Parrino

Frank Quintana

Medard Kopczynski

George Wiggins

Steve Bassett

Introduction

The meeting was declared open at 1:00 p.m. (As noticed on the Committee agenda). Jeff Blair reviewed the meeting objectives and guidelines. During the meeting the Committee reviewed and discussed outstanding issues; reviewed the draft product approval document; and provided for a comment period from 2 - 3 p.m., Friday, May 18th following the Florida Building Commission meeting and written comments to be received by the Department of Community Affairs by Friday, May 25th. Numerous grammatical and editorial changes to the draft were recommended by the Committee. DCA staff and legal will incorporate the changes to be presented in an updated draft at the next Committee meeting.

□ Agenda for the meeting was reviewed.

Motion: Approve the agenda for this meeting.

Vote: unanimous in favor. Motion passed.

□ Minutes from the April 10, 2001 meeting were reviewed.

Motion: Approve the minutes of the April 10, 2001 meeting.

Vote: unanimous in favor. Motion passed.

The following action items were addressed during the meeting:

□ **Motion:** DCA staff and legal to review licensing laws and utilize those concepts for the Florida Building Code product approval process. Bring recommendations back to the Commission.

Vote: unanimous in favor. Motion passed.

□ **Motion:** Once an entity is approved, the approval continues unless criteria changes. Use similar criteria applicable for product renewal.

Vote: unanimous in favor. Motion passed.

□ **Motion:** Entity approval application process will be made available on line and accreditation verified by DCA from lists supplied by accreditation entities.

Vote: unanimous in favor. Motion passed.

□ **Motion:** Utilize validation checklist with recommended changes for items not covered elsewhere (i.e. nationally recognized, Miami-Dade recognized, etc.)

□ **Motion:** Validation checklist is to be used for local approval only. Delete page two.

Vote: unanimous in favor. Motion passed.

- **Motion:** A revised two page checklist is to be used for statewide approval.
Vote: unanimous in favor. Motion passed.
- **Motion:** DCA staff to develop checklist for statewide approval and bring back for review at next meeting.
Vote: unanimous in favor. Motion passed.
- **Motion:** Use the lowest cost option to place information for approved products on the DCA database. Provide hot-links to other approved product databases (i.e. UL, NES, etc.)
Vote: unanimous in favor. Motion passed.
- **Motion:** Application for statewide approval to include reports. Validation entity information to be added to form and validation certification to be included as an attached document.
Vote: unanimous in favor. Motion passed.
- **Motion:** Table discussion of fee schedules until next meeting.
Vote: unanimous in favor. Motion passed.
- **Motion:** Allow further comments on draft document to be received by 3:00 p.m. tomorrow and by e-mail to DCA staff within a week.
Vote: unanimous in favor. Motion passed.

Conclusion

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45

ATTACHMENT 5

2001 Legislative Session Actions Overview

Florida Building Commission

Legislative Session Summary

CS for CS for SBs 336 and 190

Passed 5/4/01 at 11:10 p.m. YEAS 90 NAYS 21

Commission Recommendations prior to Session

- Delay implementation of the Florida Building Code for three months to October 1, 2001.

The Legislature delayed the effective date of the Florida Building Code for an additional three months beyond that recommended by the Commission, to January 1, 2002. Sections 34 through 39 (beg. page 60) implement that change by delaying the effective date of all statutes related to code implementation until January 1, 2002. The statutes affected include those governing the change in rulemaking authority and enforcement of state agency construction regulations, repeal of statutes adopting the state minimum building codes, repeal of local amendments to the state minimum building codes, and those authorizing adoption, amendment and enforcement of the new Florida Building Code.

- Authorize the Commission to go forward with rule adoption to implement its recommended product evaluation and approval system.

Section 30 (beg. page 51) fully implements the Commission's recommendations. The system will rely upon the private sector testing, evaluation, certification and quality assurance programs with required validation of information supplied by those programs. Manufacturers may choose to have products approved by the state or by local jurisdictions. Provides for a schedule for rule adoption so that all entities are approved and products must be approved through the system by October 1, 2003.

- Exempt certain storage sheds and lawn storage buildings from the mandatory wind impact standards of the Florida Building Code.

Section 25 (on page 45) of the bill exempts storage sheds that are not designed for human habitation and that have a floor area of 750 sq. ft. or less from the mandatory wind-borne-debris-impact standards of the code. The language was modified only to eliminate a disparity by applying the exemption to both offsite manufactured and onsite constructed buildings.

- Authorize the privatization of the prototype building program and fee system to compensate the contractor for services under such program. Clarify exemption of prototype buildings from local amendments to the code.

Section 25 (on page 47) fully implements the Commission's recommendations for prototype buildings, requiring that Department rules provide for plan review and approval to be performed by a public or private entity under contract and authorizing the Department to charge reasonable fees for program administration. Further, this section clarifies that approved prototypes are exempt from any locally adopted amendments.

- Exempt from the public records act the plans of buildings designated as essential facilities, such as schools, correctional facilities and hospitals, which may be within the records of the Department of Community Affairs through the prototype buildings, factory-built schools or manufactured buildings programs.

The Department was unable to secure this exemption from the Legislature this year and recommends further study and coordination with DOE, DJJ, DOC and other state agencies to determine whether such plans are already exempt, whether the exemption is specific to the agency which possesses the plans, or whether a full exemption is needed. A separate bill must pass the Legislature unrelated to any other substantive law in order to grant an exemption from public records.

- Transfer \$4 collected on each electrical contractor's license from the DOE to the DCA to fund research issues relating to building construction and CEU requirements from industry; conform to HB 219 which transferred the same fee on all other contractors' licenses.

Section 19 (page 29) fully implements the Commission's recommendation on this issue.

- Authorize the Commission to establish in the code standards for preliminary construction prior to completion of plans review, and clarify that the code establishes the minimum requirements for plan review.

Section 27 (pages 48 and 49) authorizes the code to set standards and criteria for preliminary construction prior to completion of plans review, including issuance of foundation only permits. This language authorizes the Commission to adopt into the new code language from the standard code relating to foundation permits. Further, this section clarifies that the statutory prohibition against issuing a permit prior to plans review is modified by the requirements of the code.

