

7th Edition (2020)



**CODE ADMINISTRATION TAC  
WITH COMMENTS**

*This document created by the Florida Department of Business and  
Professional Regulation -  
850-487-1824*

# TAC: Code Administration

Total Mods for **Code Administration** in **No Affirmative Recommendation**: 20

Total Mods for report: 20

## Sub Code: Building

**CA7126**

1

<b>Date Submitted</b>	6/23/2018	<b>Section</b>	104	<b>Proponent</b>	Ronald Treharne
<b>Chapter</b>	1	<b>Affects HVHZ</b>	No	<b>Attachments</b>	No
<b>TAC Recommendation</b>	No Affirmative Recommendation				
<b>Commission Action</b>	Pending Review				

### Comments

<b>General Comments</b>	Yes	<b>Alternate Language</b>	No
-------------------------	-----	---------------------------	----

#### Related Modifications

CA 7165 Duplication

#### Summary of Modification

Clarify that one of the duties of the Building Official is to verify that construction documents are submitted by a licensed and an appropriately qualified registered design professional in addition to verifying that construction documents comply with current codes.

#### Rationale

Some building officials have been approving submitted construction documents from registered design professionals who are illegally practicing outside their area of expertise; most common, engineers signing and sealing architectural plans. Per Florida State Statutes 471 (Engineers) and 481 (Architects) and the Building Officials Association of Florida (BOAF) "A Building Official's Guide to the Professional Practice of Architects & Engineers in Florida" – it is quite clear that basically Architects are "Responsible for comprehensive building design including: life safety, floor plans, elevations, architectural detailing, architectural features, specifications and any aspect related to human habitation of the building." Whereas, "Professional engineers are responsible for the engineering design of multiple aspects of a building project. Professional engineers practice is based upon their training, knowledge and expertise." In a nutshell, Architects design buildings (particularly ones designed for human habitation) while engineers may only design components or the systems within the building and only those systems in their area of specific training. While architects and engineers have similar training, particularly with regard to structures; architects have far more additional training than engineers in all the other aspects associated with a building design. Unfortunately, many building officials do not know that difference and simply look for a raised seal on the drawing equating an engineer as equal to an architect when they should be looking at the building code's definition of a "registered design professional" as the only one truly qualified to sign and seal their respective disciplines work.

#### Fiscal Impact Statement

##### Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code

The Building Official already is responsible for verifying that the construction documents comply with current applicable codes as per Florida State Statute 468.604, so virtually no extra cost for the responsibility of verifying who submitted the construction documents.

##### Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

Specifically, the Building Official's responsibility to also verify that the construction document is submitted by an appropriately qualified registered design professional. This should only be a one-time check; thus, little extra cost; and, no extra cost for the building/property owner.

##### Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

It should be a huge impact for those registered design professionals (RDP) who are currently practicing within their area of licensure because it should effectively stop those RDP who have been practicing outside their area of licensure; tarnishing the reputations of lawfully abiding RDP.

##### Impact to small business relative to the cost of compliance with code

None, other than they should have available better constructions documents from which to work because they have been submitted by someone with expertise in that area; thus, this should only lower the number of mistakes and save small businesses money.

#### Requirements

##### Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public

Since the primary responsibility of both the Building Official and the RDP is to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the general public, any RDP who is practicing outside their area of licensure, training and expertise is more apt to make mistakes which can potentially harm the public.

**Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction**

Having the registered design professional who is best qualified to submit a specific construction document because of their expertise and training should typically yield the best selection of the products, methods or systems of construction.

**Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities**

Having a registered design profession best qualified for the submittal of the construction document should actually reduce any discrimination against materials, methods or systems of construction since the RDP should have more knowledge and experience of the options available.

**Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code**

With both appropriately qualified registered design professionals preparing the construction document and the Building Official reviewing the construction document, this should only help reinforce the effectiveness of the code by minimizing possible errors or omissions.

**2nd Comment Period**

**Proponent** christian noll      **Submitted** 5/26/2019      **Attachments** No

**CA7126-G2**

**Comment:**

I disagree with the rationale of this modification. Statute 471.003(3) is quite clear that engineers can perform the duties of an architect and vice versa:  
471.003(3) Notwithstanding the provisions of this chapter or of any other law, no licensed engineer whose principal practice is civil or structural engineering, or employee or subordinate under the responsible supervision or control of the engineer, is precluded from performing architectural services which are purely incidental to her or his engineering practice, nor is any licensed architect, or employee or subordinate under the responsible supervision or control of the architect, precluded from performing engineering services which are purely incidental to her or his architectural practice. However, no engineer shall practice architecture or use the designation "architect" or any term derived therefrom, and no architect shall practice engineering or use the designation "engineer" or any term derived therefrom.

**2nd Comment Period**

**Proponent** Mark Eady      **Submitted** 5/26/2019      **Attachments** No

**CA7126-G3**

**Comment:**

I do not recommend the code modification as engineers are fully qualified and should not be excluded to practice building design functions incidental to their engineering work.

**2nd Comment Period**

**Proponent** Thomas Chase      **Submitted** 5/26/2019      **Attachments** No

**CA7126-G4**

**Comment:**

I RECOMMEND DENYING THIS CODE MODIFICATION. This is a move to prevent engineers from performing building and architectural design incidental to other engineering aspects. It will drive up costs. I deeply respect the professions of engineering and architecture and have friends in both fields. This, however, smacks of an effort to favor one profession at the expense of the public and consumers of both services. Engineers have done architecture incidental to their engineering projects (and vice versa) for centuries and that should not change now. Please deny this requested code modification.

**2nd Comment Period**

**Proponent** Keith Nugent      **Submitted** 5/26/2019      **Attachments** No

**CA7126-G5**

**Comment:**

I do NOT recommend approval

## 1st Comment Period History

<b>Proponent</b>	Mo Madani	<b>Submitted</b>	1/30/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	No
------------------	-----------	------------------	-----------	--------------------	----

CA7126-G1

**Comment:**

Section 553.73(2), Florida Statutes

...Provisions relating to the personnel, supervision or training of personnel, or any other professional qualification requirements relating to contractors or their workforce may not be included within the Florida Building Code, and subsections (4), (6), (7), (8), and (9) are not to be construed to allow the inclusion of such provisions within the Florida Building Code by amendment. This restriction applies to both initial development and amendment of the Florida Building Code.

Text of Modification

104.1.1.1 Review of Construction Documents

The Building Official they shall verify that each construction document is submitted by an appropriately qualified licensed registered design professional (architect, landscape architect, interior designer or engineer) as per their respective State of Florida statutes 471 (Engineers) and 481 (Architects, Landscape Architects & Interior Designers). Building Officials shall verify that engineers are submitting engineering construction documents and only in their area of training and expertise; and architects, landscape architects and interior designers are submitting architectural, landscape and interior design construction documents and only in their area of training and expertise. The Building Official shall report any unlicensed activity of a registered design professionals practicing outside their area of licensure to the Department of Business and Professional Regulation (DBPR) and the registered design professional's respective regulating board. In addition, the Building Official shall verify that the submitted construction document complies with all current applicable codes.

<b>Date Submitted</b>	11/2/2018	<b>Section</b>	104	<b>Proponent</b>	Ronald Treharne
<b>Chapter</b>	1	<b>Affects HVHZ</b>	No	<b>Attachments</b>	No
<b>TAC Recommendation</b>	No Affirmative Recommendation				
<b>Commission Action</b>	Pending Review				

**Comments**

**General Comments** Yes **Alternate Language** Yes

**Related Modifications**

None

**Summary of Modification**

Clarify that one of the duties of the Building Official is to verify that construction documents are submitted by a licensed and an appropriately qualified registered design professional in addition to verifying that construction documents comply with current codes.

**Rationale**

Some building officials have been approving submitted construction documents from registered design professionals who are illegally practicing outside their area of expertise; most common, engineers signing and sealing architectural plans. Per Florida State Statutes 471 (Engineers) and 481 (Architects) and the Building Officials Association of Florida (BOAF) "A Building Official's Guide to the Professional Practice of Architects & Engineers in Florida" – it is quite clear that basically Architects are "Responsible for comprehensive building design including: life safety, floor plans, elevations, architectural detailing, architectural features, specifications and any aspect related to human habitation of the building." Whereas, "Professional engineers are responsible for the engineering design of multiple aspects of a building project. Professional engineers practice is based upon their training, knowledge and expertise." In a nutshell, Architects design buildings (particularly ones designed for human habitation) while engineers may only design components or the systems within the building and only those systems in their area of specific training. While architects and engineers have similar training, particularly with regard to structures; architects have far more additional training than engineers in all the other aspects associated with a building design. Unfortunately, many building officials do not know that difference and simply look for a raised seal on the drawing equating an engineer as equal to an architect when they should be looking at the building code's definition of a "registered design professional" as the only one truly qualified to sign and seal their respective disciplines work.

**Fiscal Impact Statement****Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

The Building Official already is responsible for verifying that the construction documents comply with current applicable codes as per Florida State Statute 468.604, so virtually no extra cost for the responsibility of verifying who submitted the construction documents.

**Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code**

Specifically, the Building Official's responsibility to also verify that the construction document is submitted by an appropriately qualified registered design professional. This should only be a one-time check; thus, little extra cost; and, no extra cost for the building/property owner.

**Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code**

It should be a huge impact for those registered design professionals (RDP) who are currently practicing within their area of licensure because it should effectively stop those RDP who have been practicing outside their area of licensure; tarnishing the reputations of lawfully abiding RDP.

**Impact to small business relative to the cost of compliance with code**

None, other than they should have available better constructions documents from which to work because they have been submitted by someone with expertise in that area; thus, this should only lower the number of mistakes and save small businesses money.

**Requirements****Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

Since the primary responsibility of both the Building Official and the RDP is to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the general public, any RDP who is practicing outside their area of licensure, training and expertise is more apt to make mistakes which can potentially harm the public.

**Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction**

Having the registered design professional who is best qualified to submit a specific construction document because of their expertise and training should typically yield the best selection of the products, methods or systems of construction.

**Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities**

Having a registered design profession best qualified for the submittal of the construction document should actually reduce any discrimination against materials, methods or systems of construction since the RDP should have more knowledge and experience of the options available.

**Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code**

With both appropriately qualified registered design professionals preparing the construction document and the Building Official reviewing the construction document, this should only help reinforce the effectiveness of the code by minimizing possible errors or omissions.