- Authorize the Commission to produce a code commentary to accompany the new Florida Building Code, which would not have rule authority under the Administrative Procedure Act.

Section 26 (on page 47) fully implements the Commission's recommendation, authorizing the production of a commentary for technical assistance.

- Authorize local officials to apply the federal disproportionate cost exemption to the Florida-specific requirement for vertical accessibility to all levels of a facility.

The Department was unable to attain gubernatorial support for this legislative change this year. It is our understanding that the Building Owners and Managers Association and the International Council of Shopping Centers are separately seeking legislative clarification of this issue.

- Provide for consistent statewide implementation of the Residential Swimming Pool Safety Act by (1) adopting within the new code standards for residential swimming pool barriers, pool covers, latching devices, door and window exit alarms and other equipment required thereby, and (2) authorizing the Commission to issue declaratory statements interpreting sections of the act governing construction standards.

Section 24 (on page 37) authorizes the Commission to adopt required standards within the code, and Section 26 (page 46) authorizes the Commission to issue declaratory statements.

- Exempt specified telecommunications spaces from the fire sprinkler requirements of section 553.895, provided that these spaces are equipped with an equivalent fire prevention standard approved by both the Florida Building Commission and the State Fire Marshal.

Section 31 (on page 60) fully implements the Commission's recommendation on this fire sprinkler exemption.

- Authorize the Commission to determine transition issues such as the status of pending building permit applications on the date the new code takes effect. The Commission recommended that these issues be dealt with through rulemaking.

Section 24 (on page 42) specifies that a building permit for which an application is made prior to the effective date of the Florida Building Code will be governed by the state minimum building code in effect on the date of the application.

- Correct cross-references to provisions within s. 316.1955 which were transferred to s. 553.5041 last year.

Section 23 (page 36) implements these corrections by substituting the correct cross-references to accessible parking requirements.

Commission Recommendations on Issues Arising During Session

- Authorize the Commission to study and make recommendations regarding alternative plans review and inspection of buildings and facilities (response to SB 744 and HB 1223 filed by Senator Clary and Representative Cantens, which would have set requirements for alternative plans review for commercial and multi-family residential buildings).

Section 41 (beg. page 64) creates a Building Construction Permitting and Inspection Task Force to study and make recommendations to the 2002 Legislature on these important issues. The Task Force will be composed of 11 members representing various interest groups and have two members appointed by the Florida Building Commission.

- Authorize the Commission to research and report on appropriate limitations for future amendments to the new Florida Building Code (in response to an amendment in the bill which would have defined "specific needs" as it relates to modifications of the base code and amendments to the adopted code).

Section 44 (beg. page 67) directs the Commission to research and evaluate the types of specific needs for the state and its localities which are appropriate to justify amendments to the adopted Florida Building Code, and make recommendations for clarification of the issue to the 2002 Legislature. This section limits the Commission's authority to adopt amendments to the code until July 1, 2002 to emergency amendments, amendments relating to state agency construction regulations, amendments eliminating conflicts with law or implementing new authorities granted by law, and amendments to implement settlement agreements.

- Authorize the Commission to research and report on adoption of a Rehabilitation Code for the state.

Section 32 (page 60) directs the Commission to research the issue of adopting a statewide rehabilitation code, including review of rehabilitation codes adopted by other states, and report to the 2002 Legislature regarding the feasibility of adoption of such code.

Issues for which no Commission Recommendation Existed

- Section 1 (page 4) delays from July 1, 2001 until July 1, 2002, the date after which school districts will not be authorized to use relocatables which do not comply with SREF constructions standards.
- Section 2 (page 5) provides that for relocatable school buildings the area of operable glazing and exterior doors shall consist of at least 5 percent of the floor area.
- Section 3 (page 6) allows DMS to conduct plans review and inspection for construction on the grounds of the Capitol building and Governor's mansion, despite the delegation of that authority to local jurisdictions last year.
- Section 4 (page 7) authorizes water well contractors to perform tank and pump installation in accordance with the Florida Building Code. Though the Commission had no official position on this, the issue was discussed at the March meeting and no opposition was voiced based upon Commissioner Shaw's explanation of the Plumbers Association position.
- Sections 5 through 18 (pages 7 through 29) constitute the DBPR elevator cleanup package. The bill revises standards governing construction and installation of elevators and other conveyances, creates an Elevator Safety Technical Advisory Committee to recommend updates standards for adoption by DBPR and the Commission, provides standards for permitting and certificates of operation, provides standards for revocation of licenses and certificates of operation, provides for inspection by third party agencies and increases administrative fines for failure to comply with various requirements. This section refers to standards for elevators within the Florida Building Code and will require further amendment of the code based upon recommendations of the technical advisory committee.
- Section 20 (page 30) authorizes cities and counties to require an electrical journeyman, who is a graduate of the Institute of Applied Technology in Construction Excellence or licenses under s. 489.5335, to be present on certain industrial or commercial construction sites.
- Section 21 and 22 (beg. page 30) allow factory-built schools that comply with the hurricane protection provisions to be used as shelters; allow an approved inspection agency, certified by DCA, to conduct periodic inspections of factory built school buildings and allow the school or community college districts to charge fees for such inspections. This section also delays until January 1, 2002, the date on which the Florida Building Code becomes the construction code applicable to construction of factory-built school buildings, consistent with the new effective date of the code. Further it delays from July 1, 2000 to January 1, 2002, the deadline for inspecting factory-built school buildings currently in use. Finally, this section delays the

requirement for inspections of factory-built school buildings during each phase of construction until July 1, 2001. This last change puts a hold on inspection and issuance of insignia of buildings by the DCA, which had begun the program following the passage of chapter 2000-141 and requiring for adoption of emergency rules to implement it within 6 months of the effective date of the act.

□ Section 25 (on page 45) exempts Indian “chickees” from the code.

□ Section 28 (page 49) amends s. 553.84, F.S., relating to civil actions for violations of the Florida Building Code. The bill limits lawsuits where the construction in question was properly permitted, passed all inspections, and caused no personal injury or property damage (other than to the subject property), unless the code violator knew or should have known the violation existed. It is the Department’s understanding that the Academy of Florida Trial lawyers neither supports nor is opposed to this language, but has worked with the Florida Homebuilder’s Association to incorporate the economic loss rule into the statute.

□ Section 29 (beg. page 50) creates s. 553.8412, F.S., requiring the Florida Building Commission and the Department of Community Affairs to provide statewide outreach, through statewide licensee and professional associations, for training on the Florida Building Code within 60 days after affective date of section; authorizes Florida Building Commission to charge fees to fund the training program; provides for sunset on June 30, 2003.

□ Section 31 (on page 60) authorizes the use of a manual wet standpipe, as defined in NFPA 14, in buildings less than 75 feet in height which are protected throughout with an approved and maintained fire sprinkler system.

□ Section 33 (page 60) addresses the issue of emergency elevator access. The Department of Business and Professional Regulation estimates that there are approximately 50,000 to 55,000 elevators in the state. Currently, all elevators must have a key available to emergency personnel. This key is either in a lock-box or in the elevator machine room. In addition, some emergency personnel have keys to the most common elevators in use. This section requires the commission to research the issue of requiring all primary elevators in buildings with more than five levels to operate with a universal key, which allows access and operation of elevators by emergency personnel. The commission is directed to report its recommendations to the Legislature before the 2002 session.

□ Section 40 (beg. page 62) requires the Florida Building Commission to appoint the current members of the Building Construction Industry Advisory Committee, as established by Rule 6A-10.029, F.A.C., to the Education Technical Advisory Committee of the Florida Building Commission. The committee membership must be broadly representative of the building construction industry and must consist of not less than ten members. The committee has the following duties:

- To advise the commission on any policies or procedures needed to implement the provisions of sections 489.109 (3), 489.509(3), F.S., which relate to the \$4 fee contractors pay upon application and renewal for certification and registration that is used to fund projects relating to the building construction industry or continuing education programs offered to persons engaged in the construction industry;

- To advise the commission on implementing section 553.841, F.S., which relates to the building code training program administered by the commission;
- To advise the commission areas of priority for which research and continuing education funds should be expended; and
- To review all proposed research and continuing education projects and recommend to the commission those projects which should be funded and the amount of funds to be provided for each.

The commission is also directed, upon receipt of funds by DCA from the Construction Industry Licensing Board and the Electrical Contractors Licensing Board, to determine the amount of funds available for research projects from contractor license fees; and to identify, solicit, and accept funds from other sources for construction and building code issues.

- Section 42 (page 66) amends s. 627.0629, F.S., to delay rate filings by insurance companies until December 31, 2002. The Florida Building Commission had recommended, and the 2000 Legislature had required, that these rate filings be concurrent with the new building code.
- Section 43 (beg. page 66) amends s. 633.0215, F.S., by delaying the adoption of a statewide firesafety code to January 1, 2002, consistent with the new effective date of the Florida Building Code.
- Section 45 (page 68) appropriates \$250,000 to the Florida Community College at Jacksonville from General Revenue Funds to operate the Institute of Applied Technology in Construction Excellence.
- Section 46 (page 68) appropriates \$250,000 to the Miami-Dade Community College from General Revenue Funds to implement the building code training program.

ATTACHMENT 6

Effectiveness Assessment Results for April 2000 - March 2001

Circle the number that best describes how the Commission functions on each of the following scales: Scale Range 10 - 1 (10 highest rating to 1 lowest rating)

Participation and Communication

Communications are respectful, balanced and points are clearly understood.

Some members dominate. Limited listening and understanding.

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
2	3	3	1	3	1					AVERAGE: 7.5

Comments:

- There are several questions in this ranking.
- It would be good to keep personal agendas out of the discussions.
- Points are generally understood, however the discussions are usually dominated by some of the members. This is not always a bad thing but sometime frustrating to me. I also realize it is the nature of the type of individuals that serve in leadership capacities.
- I think the conversations are balanced.
- Commission has bent over backwards to provide balanced, open communication.

Controversy or Planning Orientation

Problems are anticipated and addressed in a timely fashion (proactive).

Commission reacts to controversy, problems, and contradictions brought to them by others (reactive).

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
3	1	3	3	1	1	1				AVERAGE: 7.8

Comments:

- I believe that the problems are anticipated, it's the reactions that sometimes leave a little to be desired.
- I think that whenever the Commission can be proactive it is. I also think with the nature of extremely broad range of issues we look at we have to rely on other people's finding problems and bringing them to the Commission. I do feel when the problems are identified we work to resolve them in a timely manner.
- The use of TAC and ad hoc committees to explore the complex details of issues and to develop recommendations for resolution is an excellent technique for addressing controversial issues.
- There have been times when the Commission was/ is reactive and the events are beyond our control. The Commission has become more pro-active and that is a good direction.

Decision Making Process

Commission uses process to effectively build a broad-based consensus.

Commission uses process to make a majority decision without a consensus of members.

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
5	5	2	1							AVERAGE: 9.1

Comments:

- I think this is one of the strongest points of the Commission.
- I appreciate the use of straw votes to facilitate the making of complex decisions; please continue to use this technique.
- I think we have taken too much time in some issues to develop consensus. Consensus building has always been core value for the Commission.

Time for Consideration

Adequate time for presentation, generating options, analysis and decision making.

Snap decisions are made or decisions are deferred because of lack of time.

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
1	3	2	4	1	1					AVERAGE: 7.7

Comments:

- Although, at the present time, things have settled down to a more manageable pace, I have always felt that time-lines have been extremely limited in the view of the magnitude and seriousness of the task over the last two years.
- The time for decision making is directly related to the amount of work to be done, and the time given in which to do it. If not for that, I would rate it a 9.
- Late in meeting we tend to steamroll to get meeting over with.
- Provided we are given the info prior to the meetings in the packets that are mailed out there is no problem.
- This is ok.
- Adequate time is taken.