**2nd Comment Period**

<b>7165-A2</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	Ronald Treharne	<b>Submitted</b>	4/18/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	Yes
	<b>Rationale</b>	Request from Mo Madani, 04-19-2019, to correct format errors.				
	<b>Fiscal Impact Statement</b>					
	<b>Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code</b>	No change				
	<b>Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code</b>	No change				
	<b>Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code</b>	No change				
	<b>Impact to Small Business relative to the cost of compliance with code</b>	None, other than they should have available better constructions documents from which to work because they have been submitted by someone with expertise in that area; thus, this should only lower the number of mistakes and save small businesses money.				
	<b>Requirements</b>					
	<b>Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public</b>	No change				
	<b>Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction</b>	No change				
<b>Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities</b>	No change					
<b>Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code</b>	No change					

**2nd Comment Period**

<b>CA7165-G3</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	Ronald Treharne	<b>Submitted</b>	4/15/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	No
	<b>Comment:</b>	<p>Recommend APPROVAL of proposed amendment 7165 by TAC Board. The amendment simply clarifies the duty of the Building Code Official (BCO) to verify that an appropriate RDP submitted the construction documents (CD). This is supported by F.S. 553.73(1) which states that the FBC "shall contain or incorporate by reference laws and rules which pertain to and govern the DESIGN, construction, erection, alteration, modification, repair, and demolition of public and private buildings, structures, and facilities and ENFORCEMENT of such laws and rules." Thus, to enforce the design of the building by an RDP, the FBC needs specific language clarifying the BCO's responsibility.</p> <p>The FBC defines an RDP as "an individual who is registered or licensed to practice their RESPECTIVE design profession...within the scope of their license...as per Chapters 471 and 481." Therefore, the BCO is responsible for enforcing the requirement that the project is designed by a respective RDP. There are already sections within the FBC supporting the BCO's responsibility to verify CD's. While many BCO's do comply, some BCO's do not. Obviously, the FBC does not make it clear enough to some BCO's that they have the responsibility to verify that the CD's are submitted by a respective RDP; for example, allowing engineers to unlawfully submit architectural drawings, and vice versa. Hence, the BCO is sanctioning unlicensed activity. Who else, other than the BCO, is in a better position to do enforce this law?</p> <p>The proposed amendment is intended to help stop this violation by clarifying the BCO's responsibility. The proposed amendment meets of all of F.S. 553.73 criteria for an amendment and does not restrict GC's from submitting residential construction documents. So, for a stronger, better and simpler FBC, which adds no cost, why not incorporate the amendment?</p>				

**2nd Comment Period**

<b>CA7165-G4</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	Dalas Disney	<b>Submitted</b>	4/18/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	No
	<b>Comment:</b>	I support and recommend approval of the amendment as submitted.				

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7165-G5

**Proponent** John Bryant      **Submitted** 4/22/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

I support the approval of the proposed amendment.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7165-G6

**Proponent** Gregory Tsark      **Submitted** 4/22/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of amendment as submitted.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7165-G7

**Proponent** Treharne Reid      **Submitted** 4/22/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of amendment as submitted

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7165-G8

**Proponent** George Stewart      **Submitted** 4/25/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of amendment as submitted.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7165-G9

**Proponent** Carl Kaiserman      **Submitted** 4/25/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

Recommend Approval of Amendment as submitted.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7165-G10

**Proponent** Warren Barry      **Submitted** 4/26/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

I recommend approval of amendment as submitted



## 2nd Comment Period

CA7165-G11

**Proponent** Jon Kukk      **Submitted** 4/26/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

I recommend approval of amendment as submitted and thank all the people involved for their hard work.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7165-G12

**Proponent** Carl Erickson      **Submitted** 4/26/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of amendment as submitted.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7165-G13

**Proponent** Lisa Herendeen      **Submitted** 4/26/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

I support the approval of the proposed amendment.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7165-G14

**Proponent** Jordan Yee      **Submitted** 4/26/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of this amendment as submitted.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7165-G15

**Proponent** Joseph Nappi      **Submitted** 4/26/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

Architects are schooled and trained while serving as an apprentice in the area's of Administrative Building Codes, Zoning, F.A.R. for site bulking, storm and sanitary drainage systems, building flows associated with human factors all of which the Engineers training does not touch upon. My belief is that both the Architect and Engineer should collaborate on the project with the Architect as the lead designer.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7165-G16

**Proponent** adam warner      **Submitted** 4/29/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of amendment as submitted

## 2nd Comment Period

**CA7165-G17** Proponent Anthony Harwell Submitted 4/30/2019 Attachments No

**Comment:**

I approve of this modification

## 2nd Comment Period

**CA7165-G18** Proponent Lawrence Maxwell Submitted 4/30/2019 Attachments No

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of comment as submitted.

## 2nd Comment Period

**CA7165-G19** Proponent Thomas Brooks Submitted 5/2/2019 Attachments No

**Comment:**

I am in total support of this amendment.  
Tom Brooks

## 2nd Comment Period

**CA7165-G20** Proponent Alan Matthews Submitted 5/3/2019 Attachments No

**Comment:**

I would like to recommend approval of this amendment. Architectural design of buildings should only be undertaken by professionals properly trained and licensed to do so. The responsibility to provide design in compliance with the many life safety issues necessary must not be taken lightly.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide my opinion.

## 2nd Comment Period

**CA7165-G21** Proponent David Godwin Submitted 5/6/2019 Attachments No

**Comment:**

Recommend approval as written.

## 2nd Comment Period

**CA7165-G22** Proponent Terence Myers Submitted 5/6/2019 Attachments No

**Comment:**

I would like to support amendment 7165, 7169, 7181, 7232

## 2nd Comment Period

**Proponent** Greg Burke      **Submitted** 5/7/2019      **Attachments** No

CA7165-G23

**Comment:**

Approve the language as submitted. As stated in other comments, state law requires Building Officials to ensure that when reviewing plans for building permits, they ensure that the proper registered design professional has signed and sealed the documents. While there may be no cost to the building departments to perform this task, there is a large expense to the public in general in ways that are not observed by the public.

While architects and engineers perform similar tasks, their training for the tasks they perform are greatly different. Civil and structural engineers have detailed understandings of site design and structural design. Architects are trained in both fields to a far less level. Architects have training in many areas that engineers do not. Those areas include, but are not limited to life safety, accessibility, safe egress design, and code compliance.

many building officials complain of poorly prepared documents that they review more than twice for compliance and issuing of a permit. Often times the issue is the design professional preparing the document is practicing outside of his license and education. A "volley ball" effect of submit plans, review, comment, re-submit, review... takes place. The volleyball effect has the effect of the building department, through no fault of their own is working at an inefficient level because of the improperly prepared documents. The inefficiency leads to those who have prepared their documents not getting timely permits, driving up costs in financing and income for well prepared projects. The cost is extremely huge to municipalities, design professionals, developers, contractors, and the public for the wasted time in review and extra re-reviews.

## 2nd Comment Period

**Proponent** Thomas Tiedeman      **Submitted** 5/7/2019      **Attachments** No

CA7165-G24

**Comment:**

I support this amendment.

## 2nd Comment Period

**Proponent** Robert Bartlett      **Submitted** 5/7/2019      **Attachments** No

CA7165-G25

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of amendment as submitted.

## 2nd Comment Period

**Proponent** James Piatchuk      **Submitted** 5/8/2019      **Attachments** No

CA7165-G26

**Comment:**

I support and recommend approval of the amendment as submitted.

## 2nd Comment Period

**Proponent** Horan William      **Submitted** 5/10/2019      **Attachments** No

CA7165-G27

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of amendment as submitted.

## 2nd Comment Period

**CA7165-G28** Proponent David Knoll Submitted 5/11/2019 Attachments No

**Comment:**

I understand and approve of the proposed code modifications.

## 2nd Comment Period

**CA7165-G29** Proponent Michael Scarmack Submitted 5/12/2019 Attachments No

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of amendment as submitted.

## 2nd Comment Period

**CA7165-G30** Proponent James Jackson Submitted 5/13/2019 Attachments No

**Comment:**

I agree with this change Architects should be only one allowed to perform this duty.

## 2nd Comment Period

**CA7165-G31** Proponent Thomas Hester Submitted 5/14/2019 Attachments No

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of amendment as submitted.

## 2nd Comment Period

**CA7165-G32** Proponent Rob Glisson Submitted 5/16/2019 Attachments No

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of amendment as submitted.

## 2nd Comment Period

**CA7165-G33** Proponent David Hicks Submitted 5/20/2019 Attachments No

**Comment:**

Suggest approval.

## 2nd Comment Period

<b>CA7165-G34</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	david williams	<b>Submitted</b>	5/25/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	Yes
	<b>Comment:</b>	I am refuting the proposed code to disallow an engineer to create a floor plan within the scope of an MEP design. An engineer is more qualified to develop a floor plan based upon safety than an architect. Furthermore, it decreases competition and increases cost. It creates a monopoly run by the architects to increase expenses to homeowners and business owners looking for construction designs. I am completely against this effort as being completely "Un-American" and discouraging competitive competition.				

## 2nd Comment Period

<b>CA7165-G35</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	christian noll	<b>Submitted</b>	5/26/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	No
	<b>Comment:</b>	I disagree with the rationale of this modification. It is the author's opinion that "While architects and engineers have similar training, particularly with regard to structures; architects have far more additional training than engineers in all the other aspects associated with a building design." Florida statute 471.003(3) and 481.229(4) both state that "Notwithstanding the provisions of this part or of any other law, no registered engineer whose principal practice is civil or structural engineering, or employee or subordinate under the responsible supervision or control of the engineer, is precluded from performing architectural services which are purely incidental to his or her engineering practice, nor is any registered architect, or employee or subordinate under the responsible supervision or control of such architect, precluded from performing engineering services which are purely incidental to his or her architectural practice. However, no engineer shall practice architecture or use the designation "architect" or any term derived therefrom, and no architect shall practice engineering or use the designation "engineer" or any term derived therefrom." The preceding statement does not state that an architect has any more training than an engineer. Also the author infers that architects are more suited to design of buildings that are human inhabited. But 481.203(6) states that the practice of "architecture" means the rendering or offering to render services in connection with the design and construction of a structure or group of structures which have as their principal purpose human habitation or use, and the utilization of space within and surrounding such structures. This does not preclude engineers from designing buildings that are human inhabited per 471.003(3).				

## 2nd Comment Period

<b>CA7165-G36</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	Mark Eady	<b>Submitted</b>	5/26/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	No
	<b>Comment:</b>	I do not recommend the code modification as engineers are fully qualified and should not be excluded to practice building design functions incidental to their engineering work.				

## 2nd Comment Period

<b>CA7165-G37</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	Ruben Oliveira	<b>Submitted</b>	5/26/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	No
	<b>Comment:</b>	I disapprove the proposed code modification. An engineer with their background and educational experience can easily interpret and design to the applicable codes. It seems as a certain group is trying to monopolize the building design industry and this will result in higher prices to the consumer.				