Information and Analysis

Critical background and comparison of options yield politically and practically feasible decisions.

Too little or too much, hard to use information on situation, options & impacts yield hard to implement decisions.

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
2		5	4		1					AVERAGE: 7.8

Comments:

- ☐ I'm not sure what this means, but I gave it a 7 to be upbeat and team-oriented.
- ☐ It depends on the issue. For instance I could use all the info possible on Product approval and I don't care if I ever hear another thing about air handlers in the attic. There is certainly a balance to giving enough info for a given complex issue and getting too bogged down in minutia. I think the amount is generally adequate.
- ☐ This is fine.

What are the key Tasks and/or unresolved Substantive Issues that need to be addressed by the Commission during 2001?

- ☐ Focus on training/ transition period, assistance with the local adoption process, help with wind line determination, code interpretations, development of a good code commentary, finalization of the product approval requirements.
- ☐ Creating the mechanism for consistent interpretation and enforcement, (interpretation process).
- ☐ Product Approval
- ☐ Rules of procedure
- ☐ Clear guidance for interpretations on Vertical Accessibility in remodeling existing buildings
- ☐ Policy on types of amendments to be considered during annual review (vs 3 yr code update)
- ☐ Prototype Bldg Plan Review Process
- ☐ Bldg Code Training & Education
- ☐ Generate complete (exhaustive)list of tasks to be accomplished at local government level to full implement the Code as guide to local communities (for example: adopt local ord for windline locations, adopt local administrative amendment Ordinance, where needed; create countywide board, if desired to adopt local tech amendments, etc)
- ☐ Participation and monitoring of changes/hearings on the international family of codes.
- ☐ Training and Education, working out glitches, addressing local amendments.
- ☐ Privatization
- ☐ Training
- ☐ Product Approval
- ☐ Privatization
- ☐ Swimming Pool Issues
- ☐ Amendment Process
- ☐ Product approval
- ☐ Prototype buildings
- ☐ Complete training programs
- ☐ Product Approval
- ☐ Education of Industry
- ☐ Dissemination of code to public
- ☐ State rules need to be re-formatted into code format.
- ☐ Code changes where statute changed (Hurricane /Public Education)
- ☐ Processing of amendments, review of the International Building Code, building department privatization and funding issues.

What are the key Process and Communication Issues that need to be addressed by the Commission?

- ☐ Those associated with training/ transition period, assistance with the local adoption process, help with wind line determination, code interpretations, development of a good code commentary, finalization of the product approval requirements.
- ☐ Interpretation process.
- ☐ On going communication with all areas the construction industry to minimize going to the Legislature for solutions each year.
- ☐ The Commission's role in implementing the code to local areas.
- ☐ Training
- ☐ How is public acceptance of code once it is in their hands being addressed.
- ☐ Problem issues that may arise.
- ☐ Prototype Building Plan Review.
- ☐ As I am a "lame" duck, this question is best answered by the active members.
- ☐ Getting a code on place by October 1, 2001.
- ☐ Product Approval
- ☐ Rules of Procedure

Is There Any Additional Information or Support Needed to Complete Tasks?

- ☐ Although I have always felt additional staff was needed to accomplish the overall task, it seems as though the present staff is providing the necessary support when and how needed.
- ☐ I think that the support has been excellent, consideration the situation in which the staff and facilitators have been placed.
- ☐ After legislative session, prepare complete summary of key items passed the bldg. code bill and other bills affecting construction and make available on line.
- ☐ Prepare summary of all Ch 553 Bldg Code regulation requirements and make available on line.
- ☐ A way to monitor progress on implementing the code, set up of a quality assurance method for training/education.
- ☐ I believe the tasks I listed above are well on their way to completion. It is just a matter of rolling up the sleeves and grinding out the remaining outstanding issues. I would note that I could use some additional information on some of the bills etc. that are frequently referred to in the meetings. Being the new kid on the block I am not too familiar with a lot of the text in these things.
- ☐ Each TAC needs to meet with respective trades to ensure workability and training issues are resolved if any.
- ☐ Education. You are doing a great job. Thanks.

Ad Hoc Committee and TAC Chair Issues Assessment

What are the key Tasks and/or unresolved Substantive Issues that need to be addressed by your Ad Hoc committee or TAC group?

- I think that the work plan has adequately defined these tasks. It's now a matter of identifying those that remain unfinished, and focusing on their completion.
- We have ongoing issues such as Accessibility training and assisting with what is to be presented, membership, providing oversight and making recommendations to FBC on requirements of FL Bldg, Code involving accessibility, serve as an educational resource, train members of the Commission and Waiver Council on accessibility issues.
- Product Approval: Develop rule; implement changes to law
- Privatization: develop consensus and make recommendations to Legislature; solicit participation by stakeholders
- Swimming Pool Safety: Harmonize Chapter 515 (Building Code) with Chapter 553 (Statute).
- Training, training, training.
- Prototype Plan Review Process.
- Items for Research for UF team we are getting from DOE.
- State rule reformat and rewrite .

What are the key Process and Communication Issues that need to be addressed by your Ad Hoc committee or TAC group?

- I think that the work plan has adequately defined these tasks. It's now a matter of identifying those that remain unfinished, and focusing on their completion.
- Membership issues and communication within the TAC itself. Ongoing communication to the FBC members regarding accessibility issues.
- HVAC./air handler equipment issues.
- Prototype Plan Review Process.
- Items for Research for UF team we are getting from DOE.
- State rule reformat and rewrite .

Other Comments

- I don't feel that the staff and facilitators have been given enough credit for all of the work they have done, and will continue to do...especially now that the State is considering downsizing services.
- The TAC runs very effectively and can address issues in a timely manner. There are no substantive issues that need to be addressed on an urgent basis. However, the swimming pool code issue is currently very unclear to the industry and code officials. The scheduled workshop will help substantially with this issue.