## 2nd Comment Period

<b>CA7165-G38</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	Keith Nugent	<b>Submitted</b>	5/26/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	No
	<b>Comment:</b>	I disapprove the proposed code modification this code appears to limit engineer's ability to practice in areas they are fully qualified for.				

## 1st Comment Period History

Proponent	Sanjeev Mangoli	Submitted	1/2/2019	Attachments	No
-----------	-----------------	-----------	----------	-------------	----

CA7165-G1

**Comment:**

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code (553.73(9)(b),F.S.)

There is a huge cost to common public, as with this the building officials shall start demanding the sign and seal for even additions and alterations. Even if you consider an average of \$ 200 per single family and assume only 1/10th of these apply for some additions or alterations, the cost impact would be HUGE.

Suggestion is to include the provisions of

FS 489.113 (9) (b)

FS 481.229

R606.1.1Professional registration not required.

Please include these provisions in the language and consider having an exception, if the plans are submitted by the Certified General contractor to be acceptable.

## 1st Comment Period History

Proponent	Sanjeev Mangoli	Submitted	1/2/2019	Attachments	No
-----------	-----------------	-----------	----------	-------------	----

CA7165-G2

**Comment:**

While defining a design professional the following Florida Statues should be included to consider the construction documents submitted by Licensed Certified General contractor to be acceptable as per the provisions of

489.113 (9) (b)

R 606.1.1 ( Residential Building Code FBC-2017)

481.229 Exception; exemptions from Licensure ( Single Family and Two Family)

The Building Official shall verify that each construction document is submitted by its respective registered design professional.

#### 104.1 1.1 Review of Construction Documents

The Building Official they shall verify that each construction document is submitted by an appropriately qualified licensed registered design professional (architect, landscape architect, interior designer or engineer) as per their respective State of Florida statutes 471 (Engineers) and 481 (Architects, Landscape Architects & Interior Designers). Building Officials shall verify that engineers are submitting engineering construction documents and only in their area of training and expertise; and architects, landscape architects and interior designers are submitting architectural, landscape and interior design construction documents and only in their area of training and expertise. The Building Official shall report any unlicensed activity of a registered design professionals practicing outside their area of licensure to the Department of Business and Professional Regulation (DBPR) and the registered design professional's respective regulating board. In addition, the Building Official shall verify that the submitted construction document complies with all current applicable codes.



<b>Date Submitted</b> 12/3/2018	<b>Section</b> 110.3	<b>Proponent</b> T Stafford
<b>Chapter</b> 1	<b>Affects HVHZ</b> No	<b>Attachments</b> Yes
<b>TAC Recommendation</b>	No Affirmative Recommendation	
<b>Commission Action</b>	Pending Review	

**Comments**

**General Comments** Yes **Alternate Language** Yes

**Related Modifications****Summary of Modification**

Section 110.3 is proposed to be revised to add exterior wall coverings and soffits to the list of required inspections.

**Rationale**

The purpose of this code change proposal is to improve the high wind performance of exterior wall cladding and soffits by specifically requiring inspections to verify compliant installation.

As part of the response to Hurricane Irma in Florida, the Federal Insurance and Mitigation Administration (FIMA) deployed a Mitigation Assessment Team (MAT) composed of national and regional building science experts to assess the damage in Florida. The primary purpose of a MAT is to improve the natural hazard resistance of buildings by evaluating the key causes of building damage, failure, and success, and developing strategic recommendations for improving short-term recovery and long-term disaster resilience to future natural hazard events. The following MAT-related information will be included in the FEMA MAT Report: Hurricane Irma in Florida which is anticipated to be published in December 2018. Links to download the free report will be shared with FBC TAC members and Commission members for reference upon publication.

See uploaded support file for further discussion and justification for this proposal.

**Fiscal Impact Statement****Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

This proposal will impact local entities relative to enforcement of the code as 2 additional components have been added to the list of required inspections. If approved, this code change may require an additional site visit to verify compliance by local building departments.

**Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code**

No impact to building and property owners relative to the cost of compliance with the code.

**Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code**

No impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with the code.

**Impact to small business relative to the cost of compliance with code**

No impact to small business relative to the cost of compliance with the code.

**Requirements****Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

This proposal adds exterior wall coverings and soffits to the list of required inspections. The failure of wall coverings and soffits can result in significant water intrusion.

**Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction**

This proposal strengthens the code by adding exterior wall coverings and soffits to the list of required inspections to ensure code compliant products are being used and installed properly. The failure of wall coverings and soffits can result in significant water intrusion.

**Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities**

This proposal does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities.

**Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code**

This proposal does not degrade the effectiveness of the code.

**2nd Comment Period**

<b>7647-A1</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	James Schock	<b>Submitted</b>	5/21/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	Yes
	<b>Rationale</b>	This modification makes it clear these inspections are in progress inspections due to the fact that fasteners are hidden during installation. This will also not hold up the inspection or construction process. As a member of the Michael MAT team I believe this change is needed to help prevent massive water intrusion.				
	<b>Fiscal Impact Statement</b>					
	<b>Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code</b>	By allowing this to be an in progress inspection it will not delay the construction progress				
	<b>Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code</b>	No additional cost to the building or property owner but will result in better installation compliance				
	<b>Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code</b>	By allowing this to be an in progress inspection it will not delay the construction progress. Because the inspection is in progress it will not cause construction delays				
	<b>Impact to Small Business relative to the cost of compliance with code</b>	No impact to small business relative to the cost of compliance with the code.				
	<b>Requirements</b>					
	<b>Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public</b>	This change will help prevent water intrusion thereby protecting public safety, health and welfare				
	<b>Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction</b>	Strengthens the building code by way of a compliance inspection				
<b>Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities</b>	Does not discriminate against any material or product					
<b>Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code</b>	Improves code compliance					

**2nd Comment Period**

<b>CA7647-G1</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	T Stafford	<b>Submitted</b>	5/20/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	No
	<b>Comment:</b>	<p>We request that the Code Administration TAC reconsider its recommendation on Mod# CA7647 to Approve as Submitted. This modification simply adds exterior wall coverings and soffit coverings to the list of required inspections in Chapter 1 of the FBCB. There was no opposition to this proposal and limited discussion, but we believe the primary concern was code enforcement's ability to make such inspections due to fasteners and other components being covered. However, the same issues apply to roof coverings, but they are specifically required to be inspected.</p> <p>The performance of wall coverings and soffits continue to be a problem in Florida during high wind events. As indicated in the original modification, the following recommendations were made in the FEMA Hurricane Irma MAT Report:</p> <p>Recommendation FL-11b: The FBC should require wall cladding inspections. Most MAT-observed wall cladding failures demonstrated one or more examples of non-compliant installation, which can be mitigated through field inspections. Common examples of wall cladding failures for vinyl siding include missing utility trim and starter strips.</p> <p>Recommendation FL-10b: The FBC should require soffit inspections. Soffit inspections will help to ensure compliant products are used and the soffit is securely attached.</p> <p>While the Hurricane Michael MAT report is still being developed, similar issues were observed. We ask for your support of this public comment to Approve as Submitted Mod#7647.</p>				

4. Exterior wall coverings. Shall at a minimum include the following building components in progress inspections:

- Exterior wall coverings and veneers
- Soffit coverings

Revise as follows:

**110.3 Required inspections.** The building official upon notification from the permit holder or his or her agent shall make the following inspections, and shall either release that portion of the construction or shall notify the permit holder or his or her agent of any violations which must be corrected in order to comply with the technical codes. The building official shall determine the timing and sequencing of when inspections occur and what elements are inspected at each inspection.

### Building

1.Foundation inspection. To be made after trenches are excavated and forms erected and shall at a minimum include the following building components:

- Stem-wall
- Monolithic slab-on-grade
- Piling/pile caps
- Footers/grade beams

1.1.In flood hazard areas, upon placement of the lowest floor, including basement, and prior to further vertical construction, the elevation certification shall be submitted to the authority having jurisdiction.

2.Framing inspection. To be made after the roof, all framing, fireblocking and bracing is in place, all concealing wiring, all pipes, chimneys, ducts and vents are complete and shall at a minimum include the following building components:

- Window/door framing
- Vertical cells/columns
- Lintel/tie beams
- Framing/trusses/bracing/connectors
- Draft stopping/fire blocking
- Curtain wall framing
- Energy insulation
- Accessibility
- Verify rough opening dimensions are within tolerances.

3.Sheathing inspection. To be made either as part of a dry-in inspection or done separately at the request of the contractor after all roof and wall sheathing and fasteners are complete and shall at a minimum include the following building components:

- Roof sheathing
- Wall sheathing
- Sheathing fasteners
- Roof/wall dry-in

4. Exterior wall coverings. Shall at a minimum include the following building components:

•Exterior wall coverings and veneers

•Soffit coverings

5. 4.Roofing inspection. Shall at a minimum include the following building components:

•Dry-in

•Insulation

•Roof coverings

•Flashing

6. 5.Final inspection. To be made after the building is completed and ready for occupancy.

6.1 5.4.In flood hazard areas, as part of the final inspection, a final certification of the lowest floor elevation shall be submitted to the authority having jurisdiction.

*(renumber remaining inspection items)*

**Reason Statement:** The purpose of this code change proposal is to improve the high wind performance of exterior wall cladding and soffits by specifically requiring inspections to verify compliant installation.

As part of the response to Hurricane Irma in Florida, the Federal Insurance and Mitigation Administration (FIMA) deployed a Mitigation Assessment Team (MAT) composed of national and regional building science experts to assess the damage in Florida. The primary purpose of a MAT is to improve the natural hazard resistance of buildings by evaluating the key causes of building damage, failure, and success, and developing strategic recommendations for improving short-term recovery and long-term disaster resilience to future natural hazard events. The following MAT-related information will be included in the FEMA MAT Report: Hurricane Irma in Florida which is anticipated to be published in December 2018. Links to download the free report will be shared with FBC TAC members and Commission members for reference upon publication.

The MAT observed building envelope damage on both older and newer residential construction. Exterior wall coverings and soffits, particularly vinyl products, were among the most frequently observed damaged components. While there were observations indicating the use of products with inadequate wind load design pressure ratings, the MAT frequently observed instances of installation issues that likely contributed to vinyl siding damage. The image below (taken from MAT Report Figure 4-28) shows a Marathon Key duplex building (built 2017) with vinyl siding loss across the front and left exterior walls. In addition to fastener installation concerns noted in the report, the failure of vinyl siding on this building on the front-facing wall above the front porch may have been initiated where a J-channel was installed instead of a manufacturer's specified starter strip.



The MAT observed many post-FBC buildings with vinyl and metal soffit damage in the Florida Keys and Collier County. Based on estimated wind speeds at the sites visited (see MAT report), failure occurred to siding and soffit components at wind speeds well below design wind speeds for these areas. Another example is shown in the picture below of a house in Goodland (Collier County) (MAT Report Figure 4-21). Although the loss of the fascia cover likely played a role by elevating wind pressures within the closed soffit system, the unconventional installation provided inadequate support for the soffit panels.

The two parallel runs of vinyl soffit appear to be joined at the eave's midpoint with back-to-back J-channels. Additionally, the photo indicates the lack of a nailing strip along the exterior wall. The ends of the soffit panels were clearly not fastened at the exterior wall and likely were not fastened at the midpoint of the eave which would have contributed to the poor wind performance of this soffit system.



MAT observations described above along with other examples detailed in the MAT Report, led to the following conclusions and recommendations:

**Conclusion FL-11: The MAT observed evidence of inadequate resistance to wind pressures for certain wall coverings of residential buildings.** In particular, failure of vinyl siding on post-FBC residential structures was widespread. Instances of improper installation and concerns about appropriate design pressure ratings are addressed in Chapter 4 and were probable factors in the damage observed.

**Recommendation FL-11b: The FBC should require wall cladding inspections.** Most MAT-observed wall cladding failures demonstrated one or more examples of non-compliant installation, which can be mitigated through field inspections. Common examples of wall cladding failures for vinyl siding include missing utility trim and starter strips.

**Conclusion FL-10: The MAT observed evidence of inadequate resistance to wind pressures and improper installation of soffits on residential buildings.** Widespread loss of soffits was observed in residential construction, and wind-driven rain infiltrated some areas where soffits were displaced or lost.

**Recommendation FL-10b: The FBC should require soffit inspections.** Soffit inspections will help to ensure compliant products are used and the soffit is securely attached.



As noted in previous reports and studies on hurricanes that impacted the State of Florida, the failure of soffits and siding on buildings can result in significant water damage to the interior of the building. Specifically requiring inspections of exterior wall and soffit coverings will help ensure compliant products are used and properly installed, which would significantly improve their performance in high wind events.

<b>Date Submitted</b>	11/2/2018	<b>Section</b>	201	<b>Proponent</b>	Ronald Treharne
<b>Chapter</b>	2	<b>Affects HVHZ</b>	Yes	<b>Attachments</b>	No
<b>TAC Recommendation</b>	No Affirmative Recommendation				
<b>Commission Action</b>	Pending Review				

**Comments**

**General Comments** Yes **Alternate Language** Yes

**Related Modifications**

General substitution of the term "architect or engineer" with the term "registered design professional" throughout all of the Florida Building Code.

**Summary of Modification**

Substitution of the term "architect or engineer" with the term "registered design professional" or better still, "appropriately qualified registered design professional" throughout all of the FBC Florida Building Code

**Rationale**

Unfortunately, when many Building Official's see the phrase "architect or engineer", particularly in the early sections of the Florida Building Code dealing with structural design; they, mistakenly believe that an engineer is equivalent to an architect. This is not true. Architect's have more training in building design, particularly with regard to life safety and protection of the general welfare of the public. Simply, Architects are trained to design buildings; whereas engineers only elements, components and systems within the building. In addition, engineers specialize in the various components of a building. Thus, an engineering with training and expertise in electrical engineering is not really qualified to design the structure of the building, much less the complete building. Likewise, environmentally oriented civil engineers are not qualified to design mechanical and electrical systems, let alone architectural drawings. Yet, they frequently do. And this causes a myriad of problems for the Building Officials, building contractors and property owners. Most of the Florida Building Code use the better term "registered design professional"; within their respective sections which prompts the Building Official to ask the simple question: "Is this construction document being submitted by the appropriately qualified registered design professional?" (Architect, Landscape Architect, Interior Designer or an Engineer qualified in that specific area of design. Replacing the non-equivalent phrase "architect or engineer" with "registered design professional" throughout the FBC should help resolve this confusion among Building Officials as to who is appropriately qualified to submit specific construction documents; and, more importantly stopping engineers from practicing architecture.

**Fiscal Impact Statement****Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

None, other than improving the situation by reducing code enforcement problems.

**Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code**

No extra cost to building and property owners; if anything, potential savings from having less mistakes.

**Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code**

It should be a huge impact for those registered design professionals (RDP) who are currently practicing within their area of licensure because it should effectively stop those RDP who have been practicing outside their area of licensure; tarnishing the reputations of lawfully abiding RDP.

**Impact to small business relative to the cost of compliance with code**

No extra cost to small businesses; if anything, potential savings from having less mistakes.

**Requirements****Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

The primary responsibility of both the Building Official and the registered design professional (RDP) is to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the general public; any RDP practicing outside their area of licensure is more apt to make mistakes which could potentially harm the public.

**Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction**

Having the registered design professional who is best qualified to submit a specific construction document because of their expertise and training should typically yield the best selection of the products, methods or systems of construction.

**Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities**

Having a registered design profession best qualified for the submittal of the construction document should actually reduce any discrimination against materials, methods or systems of construction since the RDP should have more knowledge and experience of the options available.

**Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code**

With both appropriately qualified registered design professionals preparing the construction document and the Building Official reviewing the construction document, this should only help reinforce the effectiveness of the code by minimizing possible errors or omissions.

**2nd Comment Period**

<b>7169-A4</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	Ronald Treharne	<b>Submitted</b>	4/18/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	Yes
	<b>Rationale</b>	The term "respective" may be a better adjective in this instance than "appropriately qualified."				
	<b>Fiscal Impact Statement</b>					
	<b>Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code</b>	No change				
	<b>Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code</b>	No change				
	<b>Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code</b>	No change				
	<b>Impact to Small Business relative to the cost of compliance with code</b>	No extra cost to small businesses; if anything, potential savings from having less mistakes.				
	<b>Requirements</b>					
	<b>Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public</b>	No change				
	<b>Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction</b>	No change				
<b>Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities</b>	No change					
<b>Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code</b>	No change					

**2nd Comment Period**

<b>CA7169-G3</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	Ronald Treharne	<b>Submitted</b>	4/15/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	No
	<b>Comment:</b>	<p>Recommend APPROVAL of proposed amendment 7169 by TAC because the comment citation of F.S. 553.73(2) by Mo Madani is not applicable; it deals only with CONTRACTORS and not Registered Design Professionals (RDP). The amendment simply clarifies the duty of the Building Code Official (BCO) to verify that an appropriate RDP submitted the construction documents (CD). This is supported by F.S. 553.73(1) which states that the FBC "shall contain or incorporate by reference laws and rules which pertain to and govern the DESIGN, construction, erection, alteration, modification, repair, and demolition of public and private buildings, structures, and facilities and ENFORCEMENT of such laws and rules." Thus, to enforce the design of the building by an RDP, the FBC needs specific language clarifying the BCO's responsibility.</p> <p>The FBC defines an RDP as "an individual who is registered or licensed to practice their RESPECTIVE design profession...within the scope of their license...as per Chapters 471 and 481." Therefore, the BCO is responsible for enforcing the requirement that the project is designed by a respective RDP. There are already sections within the FBC supporting the BCO's responsibility to verify CD's are submitted by the respective RDP. The confusion by some BCO's is that they equate an Architect with an Engineer. Consequently, some BCO's are allowing engineers to unlawfully submit architectural drawings, and vice versa. While many BCO's do comply, some BCO's do not. Hence, the BCO is sanctioning unlicensed activity. Who else, other than the BCO, is in a better position to do enforce this law?</p> <p>The proposed amendment is intended to help stop this violation by simply replacing "Architect or Engineer" with "RDP." The proposed amendment meets all of F.S. 553.73 criteria for an amendment and does not restrict GC's from submitting residential construction documents. So, for a stronger, better and simpler FBC, which adds no cost, why not incorporate the amendment?</p>				

**2nd Comment Period**

<b>CA7169-G4</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	Dalas Disney	<b>Submitted</b>	4/18/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	No
	<b>Comment:</b>	I support and recommend approval of the amendment as submitted.				

## 2nd Comment Period

**Proponent** Andres Varela      **Submitted** 4/21/2019      **Attachments** No

CA7169-G5

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of amendment as submitted

## 2nd Comment Period

**Proponent** John Bryant      **Submitted** 4/22/2019      **Attachments** No

CA7169-G6

**Comment:**

I agree with the propose amendment.

## 2nd Comment Period

**Proponent** Gregory Tsark      **Submitted** 4/22/2019      **Attachments** No

CA7169-G7

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of amendment as submitted.

## 2nd Comment Period

**Proponent** Treharne Reid      **Submitted** 4/24/2019      **Attachments** No

CA7169-G8

**Comment:**

I support this proposal.

## 2nd Comment Period

**Proponent** George Stewart      **Submitted** 4/25/2019      **Attachments** No

CA7169-G9

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of amendment as submitted.

## 2nd Comment Period

**Proponent** Carl Kaiserman      **Submitted** 4/25/2019      **Attachments** No

CA7169-G10

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of amendment as submitted.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7169-G11

**Proponent** Warren Barry      **Submitted** 4/26/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

I support this change/clarification in the code. However, if the term "architect or engineer" is replaced throughout with "registered design professional" as suggested, then it should apply to the text within this proposed Section 201.5. I believe a rewording of the proposed section 201.5 is required if the substitution is to be made throughout the code.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7169-G12

**Proponent** Carl Erickson      **Submitted** 4/26/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of amendment as submitted.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7169-G13

**Proponent** Lisa Herendeen      **Submitted** 4/26/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

I support the approval of the proposed amendment.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7169-G14

**Proponent** Jon Kukk      **Submitted** 4/26/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of amendment as submitted.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7169-G15

**Proponent** Andres Varela      **Submitted** 4/26/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of amendment as submitted

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7169-G16

**Proponent** Jordan Yee      **Submitted** 4/26/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

I recommend approval of this amendment as proposed.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7169-G17

**Proponent** Joseph Nappi      **Submitted** 4/26/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

Simply put the Architect is the responsible design professional for the building. The Engineer is trained within the structural environment i.e. Structural Steel Design, Reinforced Concrete any and all forces acting upon the building requiring a review by the Engineer for Wind Loads, L.L. and D.L. requirements pertaining to building code compliance.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7169-G18

**Proponent** adam warner      **Submitted** 4/29/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of amendment as submitted

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7169-G19

**Proponent** Anthony Harwell      **Submitted** 4/30/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

I approve of this modification

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7169-G20

**Proponent** Lawrence Maxwell      **Submitted** 4/30/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of comment as submitted.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7169-G21

**Proponent** Thomas Brooks      **Submitted** 5/2/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

I totally support this amendment.  
Tom Brooks

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7169-G22

**Proponent** Alan Matthews      **Submitted** 5/3/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

This amendment is necessary to the enforcement of amendment #7165. Please approve both. Thank you.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7169-G23

**Proponent** David Godwin      **Submitted** 5/6/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**  
I recommend approval as written.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7169-G24

**Proponent** Thomas Tiedeman      **Submitted** 5/7/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**  
I support this amendment.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7169-G25

**Proponent** Robert Bartlett      **Submitted** 5/7/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**  
Recommend approval of amendment as submitted.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7169-G26

**Proponent** James Piatchuk      **Submitted** 5/8/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**  
I support and recommend approval of the amendment as submitted.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7169-G27

**Proponent** Horan William      **Submitted** 5/10/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**  
Recommend approval of amendment as submitted.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7169-G28

**Proponent** Michael Scarmack      **Submitted** 5/12/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**  
Recommend approval of amendment as submitted, for the benefit of Florida citizens from undesired risks, and protect the same from un-credial entities.