COMPILATION SUMMARY OF MEETING EVALUATIONS

March 2000 - April 2001 (Fourteen Months)

Overview:

Each month Commission members are asked to rate the meeting objectives as well as specific aspects of the meeting such as usefulness of the agenda packet and facilitation. They are asked to rank each objective and aspect of the meeting on a scale of from 5 to 1, with 5 representing the highest and 1 the lowest rating.

Following reflects the cumulative evaluation ranking results from the last 14 Commission meetings. Each month approximately 18 evaluations were returned.

<i>Scale: Range 5 - 1 (5 = Good; 1= Poor)</i>	<i>CumulativeRatingAverage</i>
<u>Combined Meeting Objectives</u>	4.59
<u>Meeting Aspects</u>	
Clarity of the meeting purpose and plan	4.59
Background information was helpful	4.49
Agenda packet was helpful	4.43
Balance of structure and flexibility	4.57
Group involvement and productivity	4.39
Facilitation	4.74
Facility	4.06

Comments:

I like the new microphones - better clarity, less feedback, less obtrusive.

Did we really need the meeting?

Find a better way to get last-minute changes to Commissioners. Many changes to flights and room reservations had to be made, that perhaps could have been avoided.

Good!

Concern about "official action" vs. not in sunshine. Suggest cover all requirements and possible board actions in future public meeting advertisements.

Spaces are too cold!!

Good meeting.

Terrible planning.

Rooms are spread out to where it takes a while to get to meeting. When it rains, you can't get to your room without getting wet.

Facility/Service Poor.

Hotel had no idea if we were meeting or not (they said it was scheduled).
Convenient location near airport, however - no sound insulator and guests were in-out all night.
Table arrangement too small.
Great job on facilitation.
Hotel was substandard - staff should check out hotels thoroughly before booking.
Excellent facilitation.
Too hot or cold in meeting room.
Facilitation excellent, particularly reviewing report to legislature.
Facility access from turnpike via Osceola.
Fine!
Please try to send agendas out without further changes a week in advance if at all possible.
Schedule was good - was able to attend other TAC & Ad Hoc meetings.
Agenda Packet info. Was incorrect on time of Ad Hoc meetings.
The quality of service from staff was good.
Good Meeting.
(Hotel) Sold my room to a wedding party. Workers at check-in did not know if DCA was staying in facility or not. Had to relocate me to another hotel. Even with a confirmation # and making reservation on time. I also know of other people associated with the meeting that the same above mentioned incident happened to (Guests of Commission).
Very Good.
Good Location. Easy Access.

What did you like best about the meeting?

Good commission participation.
One day in lieu of two.
The reserve with which the commission held their views on the public comment.
The information as to the opinion of the councilman from South Florida that nothing could change their mind as regards to their acceptance of a state code.
That it was short.
Sound was good.
Good facility.
One day.
Excellent meeting room.
Good facilitation, good work by Ad Hoc committees.
Progress in resolving the product approval system
Comfortable facility.
The Polish Guy!
With a lot of issues to decide the meeting moved forward well.
Closed session.
The tent.
Staff and facilitators did a great job in spite of the surroundings, the minimal time frame, and the volume of work to be done.
One (1) day meeting.
We covered a lot of ground & issues.
Someone needs to let the hotel know in case there is ever another natural or unnatural disaster.
Handled important items to finalize code.
Settlement of rule challenge.

Conformity to schedule.
Nice Facility.
Finalizing "The Challenge," especially air handlers.
Good job of consensus building.
This was a good meeting.
Good meeting.
Productive.
Voting many times in Palm Beach.
The way staff handled product approval.
Issues well explained.
Solved Problems.
Ability of Commission to work out differences.
Short....
We were able to compromise a consensus.
Moved and covered issues quickly.
Flexibility of scheduled committees & FBC meeting on Wed.
Good Hotel.
Covered a lot in short amount of time.

How could the meeting have been improved?

Limit the "debating" during public comments. Allow the chair to "stop" unwarranted comments.
Nothing comes to mind.
All OK.
A little more room at tables would be nice. Commission does not have room to open their books.
Seating/table space not adequate. Staff should specify min. space per commissioner to the hotel at all future meetings.
A schedule published in advance that was realistic from the beginning.
Schedule - always seems to change from when we leave office to when we start meetings...can someone e-mail a FINAL meeting schedule just before we leave business offices? (As best you can).
Will you summarize a list of Ad Hoc and other committees (all) with names of members?
Thanks.
Staff needs to prevent scheduling meetings of Ad Hocs that conflict with Commissioners ability to be in more than one meeting at a time.
More Polish Guy!
No more tents!
Better organization of materials - provide executive summary or synopsis of issue to facilitate our decisions.
More organization of notebooks for easier reference.
The information needed better organization so topics being discussed could be readily found.
Organization of materials so you don't have to leaf back and forth to four different documents.
Provide more desk/table space for 2-32 ring binders and other papers.
Be held inside of a building.
Not in tent - copies of indexed books in advance to review.
Try to keep "tent camping" to a minimum.

I would have been better if amendments before commission had been coordinated with fiscal info.
 Different hotel.
 By not having noise of elevator - machinery in meeting room.
 More table room at the commission meeting.
 Room size didn't fit group.
 Facility need to meet ADA.
 Do not overlap Ad Hoc meetings so that critical issues/knowledge cannot be attained by participating in said Ad Hoc meetings.
 Need more space for each commissioner at the table.
 Microphone and facilities were inferior.
 Too cold!
 Submit dec. statement info in advance by email or fax for consideration.
 Use different hotel.
 Brrr!
 Too late getting the background information and agenda packet to us.
 Location - Difficult to access/quality of rooms.
 Fine.
 Parking was limited.
 Move meeting to New Hampshire.

Workplan Prioritization Ranking Exercise Results

The Commission was asked to rank those workplan tasks that do not have a legislatively mandated delivery date. Many of these workplan tasks have been identified by the Commission as issues for Commission review and recommendations. Following in ranked are order are the results of the prioritization ranking exercise.