## 2nd Comment Period

<b>CA7169-G29</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	David Knoll	<b>Submitted</b>	5/13/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	No
	<b>Comment:</b>	I understand and approve the proposed modification.				

## 2nd Comment Period

<b>CA7169-G30</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	Thomas Hester	<b>Submitted</b>	5/14/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	No
	<b>Comment:</b>	Recommend approval of amendment as submitted."				

## 2nd Comment Period

<b>CA7169-G31</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	Rob Glisson	<b>Submitted</b>	5/16/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	No
	<b>Comment:</b>	Recommend approval of amendment as submitted.				

## 2nd Comment Period

<b>CA7169-G32</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	David Hicks	<b>Submitted</b>	5/20/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	No
	<b>Comment:</b>	Recommend approval.				

## 2nd Comment Period

<b>CA7169-G33</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	christian noll	<b>Submitted</b>	5/26/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	No
	<b>Comment:</b>	I disagree with the rationale of this modification. It is the author's opinion that "While architects and engineers have similar training, particularly with regard to structures; architects have far more additional training than engineers in all the other aspects associated with a building design." Florida statute 471.003(3) and 481.229(4) both state that "Notwithstanding the provisions of this part or of any other law, no registered engineer whose principal practice is civil or structural engineering, or employee or subordinate under the responsible supervision or control of the engineer, is precluded from performing architectural services which are purely incidental to his or her engineering practice, nor is any registered architect, or employee or subordinate under the responsible supervision or control of such architect, precluded from performing engineering services which are purely incidental to his or her architectural practice. However, no engineer shall practice architecture or use the designation "architect" or any term derived therefrom, and no architect shall practice engineering or use the designation "engineer" or any term derived therefrom." The preceding statement does not state that an architect has any more training than an engineer.				



## 2nd Comment Period

CA7169-G34	<b>Proponent</b>	Mark Eady	<b>Submitted</b>	5/26/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	No
	<b>Comment:</b>	I do not recommend the code modification as engineers are fully qualified and should not be excluded to practice building design functions incidental to their engineering work.				

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7169-G35	<b>Proponent</b>	Ruben Oliveira	<b>Submitted</b>	5/26/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	No
	<b>Comment:</b>	I disapprove of the proposed code modification. An engineer with their background and educational experience can easily interpret and design to the applicable codes. It seems as a certain group is trying to monopolize the building design industry. This will result in higher prices to the consumer.				

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7169-G36	<b>Proponent</b>	Keith Nugent	<b>Submitted</b>	5/26/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	No
	<b>Comment:</b>	I disapprove the proposed code modification this code appears to limit engineer's ability to practice in areas they are fully qualified for.				

## 1st Comment Period History

CA7169-G1	<b>Proponent</b>	Sanjeev Mangoli	<b>Submitted</b>	1/2/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	No
	<b>Comment:</b>	Appropriately Registered Design Professional/ should include the exception to meet the requirements of FS 489				

## 1st Comment Period History

CA7169-G2	<b>Proponent</b>	Mo Madani	<b>Submitted</b>	1/30/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	No
	<b>Comment:</b>	Section 553.73(2), Florida Statutes ...Provisions relating to the personnel, supervision or training of personnel, or any other professional qualification requirements relating to contractors or their workforce may not be included within the Florida Building Code, and subsections (4), (6), (7), (8), and (9) are not to be construed to allow the inclusion of such provisions within the Florida Building Code by amendment. This restriction applies to both initial development and amendment of the Florida Building Code.				

Substitution of the term "architect or engineer" with the term "registered design professional" or better still, "~~appropriately qualified~~ respective registered design professional" throughout all of the FBC Florida Building Code

Either, throughout the entire Florida Building Code, replace the term “~~architect or engineer~~” with “registered design professional” or better still, “appropriately qualified registered design professional”; or add

Section 201.5

Architect or Engineer: Whenever the term “architect or engineer” is used in the Code it shall mean an architect or an engineer who is qualified to practice within that specific code section. For example, under a code section dealing with a structural issue, the engineer shall be trained in the area of structural engineering. In no instance shall the phrase “architect or engineer” meant to be construed as an equivalency of an engineer to an architect nor their ability to practice architecture or outside their area of expertise. See the definition for “registered design professional.”

<b>Date Submitted</b>	11/11/2018	<b>Section</b>	202	<b>Proponent</b>	Ronald Treharne
<b>Chapter</b>	2	<b>Affects HVHZ</b>	No	<b>Attachments</b>	No
<b>TAC Recommendation</b>	No Affirmative Recommendation				
<b>Commission Action</b>	Pending Review				

**Comments**

<b>General Comments</b>	Yes	<b>Alternate Language</b>	No
-------------------------	-----	---------------------------	----

**Related Modifications****Summary of Modification**

Clarify and refine the definition of "engineer" to be a Florida-registered professional engineer as defined in Florida State statute Chapter 471 and appropriately qualified to design elements, components and systems as defined with this code.

**Rationale**

While the term "architect" is clearly understood and is almost exclusively used in the construction industry, the term "engineer" is more ubiquitous and includes individuals with engineering knowledge well outside of the construction industry; ranging from aerospace to agricultural engineers. Unfortunately, some building officials only just check to see if an engineer's stamp is present on the drawings without questioning whether or not that engineer is qualified to submit the construction document. At least the Florida State statute Chapter 471 limits the term "engineer" to only those engineers qualified to submit construction documents pertaining to elements, components and systems germane to the Florida Building Code; namely, relating to systems dealing with the use of land, water and buildings construction. Expanding this definition should help the building official to be more cognizant of who is submitting the construction document as well as curtail those engineers practicing outside their area of licensure.

**Fiscal Impact Statement****Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

Should stop those engineers practicing outside their area of licensure; particularly those engineers not knowledgeable of building construction.

**Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code**

It may increase the cost of construction documents to owners because they may no longer be able to find engineers practicing outside their area of licensure who were willing to stamp the construction documents at a reduced fee.

**Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code**

This should help those ethical and lawful engineers who are practicing within their area of licensure since they will no longer be competing with unethical and unlawful engineers willing to sell their stamp.

**Impact to small business relative to the cost of compliance with code**

Should help small businesses since, hopefully, they should be working from construction documents designed and submitted by more qualified engineers; less errors and omissions.

**Requirements****Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

Most engineers, particularly engineers without education and training relating to building construction have little training with regard to the building related health, safety, and welfare issues; stopping them from "stamping" drawings should help the general public.

**Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction**

Appropriately qualified engineers submitting construction documents should improve the code and because of their specialized knowledge help them specify better products, methods and systems used in construction.

**Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities**

Likewise, appropriately qualified engineers submitting construction documents should because of their specialized knowledge reduce discrimination against materials, products, methods, or systems.

**Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code**

Clarification and specificity normally should only help the effectiveness of the building code.

## 2nd Comment Period

**Proponent** Ronald Treharne      **Submitted** 4/15/2019      **Attachments** No

CA7232-G2

**Comment:**

Recommend APPROVAL of proposed amendment 7232 by TAC because the comment citation of F.S. 553.73(2) by Mo Madani is not applicable; it deals only with CONTRACTORS and not Registered Design Professionals (RDP). The amendment simply clarifies the duty of the Building Code Official (BCO) to verify that an appropriate RDP submitted the construction documents (CD). This is supported by F.S. 553.73(1) which states that the FBC "shall contain or incorporate by reference laws and rules which pertain to and govern the DESIGN, construction, erection, alteration, modification, repair, and demolition of public and private buildings, structures, and facilities and ENFORCEMENT of such laws and rules." Thus, to enforce the design of the building by an RDP, the FBC needs specific language clarifying the BCO's responsibility.

The FBC defines an RDP as "an individual who is registered or licensed to practice their RESPECTIVE design profession...within the scope of their license...as per Chapters 471 and 481." Therefore, the BCO is responsible for enforcing the requirement that the project is designed by a respective RDP. Unfortunately, some BCO's are permitting CD's to be submitted by engineers practicing outside their area of licensure, and thus, are sanctioning unlicensed activity. Thus, by clarifying the definition of the term "engineer" as someone qualified in their respective knowledge area, the BCO will know when to accept, or at least question, which CD's are from which engineer. Who else, other than the BCO, is in a better position to do enforce this law?

The proposed amendment is intended to help stop this violation by clarifying the definition of an engineer as one with expertise in the area of the CD submittal. The proposed amendment meets all of F.S. 553.73 criteria for an amendment and does not restrict GC's from submitting residential construction documents. So, for a stronger, better and simpler FBC, which adds no cost, why not incorporate the amendment?

## 2nd Comment Period

**Proponent** Dalas Disney      **Submitted** 4/18/2019      **Attachments** No

CA7232-G3

**Comment:**

I support and recommend approval of the amendment as submitted.

## 2nd Comment Period

**Proponent** Andres Varela      **Submitted** 4/21/2019      **Attachments** No

CA7232-G4

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of amendment as submitted

## 2nd Comment Period

**Proponent** John Bryant      **Submitted** 4/22/2019      **Attachments** No

CA7232-G5

**Comment:**

I agree with the proposed amendment.

## 2nd Comment Period

**Proponent** Gregory Tsark      **Submitted** 4/22/2019      **Attachments** No

CA7232-G6

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of amendment as submitted.

## 2nd Comment Period

**Proponent** Eric Glinsboeckel      **Submitted** 4/24/2019      **Attachments** No

CA7232-G7

**Comment:**

I fully support this modification as this has been a long-time contention and issue in Florida.