Task	Raw Score	Prioritization Rank
Board of Appeals Process	154	1
Commission Code Commentary	152	2
Funding for Code Enforcement	152	2
Technical Support for the Code	138	4
Roles/Relationship Between FBC/DCA	137	5
Building Construction Industry Advisory Council	127	6
FBC to IBC Transition	126	7
Role of State Collaborating with Building Depts.	124	8
Exception to Buildings Exempt from Code	117	9
Voluntary Standards for Building Departments	115	10
Storm Rating System	114	11
ISO Rating Program	113	12

WORKPLAN—BY TASKS

(Reviewed and Prioritized June 2000; Adopted Unanimously July 2000)
(Revised May 2001)

I. Ongoing Review and Response to Legislative Mandates

A. Develop Recommendations to the Legislature for Changes to Existing Laws and Conforming Amendments to Laws [553.77 (1)(a)(b)]

Tasks Schedule

June – December Annually: Commission develops recommendations as part of their annual review process and approves recommendations to be included in its report to the Legislature.

B. Respond to Legislative Mandates

Tasks Schedule

Ongoing: Commission develops recommendations as part of their annual Code review process.

January Annually: Commission approves recommendations to be included in its Report to the Legislature.

C. Annual Report to Legislature

Tasks Schedule

Ongoing: Commission develops recommendations as part of their annual Code review process.

January Annually: Commission approves recommendations to be included in its Report to the Legislature.

D. Administrative Support for the Commission and Code Maintenance (Changes/Updates/Format/Glitches)

Tasks Schedule

Ongoing: Commission identifies tasks for staff review and recommendations.

January Annually: Commission reviews recommendations and takes action as needed.

II. Legislatively Prioritized/Mandated Tasks

E. Product Approval System

(553.842—Recommendations on a statewide system for product evaluation and approval)

Tasks Schedule

December 2000: Commission decides on amendments and adopts final recommendations to present to the Legislature.

February 2001: Committee conducts workshop to identify unresolved issues for finalizing rule development.

March – July 2001: Committee develops recommendations on unresolved issues.

August 2001: Rule development workshop on system.

September 2001: Public hearing and Rule Adoption approved by Commission.

F. Recommendations for Consistent Interpretation and Enforcement of the Swimming Pool Safety Act (SB 86) Provisions of the Code (Harmonize Code with Statute)
Tasks Schedule

Jan. 2001: Chair appoints Ad Hoc Committee to develop recommendations.

Feb. 2001: Committee conducts workshop to identify and clarify issues.

July/August 2001: Committee develops recommendations with stakeholders.

G. Guidelines for Local Government Privatization of Inspection Functions
[HB 4181 Task] [553.77 (1)(o)]

Tasks Schedule

July 2001: Chair appoints members.

H. Review Rehabilitation Code (Existing Buildings) for Inclusion in the Code
Tasks Schedule

Jan. 2001: Chair appoints Ad Hoc Committee to develop recommendations.

August 2001: Committee identifies key issues and develops workplan/schedule.

I. Establish Commission Rules of Procedure [Procedural Task]

Tasks Schedule

Develop and adopt recommendations for Commission operational and decision-making procedures and adopt by administrative rule.

October 2000: Commission reviews statutes, identifies key issues, and approves code amendment process. Chair appoints Ad Hoc to develop final recommendations.

March - July 2001: Ad Hoc develops recommendations.

August 2001: Commission adopts final recommendations.

J. Emergency Elevator Access Recommendations

Tasks Schedule

July/August 2001: Chair assigns task.

III. Education System

K. Information and Communication Support for the Building Code System

Tasks Schedule

September 1999: Center for Professional Development (at FSU) begins assessment phase for system conceptual design

December 1999: Report on assessment phase including system conceptual design

December 2000: Commission delays release pending transition training development.

L. Education/Training Programs for the Florida Building Code [HB 4181; HB 219—Section 42; Section 89; Section 120] and Transition Training—BCTP

Tasks Schedule

October 2000: Committee reviews previous project findings and recommendations, and BCTP as outlined in Statute; and, develops implementation strategy.

November 2000: Committee develops preliminary “Program” implementation recommendations for Commission consideration.

December 2000: Committee approves BCTP recommendations.

Commission reviews public comment, refines as needed, and adopts final recommendations to include in the annual Report to the Legislature.

January 2001: “Building Code Training Program” implementation recommendations complete and submitted in Report to the legislature.

Winter/Spring 2001: Commission implements system recommendations.

IV. Commission Prioritized Tasks

M. Establish System for Plans Review and Approval of Prototype Buildings 🍏 [HB – 4181 Task] [553.77 (6)]

Tasks Schedule

November 2000 – March 2001: Ad Hoc develops recommendations.

December 2000: Ad Hoc completes and Commission approves recommendations to Legislature.

January - July 2001: Ad Hoc refines recommendations.

August 2001: Ad Hoc finalizes recommendations based on Legislative action and Commission adopts final recommendations. Rule Development workshop.

N. Board of Appeals Process [Procedural Task]

Tasks Schedule

October 2000: Task assigned to Rules of Procedure Ad Hoc

Late 2001/Early 2002: Ad Hoc develops recommendations for Commission consideration.

O. Develop Procedure and Process for Commission Commentary

Tasks Schedule

Review and adopt recommendations for Legislative consideration.

October 2000: Task assigned to Rules of Procedure Ad Hoc

Late 2001/Early 2002: Ad Hoc develops recommendations for Commission consideration.

P. Develop Funding Recommendations for Code Enforcement

Note: Part of ongoing review for Commission’s annual report to the Legislature.

Tasks Schedule

October 1999: Deferred to DCA Administrative Support Agency and Governor’s office to address and make recommendations to the Legislature.

February – December 2000: Staff reviews as needed or requested by the Commission.

July 2000: Task referred to Partnership for Building Department Effectiveness Task Group

Late 2001/Early 2002: Ad Hoc identifies key issues and forms workplan.

Q. Technical Support for the Code [Procedural Task]

Tasks Schedule

Recommendations to Commission for ongoing review and support for technical review of the code.

October 2000: Commission assigns to administrative agency (DCA) to develop recommend’s.