## 2nd Comment Period

**Proponent** Treharn Reid      **Submitted** 4/24/2019      **Attachments** No

CA7232-G8

**Comment:**

I support this proposal.

## 2nd Comment Period

**Proponent** Carl Kaiserman      **Submitted** 4/25/2019      **Attachments** No

CA7232-G9

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of amendment as submitted.

## 2nd Comment Period

**Proponent** Warren Barry      **Submitted** 4/26/2019      **Attachments** No

CA7232-G10

**Comment:**

I recommend approval of amendment as submitted.

## 2nd Comment Period

**Proponent** Carl Erickson      **Submitted** 4/26/2019      **Attachments** No

CA7232-G11

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of amendment as submitted.

## 2nd Comment Period

**Proponent** Jon Kukk      **Submitted** 4/26/2019      **Attachments** No

CA7232-G12

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of amendment as submitted.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7232-G13

**Proponent** Andres Varela      **Submitted** 4/26/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of amendment as submitted

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7232-G14

**Proponent** Jordan Yee      **Submitted** 4/26/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

I recommend approval of this amendment as submitted.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7232-G15

**Proponent** Joseph Nappi      **Submitted** 4/26/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

Engineers should confine themselves to the structural aspects of building design and leave the site bulking, zoning, occupancy and use classifications to the Architects.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7232-G16

**Proponent** adam warner      **Submitted** 4/29/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of amendment as submitted

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7232-G17

**Proponent** Anthony Harwell      **Submitted** 4/30/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

I approve of this modification

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7232-G18

**Proponent** Lawrence Maxwell      **Submitted** 4/30/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of comment as submitted.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7232-G19

**Proponent** Thomas Brooks      **Submitted** 5/2/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

I am in favor of this amendment.  
Tom Brooks

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7232-G20

**Proponent** Alan Matthews      **Submitted** 5/3/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

This amendment is necessary to the enforcement of amendment 7165. Please approve them both. Thank you.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7232-G21

**Proponent** David Godwin      **Submitted** 5/6/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

Recommend approval as written.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7232-G22

**Proponent** Thomas Tiedeman      **Submitted** 5/7/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

I support this amendment.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7232-G23

**Proponent** Robert Bartlett      **Submitted** 5/7/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of amendment as submitted.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7232-G24

**Proponent** James Piatchuk      **Submitted** 5/8/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

I support and recommend approval of the amendment as submitted.



## 2nd Comment Period

CA7232-G25

**Proponent** Horan William      **Submitted** 5/10/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of amendment as submitted.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7232-G26

**Proponent** Michael Scarmack      **Submitted** 5/12/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of amendment as submitted.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7232-G27

**Proponent** David Knoll      **Submitted** 5/13/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

I understand and approve of the proposed modification.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7232-G28

**Proponent** Thomas Hester      **Submitted** 5/14/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of amendment as submitted.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7232-G29

**Proponent** Rob Glisson      **Submitted** 5/16/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of amendment as submitted.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7232-G30

**Proponent** David Hicks      **Submitted** 5/20/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

Recommend approval.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7232-G31	<b>Proponent</b>	Mark Eady	<b>Submitted</b>	5/26/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	No
	<b>Comment:</b>	I do not recommend the code modification as engineers are fully qualified and should not be excluded to practice building design functions incidental to their engineering work.				

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7232-G32	<b>Proponent</b>	Ruben Oliveira	<b>Submitted</b>	5/26/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	No
	<b>Comment:</b>	I completely disapprove of this proposed code modification. An engineer with their background and educational experience can easily interpret and design to the applicable codes. It appears that a certain group is trying to monopolize the building design industry, and this will result in higher prices to the consumer.				

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7232-G33	<b>Proponent</b>	Keith Nugent	<b>Submitted</b>	5/26/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	No
	<b>Comment:</b>	I do NOT recommend approval				

## 1st Comment Period History

CA7232-G1	<b>Proponent</b>	Mo Madani	<b>Submitted</b>	1/30/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	No
	<b>Comment:</b>	Section 553.73(2), Florida Statutes ...Provisions relating to the personnel, supervision or training of personnel, or any other professional qualification requirements relating to contractors or their workforce may not be included within the Florida Building Code, and subsections (4), (6), (7), (8), and (9) are not to be construed to allow the inclusion of such provisions within the Florida Building Code by amendment. This restriction applies to both initial development and amendment of the Florida Building Code.				

ENGINEER: A Florida-registered professional engineer, as defined in Florida State statute Chapter 471 and who is appropriately qualified to design elements, components and systems as described within the respective code section.

<b>Date Submitted</b> 11/28/2018	<b>Section</b> 202	<b>Proponent</b> George Wiggins (BOAF)
<b>Chapter</b> 2	<b>Affects HVHZ</b> No	<b>Attachments</b> No
<b>TAC Recommendation</b> No Affirmative Recommendation		
<b>Commission Action</b> Pending Review		

**Comments**

<b>General Comments</b> Yes	<b>Alternate Language</b> No
-----------------------------	------------------------------

**Related Modifications**

Existing Building Code

**Summary of Modification**

Editorial & clarification change to base code for definition of "Repair"

**Rationale**

Confusion over whether the definition of "repair" includes replacement of damaged members has been unclear in existing definition language and this clarifies that distinction.

**Fiscal Impact Statement**

**Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

Brings clarity to a definition.

**Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code**

None

**Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code**

None

**Impact to small business relative to the cost of compliance with code**

None.

**Requirements**

**Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

Clarifying that "replacement" of a damaged member is part of a "repair" and not an "alteration" and therefore helps to correlates with the Existing Buildings Code requirement for a "repair".

**Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction**

Improves the code by providing greater specificity to the definition of "repair."

**Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities**

This definition clarification will not result in a discrimination of materials, products, methods, or systems of construction.

**Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code**

This definition clarification will not result in any degradation of the code effectiveness.

**2nd Comment Period**

<b>Proponent</b> George Wiggins	<b>Submitted</b> 5/23/2019	<b>Attachments</b> No
---------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------

CA7505-G1

**Comment:**

The current definition of "repair" is enhanced and clarified by the addition of the word "replacement" in the definition, resulting in an improvement of the current definition. In addition, there is no additional cost associated with this code modification.

**2nd Comment Period**

<b>Proponent</b> Harold Barrineau	<b>Submitted</b> 5/26/2019	<b>Attachments</b> No
-----------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------

CA7505-G2

**Comment:**

I agree with this modification.

**Section 202**

[A] **REPAIR** The reconstruction, replacement or renewal of any part of an existing building for the purposes of its maintenance or to correct damage.

<b>Date Submitted</b>	11/2/2018	<b>Section</b>	313	<b>Proponent</b>	Ronald Treharne
<b>Chapter</b>	3	<b>Affects HVHZ</b>	No	<b>Attachments</b>	Yes
<b>TAC Recommendation</b>	No Affirmative Recommendation				
<b>Commission Action</b>	Pending Review				

**Comments**

<b>General Comments</b>	Yes	<b>Alternate Language</b>	No
-------------------------	-----	---------------------------	----

**Related Modifications**

None

**Summary of Modification**

Add a new section 313 and table 313.1 which clarifies for the Building Official which occupancy requires to be submitted by an architect and which ones may be submitted by an architect or an engineer.

**Rationale**

Some Building Officials are confused and sometimes equate an architect to an engineer as both being permitted to design buildings. Florida State statutes 471 (Engineers) and 481 (Architects, Landscape Architects & Interior Designers) specify that only architects may design buildings, particularly those designed for human occupancy, and engineers may only design those elements, components or systems within a building. The addition of this simple table as a new section 313 and table 313.1 should clarify for the Building Official which construction documents are needed to be submitted by which registered design professional (architect or engineer) for each of the occupancy types.

**Fiscal Impact Statement****Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

No extra work or cost; this addition helps enforcement of statutes 471 and 481.

**Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code**

No extra work or cost; this addition helps enforcement of statutes 471 and 481.

**Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code**

It should be a huge impact for those registered design professionals (RDP) who are currently practicing within their area of licensure because it should effectively stop those RDP who have been practicing outside their area of licensure; tarnishing the reputations of law-abiding RDP.

**Impact to small business relative to the cost of compliance with code**

No extra work or cost; this addition helps enforcement of statutes 471 and 481.

**Requirements****Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

Since the primary responsibility of both the Building Official and the registered design professional is to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the general public, anyone who is practicing outside their area of licensure is more apt to make mistakes which can potentially harm the public.

**Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction**

Having the registered design professional who is best qualified to submit a specific construction document because of their expertise and training should typically yield the best selection of the products, methods or systems of construction.

**Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities**

Having a registered design profession best qualified for the submittal of the construction document should actually reduce any discrimination against materials, methods or systems of construction since the RDP should have more knowledge and experience of the options available.

**Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code**

With both appropriately qualified registered design professionals preparing the construction document and the Building Official reviewing the construction document, this should only help reinforce the effectiveness of the code by minimizing possible errors or omissions.

## 2nd Comment Period

**Proponent** Ronald Treharne      **Submitted** 4/15/2019      **Attachments** No

CA7181-G3

**Comment:**

Recommend APPROVAL of proposed amendment 7181 by TAC because the comment citation of F.S. 553.73(2) by Mo Madani is not applicable; it deals only with CONTRACTORS and not Registered Design Professionals (RDP). The amendment simply clarifies the duty of the Building Code Official (BCO) to verify that an appropriate RDP submitted the construction documents (CD). This is supported by F.S. 553.73(1) which states that the FBC "shall contain or incorporate by reference laws and rules which pertain to and govern the DESIGN, construction, erection, alteration, modification, repair, and demolition of public and private buildings, structures, and facilities and ENFORCEMENT of such laws and rules." Thus, to enforce the design of the building by an RDP, the FBC needs specific language clarifying the BCO's responsibility.

The FBC defines an RDP as "an individual who is registered or licensed to practice their RESPECTIVE design profession...within the scope of their license...as per Chapters 471 and 481." Therefore, the BCO is responsible for enforcing the requirement that the project is designed by a respective RDP. There are already sections within the FBC supporting the BCO's responsibility to verify CD's are submitted by the respective RDP. Unfortunately, some BCO's are permitting CD's to be submitted by RDP's outside their area of licensure, and thus are sanctioning unlicensed activity. Thus, by inserting a simple table referencing the FBC's own Occupancy Classification, the BCO will know when to accept which CD's from which RDP. Who else, other than the BCO, is in a better position to do enforce this law?

The proposed amendment is intended to help stop this violation by creating an RDP to Occupancy table. The proposed amendment meets all of F.S. 553.73 criteria for an amendment and does not restrict GC's from submitting residential construction documents. So, for a stronger, better and simpler FBC, which adds no cost, why not incorporate the amendment?

## 2nd Comment Period

**Proponent** Dalas Disney      **Submitted** 4/18/2019      **Attachments** No

CA7181-G4

**Comment:**

I support and recommend approval of the amendment as submitted.

## 2nd Comment Period

**Proponent** John Bryant      **Submitted** 4/22/2019      **Attachments** No

CA7181-G5

**Comment:**

I approve of the proposed amendment.

## 2nd Comment Period

**Proponent** Gregory Tsark      **Submitted** 4/22/2019      **Attachments** No

CA7181-G6

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of amendment as submitted.

## 2nd Comment Period

**Proponent** Treharne Reid      **Submitted** 4/24/2019      **Attachments** No

CA7181-G7

**Comment:**

I support this proposal.

## 2nd Comment Period

<b>CA7181-G8</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	George Stewart	<b>Submitted</b>	4/25/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	No
	<b>Comment:</b>	Recommend approval of amendment as submitted.				

## 2nd Comment Period

<b>CA7181-G9</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	Carl Kaiserman	<b>Submitted</b>	4/25/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	No
	<b>Comment:</b>	Recommend approval of amendment as submitted.				

## 2nd Comment Period

<b>CA7181-G10</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	Warren Barry	<b>Submitted</b>	4/26/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	No
	<b>Comment:</b>	I strongly support this change/clarification in the code, and comment G3 with the following comments: 1) I question if section 313 is the most appropriate section to place for it, as chapter 3 is for classifying occupancies, not clarifying who must sign and seal the construction documents for each occupancy. Section 107 seems to be a more appropriate location for this clarification as it relates to the requirements of submitted documents. I would suggest, instead, inserting it between 107.1 and 107.2, placing it as section 107.1.1. 2) The word "shall" should be used instead of "should". The Building official "shall" use ..... "Should" suggests that enforcement of this table is optional. 3) The text above the table should clarify that the table is in reference to the architectural portion of plans, and that the applicable engineer shall sign and seal the engineering drawings within the overall construction document package, as applicable to their area of engineering specialization (civil, structural, mechanical, electrical, fire sprinkler, etc.).				

## 2nd Comment Period

<b>CA7181-G11</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	Warren Barry	<b>Submitted</b>	4/26/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	No
	<b>Comment:</b>	I believe there should be a separate line on the table for one and two family dwellings, clarifying the design professional requirements for such projects, as these are viewed and enforced differently from other R occupancies. I propose that an Architect be listed as required for the architectural portion of plans for all two family dwellings, one family dwellings of more than one story, and for single family dwelling of more than 2,250 square feet total under roof, due to the added complexity associated with such projects in comparison to a small single story home that is under 2,250 sq.ft. At a minimum, there should be a requirement for a design professional (architect or engineer) to sign and seal both the architectural and structural drawings, not just the structural portion of the plans, which is commonly detached as a separate "wind load package". There is often no review of the architectural portion of the plans by any registered/licensed design professional. For this to be effective, this proposed table should be listed in section 107.2 of the building code, as mentioned in my prior comment, as the residential code references chapter 1 of the building code in R101.2.1, not chapter 3.				

## 2nd Comment Period

<b>CA7181-G12</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	Carl Erickson	<b>Submitted</b>	4/26/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	No
	<b>Comment:</b>	Recommend approval of amendment as submitted.				



## 2nd Comment Period

CA7181-G13

**Proponent** Jon Kukk      **Submitted** 4/26/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of amendment as submitted.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7181-G14

**Proponent** Andres Varela      **Submitted** 4/26/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of amendment as submitted

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7181-G15

**Proponent** Jordan Yee      **Submitted** 4/26/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

I recommend approval of this amendment as submitted.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7181-G16

**Proponent** Joseph Nappi      **Submitted** 4/26/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

No extra work or cost, Architects are proficient in addressing Occupancy, Use and Egress.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7181-G17

**Proponent** adam warner      **Submitted** 4/29/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of amendment as submitted

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7181-G18

**Proponent** Anthony Harwell      **Submitted** 4/30/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

I approve of this modification

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7181-G19

**Proponent** Lawrence Maxwell      **Submitted** 4/30/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of comment as submitted.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7181-G20

**Proponent** Thomas Brooks      **Submitted** 5/2/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

I am Totally in favor of this amendment.  
Tom Brooks

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7181-G21

**Proponent** Alan Matthews      **Submitted** 5/3/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

This amendment is necessary to the enforcement of amendment 7165. Please approve it along with #7165. Thank you.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7181-G22

**Proponent** Greg Burke      **Submitted** 5/7/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of the Table.

The table very clearly demonstrates who by their education, testing, licensing and experience are qualified to design the buildings in the table.

The location in Chapter 3 is likely the wrong place. Chapter 1 is more likely the place along with modification 7165, delineating the need for the proper registered design professional responsibility.

There should be a footnote delineating the requirements of FS 481 relating to the requirements for single and two-family residences.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7181-G23

**Proponent** Thomas Tiedeman      **Submitted** 5/7/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

I support this amendment.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7181-G24

**Proponent** Robert Bartlett      **Submitted** 5/7/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of amendment as submitted.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7181-G25

**Proponent** James Piatchuk      **Submitted** 5/8/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

I support and recommend approval of the amendment as submitted.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7181-G26

**Proponent** Horan William      **Submitted** 5/10/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of amendment as submitted.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7181-G27

**Proponent** Michael Scarmack      **Submitted** 5/12/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of amendment as submitted.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7181-G28

**Proponent** David Knoll      **Submitted** 5/13/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

I understand and approve of the proposed modification.

## 2nd Comment Period

CA7181-G29

**Proponent** Thomas Hester      **Submitted** 5/14/2019      **Attachments** No

**Comment:**

Recommend approval of amendment as submitted.”

## 2nd Comment Period

<b>CA7181-G30</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	Rob Glisson	<b>Submitted</b>	5/16/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	No
	<b>Comment:</b>	Recommend approval of amendment as submitted.				

## 2nd Comment Period

<b>CA7181-G31</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	David Hicks	<b>Submitted</b>	5/20/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	No
	<b>Comment:</b>	Recommend approval.				

## 2nd Comment Period

<b>CA7181-G32</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	christian noll	<b>Submitted</b>	5/26/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	No
	<b>Comment:</b>	<p>At first this modification seems like a prudent change that would prevent engineers from approving drawings not within their field of expertise. But as submitted I can see this modification as selectively benefitting professionals with "architect" in their title. The modification also states that only an architect can certify a building intended for human occupancy. Most colleges of engineering state just the opposite: that engineers are responsible for the building safety and that architects are responsible for the aesthetic design. The University of Colorado Engineering definition is as follows: "Architects design the space to meet client needs, as well as the aesthetic appearance of the inside and exterior of the building. Engineers' main responsibility is to ensure the design is safe and meets all appropriate building codes."</p> <p>By excluding engineers from being able to certify a building for human occupancy this modification will actually make buildings less safe. Therefore I do not recommend this modification.</p>				

## 2nd Comment Period

<b>CA7181-G33</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	Mark Eady	<b>Submitted</b>	5/26/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	No
	<b>Comment:</b>	I do not recommend the code modification as engineers are fully qualified and should not be excluded to practice building design functions incidental to their engineering work.				

## 2nd Comment Period

<b>CA7181-G34</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	Ruben Oliveira	<b>Submitted</b>	5/26/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	No
	<b>Comment:</b>	I disapprove of the proposed code modification. An engineer with their background and educational experience are more qualified than a "architect" in certifying a building for human occupancy.				

## 2nd Comment Period

<b>Proponent</b>	Keith Nugent	<b>Submitted</b>	5/26/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	No
------------------	--------------	------------------	-----------	--------------------	----

CA7181-G35

**Comment:**

I disapprove the proposed code modification  
this code appears to limit engineer's ability to practice in areas they are fully qualified for.

## 1st Comment Period History

<b>Proponent</b>	Sanjeev Mangoli	<b>Submitted</b>	1/2/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	No
------------------	-----------------	------------------	----------	--------------------	----

CA7181-G1

**Comment:**

R classifications should include Certified General Contractors as per the provisions of FS 489.00  
Also if the drawings down as per the FBC- Residential Code no sign and seal required.

## 1st Comment Period History

<b>Proponent</b>	Mo Madani	<b>Submitted</b>	1/30/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	No
------------------	-----------	------------------	-----------	--------------------	----

CA7181-G2

**Comment:**

Section 553.73(2), Florida Statutes  
...Provisions relating to the personnel, supervision or training of personnel, or any other professional qualification requirements relating to contractors or their workforce may not be included within the Florida Building Code, and subsections (4), (6), (7), (8), and (9) are not to be construed to allow the inclusion of such provisions within the Florida Building Code by amendment. This restriction applies to both initial development and amendment of the Florida Building Code.

Section 313

Registered Design Professional Designation by Occupancy Type

The building official should use the following table to best determine who is qualified and required to sign and seal construction documents based upon the building occupancy:

Registered Design Professional Designation by Occupancy Type

Occupancy Description License Required

A-1	Assembly	Architect
A-2	Assembly	Architect
A-3	Assembly	Architect
A-4	Assembly	Architect
A-5	Assembly	Architect
B	Business	Architect
E	Educational	Architect
F-1	Factory	Architect
F-2	Factory	Architect
H-1	Hazard	Architect or Engineer*
H-2	Hazard	Architect or Engineer*
H-3	Hazard	Architect or Engineer*
H-4	Hazard	Architect or Engineer*
H-5	Hazard	Architect or Engineer*
I-1	Institutional	Architect
I-2	Institutional	Architect
I-3	Institutional	Architect
I-4	Institutional	Architect
M	Mercantile	Architect
R-1	Residential	Architect
R-2	Residential	Architect
R-3	Residential	Architect
R-4	Residential	Architect
S-1	Storage	Architect or Engineer*
S-2	Storage	Architect or Engineer*
U	Utility	Architect or Engineer*

\*If the engineer is qualified in the area of the project design and the building is not intended for human occupancy.