R. Review Commission and Staff Roles Relative to Public Information and Involvement & Review and Clarify Mutual Roles of DCA and Commission.

Task Schedule

On Going: Commission and staff hold discussions as needed or requested on mutual roles in providing for public information and involvement in the code process.

S. Research Advisory Committee — Projects Relating to the Building Construction Industry or Continuing Education Programs [HB 219 Section 40 – 489.109 (3)]

Tasks Schedule

May 2001: Legislature moves research projects related to the construction industry from DOE to FBC.

Summer/Fall 2001: TAC organizational meeting.

T. Make Recommendations on FBC Policy for Transition to International Building Code

Task Schedule

Late 2001/Early 2002: Commission reviews task, identifies key issues, and forms workplan.

U. Role of State in Collaborating with Building Inspection Departments

Tasks Schedule

February 2000: Commission assigns task to Partnership for Building Department Effectiveness Task Group.

Late 2001/Early 2002: Commission reviews task, identifies key issues, and forms workplan.

V. Make Recommendations for Exceptions to Buildings Exempt from the Code [553.73 (7)]; [HB 219 – Section 112]

Late 2001/Early 2002: Commission reviews task, identifies key issues, and forms workplan.

**W. Voluntary Standards for Building Departments [HB 4181 Task] [553.76 (5)]
ISO Ratings Program for Building Departments [HB 4181] [553.77 (1)(n)]**

Tasks Schedule

March 2000: Ad Hoc identifies key issues and forms workplan.

May 2000: Ad Hoc develops recommendations and receives presentations from representatives of Miami-Dade and Broward counties, state building officials association (BOAF), the insurance industry, federal emergency management agency (FEMA) and other vested groups.

Late 2001/Early 2002: Commission reviews task, identifies key issues, and forms workplan.

X. Review Creating a Rating System for Structural Integrity Under Storm Conditions

Task Schedule

Late 2001/Early 2002: Commission reviews task, identifies key issues, and forms workplan.

Y. ISO Ratings Program for Building Departments [HB 4181] [553.77 (1)(n)]

Task Schedule

Late 2001/Early 2002: Commission reviews task, identifies key issues, and forms workplan.

ATTACHMENT 7

Prototype Buildings Ad Hoc Committee Report Report of the May 16, 2001 Mfg Bldg/Prototype Ad hoc Committee

Craig Parrino, Chairman

Members attending:
Christ Sanidas, Karl Thorne, John Calpini, Ed Carson

Agenda approved as submitted

March 2001 Minutes approved as submitted

Legislative update relative to the Prototype program. It was noted that all items requested by the Prototype Ad hoc were accepted during the 2002 Legislature.

May 2001 Prototype meeting actions:

Abuses: Policy issue # 9 Abuses to the Prototype System,
Motion: This issue to be deferred until data (history of the program) on the program was known, the RFP would ask the Administrator to report abuses to the Commission.

Training: Discussion on training of Prototype program
Motion: This would be addressed in the RFP as the responsibility of the Prototype Administrator to assure training of the mechanics of the program is delivered to the user.

Fees: Prototype program fees
Motion: The Legislature granted authority to set up fee structure as a criteria for the program Discussion of organizational committee chart/ players to be included in committee

Criteria: Discussion of criteria for Plans examiners and Fire inspectors
Motion: Criteria has been established by the Florida Building Code , therefore no further action is needed.

Committee: Discussion of the organizational committee chart
Motion: to continue work at the July meeting on this issue, needs approximately 2 hours .

Prototype Program development issues Part 3:
The following categories were created for management development purposes
1) Policy,
2) Administrative,
3) Local authority

April 2001 Prototype Committee motions/Recommendations/no action

Motion: Staff to notify by letter to the 67 county school districts Chairman and superintendents of required inspections /insignia prior to occupancy of Factory Built Schools. Karl/Med

1) Policy issues addressed were the following:

Motion: Policy issue # 2 -Time frame for Plans Review - Plans have a maximum 30 days turn around time when in the hands of the Plans Examiner. Note: 90 day total turn around time. Med/John

Recommendation: Policy issue #3 -Architectural control issue - Allow local Building Officials to use as much of approved plan as possible. Med/consensus

Motion: Policy issue # 4 - Alternative materials /methods -Administrator shall document why discussion was made, Administrator shall consider alternate material/methods. John/Med

Motion: Policy issue # 5 -Contract management of Plans Reviewer - Plans Examiner will be approved by F.B.C. and will report to the Administrator, the Fire Marshall approves 633 Plans Reviewer. Med/Karl

Recommendation: Policy issue # 6 -Threshold Buildings must meet established criteria as set forth by the Florida Building Code

Motion: Policy issue # 7 (part one)Ownership of Documents - Designer must approve set of plans for each permit. Plans examiner receive a royalty each time plan is approved, through the Administrator. Med/John

Administration item # 7 (part two) Administrator must approve use of plans (including tracking) each time plans are used. Mastering of prototype plans shall not be allowed. Ed/Karl

Motion: Policy issue # 8 & 12 - Limiting factors on drawings relative to site/foundation orientation.-Local jurisdiction to determine on title page the following: Limiting factors, alternatives, revisions, sheet and or page legend and design criteria. Med/Ed

No Action: Policy issue # 10 - What should system include -NA

No Action: Policy issue # 11 - Conflicts with Uniform Fire Safety Standards - See Policy issue #5 and Ad hoc developed chart in concept

Recommendation: Policy issue # 15 -Conformance to architects/engineers, requirement operations - Conformance to 471& 481 FS Requirement operations.

2) Administration Issues:

Recommendation: Administration issue # 1 -Approval process -Plans submitted to Administrator, Administrator responsible for Building/Fire Review, Administrator issues approval

Motion: Administration Issue # 7 - Plans Identification - Tracking system (numbering etc), number of times plans used, number dictating cycle of revisions, stamped in red 3x5 (horizontal) box at top right hand corner for official use only. Placed in this space shall be the Plans examiners name, date reviewed, and identification number. Med/Ed

Recommendation: Administration Issue # 8 - Tracking System (Internet) to developed by the Administrator and DCA. through the BCIF program.

Motion: Administration Issue # 9 Shelf life of Plans - For use for the Code in effect when plans were approved. Med/John

No Action: Administration Issue # 10 Record retention -addressed by the Ad hoc in December to the Legislature. April meeting, recommends compliance to State record 119 FS by the Administrator.

Note: Defer this issue to Commission Rules & Procedure Committee

Part 2- 2001 Legislative Recommendations: Ad hoc reference from the December 2000 meeting on Prototype building

- * Seek specific Legislative authority to contract for the prototype building program
- * Seek specific Legislative authority for fees and funding for the prototype building program.
- * FBC contracts to administrative entity to coordinate a system that includes funding for administration, monitoring the program, record keeping. Fees would be a % paid by client/user to plan review established by market and approved by FBC
- * Prototype building program intent should meet the Florida Building Code, Fire Code, ADA, and Fair Housing requirements (553.77 , 633 and Chapter 11 part B of the FBC)
- * Seek specific Legislative authority relating to record & Internet access of the prototype building program.
- * Seek specific Legislative authority to establish an electronic standardized format to access plans and records and to use microfiche to store and archive records for the prototype buildings program.
- * Seek specific Legislative authority to establish fees any increase approved by FBC
- * Seek specific legislative authority for exemption of the prototype building program from public records law.
- * Clarify intent of Statute 553.77(6). Statute to read: The Commission may provide by rule for plans review and approval of prototype buildings owned by public and private entities to be replicated throughout the state. Such approved plans or prototype buildings shall be exempt from further review required by s.553.79(2), except changes to the prototype design, site plans, and other site-related items ~~, or~~ approved plans of prototype buildings shall also be exempt from any local technical amendment to any part of the Florida Building Code. Construction or erection of such prototype buildings is subject to local permitting and inspections pursuant to this part.
- * Possible exemptions to local fire amendments The Fire marshal have provided exemption with limitation within their Rule.

3)Local Authority

Recommendation: Local Authority issue #2 - Changes in use category - change of use - Local Jurisdiction, existing buildings would not be in Prototype buildings program.

ATTACHMENT 8

Accessibility TAC Report

Report of the May 17, 2001 Committee meeting

Meeting called to order at 2PM by Diana Richardson, Chairman,

Members in attendance: Quorum achieved

Diana Richardson	Commissioner	-General Interest Group
Dick Browdy	Commissioner	- Producer Group
Karl Thorne	Commissioner	- Consumer Group
Dan Shaw	Commissioner	Producer Group
Steve Sensakovic		General Interest Group
Bunny Armstrong	(conference)	General Interest Group
Sharon Mignardi	-	General Interest Group
Warren Jerrigan	-	General Interest Group

Members absent:

Larry Schneider	-	Consumer Group
Jeffrey Gross	-	Consumer Group
Vacancy		Producer Group
Barabra Bernhert		Consumer Group

Agenda approved as submitted

Minutes of the April 10, 2001 Accessibility Technical Advisory Committee were approved as submitted.

Objective 1: Accessibility Code training part two technical aspects relevant to the Florida Accessibility Code, presented by DCA staff Mary Kathern Smith the final two hour credited course .

Objective 2: Discussion on potential workshop relative to 553.512 FS Advisory Council Motion: To conduct an Accessibility workshop to discuss proposed amendment to the statute. To obtain consensus and make recommendations to the Commission. Issue to be placed on the July accessibility TAC agenda assuming the Commission Chair retains this issue as TAC issue rather than a Commission issue.

Objective 3: Staff update on Accessibility TAC membership: The following proposed appointments are to be made by the Commission relative to vacancies. The following are for consideration: Sharon Mignardi to replace Karl Thorne's position in the Consumer Group, J.R. Harding to fill vacancy on the General Interest Group (vacated by Sharon Mignardi) and Commissioner Lipka to fill the vacancy on the Producer Group.

ATTACHMENT 9

Special Occupancy TAC Report

Report of the May 17, 2001 meeting

The following were reported by the Special Occupancy TAC to the Commission. The TAC met with a quorum. The following actions were reported by the TAC..

The purpose and task of the TAC at the May meeting:

* To update the Special Occupancy TAC of DCA staff work relative to Chapter 4 (and related sections and Chapters 30,31, and 34) identification of construction related issues only to remain in the code. administrative, fees etc would be retained with the perspective agency..
*Task members to review draft changes, ie strike delete. or add underline. As this task must be completed by the July Commission meeting it was the consensus of the group to meet June 18, in Tallahassee from 9-5pm at DCA to complete this task.

Motion: To adopt guidelines: All Special Occupancy provisions should be limited to Construction Standards only.

The following instructions along with Chapter 4, Chapter 30, Chapter 31 and Chapter 34 will be electronically sent to the members and interested parties to review and make comment. Deadline for comments is June 11 and will be electronically sent to the following e-mail bruce.ketcham@dca.state.fl.us.

- * Remove language relating to State Agency Administration, procedures, and fees.
- * Ensure proper and useful “cross- overs” from the Florida Building Code to the State Agency Law, Rule, office, or other mechanism needed for approval and completion of construction.
- * Chapters or provisions (example: “for definitions , see Chapter 2) must be checked and verified. If the form or manner of reference is not consistent, then it will be noted.
- * Insure Chapter, Section, Paragraph, etc., numbering is correct and consistent. (The numbering system will be the Florida Building Code to remain consistent with the Code.
- * Proposed changes as strike through (delete) or underline (add) using rational.
- * Update any sections that are no longer consistent due to changes in statute or rule
- * No substantive changes are allowed otherwise.
- * Note and correct any mistakes, typographical errors, font discrepancies, references and general “housekeeping “ items, etc.
- * Add back in provisions governing construction of Assisted Living Facilities, Adult Day Care Centers and Control of Radiation Hazards

ATTACHMENT 10

Energy TAC Report

The TAC met and discussed the scope of work for the air handler field study.

Action:

The TAC voted to recommend that the Commission approve the proposed scope of work for the air handler field study. (6/7 approved).