## Section 313

The building official should use the following table to best determine who is qualified and required to sign and seal construction documents based upon the building occupancy:

**Registered Design Professional Designation by Occupancy Type**

<b><u>Occupancy</u></b>	<b><u>Description</u></b>	<b><u>License Required</u></b>
<u>A-1</u>	<u>Assembly</u>	<u>Architect</u>
<u>A-2</u>	<u>Assembly</u>	<u>Architect</u>
<u>A-3</u>	<u>Assembly</u>	<u>Architect</u>
<u>A-4</u>	<u>Assembly</u>	<u>Architect</u>
<u>A-5</u>	<u>Assembly</u>	<u>Architect</u>
<u>B</u>	<u>Business</u>	<u>Architect</u>
<u>E</u>	<u>Educational</u>	<u>Architect</u>
<u>F-1</u>	<u>Factory</u>	<u>Architect</u>
<u>F-2</u>	<u>Factory</u>	<u>Architect</u>
<u>H-1</u>	<u>Hazard</u>	<u>Architect or Engineer*</u>
<u>H-2</u>	<u>Hazard</u>	<u>Architect or Engineer*</u>
<u>H-3</u>	<u>Hazard</u>	<u>Architect or Engineer*</u>
<u>H-4</u>	<u>Hazard</u>	<u>Architect or Engineer*</u>
<u>H-5</u>	<u>Hazard</u>	<u>Architect or Engineer*</u>
<u>I-1</u>	<u>Institutional</u>	<u>Architect</u>
<u>I-2</u>	<u>Institutional</u>	<u>Architect</u>
<u>I-3</u>	<u>Institutional</u>	<u>Architect</u>
<u>I-4</u>	<u>Institutional</u>	<u>Architect</u>
<u>M</u>	<u>Mercantile</u>	<u>Architect</u>
<u>R-1</u>	<u>Residential</u>	<u>Architect</u>
<u>R-2</u>	<u>Residential</u>	<u>Architect</u>
<u>R-3</u>	<u>Residential</u>	<u>Architect</u>
<u>R-4</u>	<u>Residential</u>	<u>Architect</u>
<u>S-1</u>	<u>Storage</u>	<u>Architect or Engineer*</u>
<u>S-2</u>	<u>Storage</u>	<u>Architect or Engineer*</u>
<u>U</u>	<u>Utility</u>	<u>Architect or Engineer*</u>

\*If the engineer is qualified in the area of the project design and the building is not intended for human occupancy.

## Section 313

## Registered Design Professional Designation by Occupancy Type

The building official should use the following table to best determine who is qualified and required to sign and seal construction documents based upon the building occupancy:

**Registered Design Professional Designation by Occupancy Type**

<b>Occupancy</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>License Required</b>
A-1	Assembly	Architect
A-2	Assembly	Architect
A-3	Assembly	Architect
A-4	Assembly	Architect
A-5	Assembly	Architect
B	Business	Architect
E	Educational	Architect
F-1	Factory	Architect
F-2	Factory	Architect
H-1	Hazard	Architect or Engineer*
H-2	Hazard	Architect or Engineer*
H-3	Hazard	Architect or Engineer*
H-4	Hazard	Architect or Engineer*
H-5	Hazard	Architect or Engineer*
I-1	Institutional	Architect
I-2	Institutional	Architect
I-3	Institutional	Architect
I-4	Institutional	Architect
M	Mercantile	Architect
R-1	Residential	Architect
R-2	Residential	Architect
R-3	Residential	Architect
R-4	Residential	Architect
S-1	Storage	Architect or Engineer*
S-2	Storage	Architect or Engineer*
U	Utility	Architect or Engineer*

\*If the engineer is qualified in the area of the project design and the building is not intended for human occupancy.



<b>Date Submitted</b> 12/14/2018	<b>Section</b> 304.2	<b>Proponent</b> Joseph Crum
<b>Chapter</b> 3	<b>Affects HVHZ</b> No	<b>Attachments</b> No
<b>TAC Recommendation</b> No Affirmative Recommendation		
<b>Commission Action</b> Pending Review		

**Comments**

<b>General Comments</b> Yes	<b>Alternate Language</b> No
-----------------------------	------------------------------

**Related Modifications**

G22-15  
Various chapters and sections from 308.2, thru 3110.2

**Summary of Modification**

The intent of this proposal is to remove the definition list sections scattered about the code and the lists of defined terms included within each such section. All of the definitions were consolidated into Chapter 2.

**Rationale**

This comment deletes the definitions sections from all the chapters except Chapter 2. Everyone who has basic knowledge about the organization of the FBC, or who understands why terms are italicized knows that terms are defined in Chapter 2. For Sections 1602.1 and 2102.1, this comment lists the definitions that should be deleted in order to be very clear that the notations must remain in those sections.

**Fiscal Impact Statement**

- Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**  
Code cleanup only will make using the code more clear.
- Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code**  
Code cleanup only so will not increase or effect the cost.
- Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code**  
Code cleanup only so will not increase or effect the cost.
- Impact to small business relative to the cost of compliance with code**  
Code cleanup only so will not increase or effect the cost.

**Requirements**

- Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**  
Code cleanup only so will not effect connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public.
- Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction**  
Code cleanup only so will not effect the code.
- Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities**  
Code cleanup only so will not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities.
- Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code**  
Code cleanup only so will not degrade the effectiveness of the code.

**2nd Comment Period**

<b>Proponent</b> Jennifer Privateer	<b>Submitted</b> 5/23/2019	<b>Attachments</b> No
-------------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------

**Comment:**  
I agree with This proposed modification

**2nd Comment Period**

<b>Proponent</b> Harold Barrineau	<b>Submitted</b> 5/25/2019	<b>Attachments</b> No
-----------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------

**Comment:**  
I agree with this modification

Section(s): 304.2, 308.2, 310.2, 402.2, 406.2, 410.2, 411.2, 412.2, 423.2, 502.1, 702.1, 802.1, 902.1, 1002.1, 1102.1, 1202.1, 1402.1, 1502.1, 1602, 1602.1, 1609.2, 1612.2, 1613.2, 1615.2, 1702.1, 1802.1, 2102.1, 2202.1, 2302.1, 2402.1, 2502.1, 2602.1, 3102.2, 3105.2, 3110.2, 404.1.1, 408.1.1, 722.1.1, [F] 307.2, [F] 415.2, [F] 421.2

**Modify as follows:**

~~304.2 Definitions. Terms are defined in Chapter 2.~~

~~[F] 307.2 Definitions. Terms are defined in Chapter 2~~

~~308.2 Definitions. Terms are defined in Chapter 2~~

~~310.2 Definitions. Terms are defined in Chapter 2~~

~~402.2 Definitions. Terms are defined in Chapter 2~~

~~404.1.1 Definition. Terms are defined in Chapter 2:~~

~~406.2 Definitions. Terms are defined in Chapter 2~~

~~408.1.1 Definitions. Terms are defined in Chapter 2~~

~~410.2 Definitions. Terms are defined in Chapter 2~~

~~411.2 Definition. Terms are defined in Chapter 2~~

~~412.2 Definitions. Terms are defined in Chapter 2~~

~~[F] 415.2 Definitions. Terms are defined in Chapter 2~~

~~[F] 421.2 Definitions. Terms are defined in Chapter 2~~

~~423.2 Definitions. Terms are defined in Chapter 2~~

**SECTION 502 DEFINITIONS**

~~502.1 Definitions. Terms are defined in Chapter 2~~

**SECTION 702 DEFINITIONS**

~~702.1 Definitions. Terms are defined in Chapter 2~~

~~722.1.1 Definitions. Terms are defined in Chapter 2:~~

**SECTION 802**

**DEFINITIONS**

~~802.1 Definitions. Terms are defined in Chapter 2~~

**SECTION 902 DEFINITIONS**

~~902.1 Definitions. Terms are defined in Chapter 2~~

**SECTION 1002 DEFINITIONS**

~~1002.1 Definitions. Terms are defined in Chapter 2~~

**SECTION 1102 DEFINITIONS**

~~1102.1 Definitions. Terms are defined in Chapter 2:~~

**SECTION 1202 DEFINITIONS**

~~1202.1 General. Terms are defined in Chapter 2~~

**SECTION 1402 DEFINITIONS**

~~1402.1 Definitions. Terms are defined in Chapter 2~~

**SECTION 1502 DEFINITIONS**

~~1502.1 Definitions. Terms are defined in Chapter 2~~

**SECTION 1602 DEFINITIONS AND NOTATIONS**

~~1609.2 Definitions. Terms are defined in Chapter 2~~

~~1612.2 Definitions. Terms are defined in Chapter 2~~

~~1615.2 Definitions. Terms are defined in Chapter 2~~

~~1613.2 Definitions. Terms are defined in Chapter 2~~

**SECTION 1702 DEFINITIONS**

~~1702.1 Definitions. Terms are defined in Chapter 2~~

**SECTION 1802 DEFINITIONS**

~~1802.1 Definitions. Terms are defined in Chapter 2~~

**SECTION 2102 DEFINITIONS AND NOTATIONS**

~~2102.1 General. Notations Terms are defined in Chapter 2. The following notations are used in the chapter:~~

**SECTION 2202 DEFINITIONS**

~~2202.1 Definitions. The following terms are defined in Chapter 2:~~

**SECTION 2302 DEFINITIONS**

~~2302.1 Definitions. Terms are defined in Chapter 2~~

**SECTION 2402 DEFINITIONS**

**2402.1 Definitions.** Terms are defined in Chapter 2

**SECTION 2502 DEFINITIONS**

**2502.1 Definitions.** Terms are defined in Chapter 2

**SECTION 2602 DEFINITIONS**

**2602.1 Definitions.** Terms are defined in Chapter 2

**3102.2 Definitions.** Terms are defined in Chapter 2

**3105.2 Definition.** Terms are defined in Chapter 2

**3110.2 Definition.** Terms are defined in Chapter 2

# Sub Code: Existing Building

CA7508

9

<b>Date Submitted</b>	11/28/2018	<b>Section</b>	202	<b>Proponent</b>	George Wiggins (BOAF)
<b>Chapter</b>	2	<b>Affects HVHZ</b>	No	<b>Attachments</b>	No
<b>TAC Recommendation</b>	No Affirmative Recommendation				
<b>Commission Action</b>	Pending Review				

## Comments

<b>General Comments</b>	Yes	<b>Alternate Language</b>	No
-------------------------	-----	---------------------------	----

### Related Modifications

Existing Building Code

### Summary of Modification

Editorial & clarification change to base code for definition of "Repair"

### Rationale

Confusion over whether the definition of "repair" includes replacement of damaged members has been unclear in existing definition language and this clarifies that distinction.

### Fiscal Impact Statement

#### Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code

Brings clarity to a definition.

#### Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

None

#### Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

None

#### Impact to small business relative to the cost of compliance with code

None

### Requirements

#### Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public

Clarifying that "replacement" of a damaged member is part of a "repair" and not an "alteration" and therefore helps to correlates with the Existing Buildings Code requirement for a "repair"

#### Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Improves the code by providing greater specificity to the definition of "repair."

#### Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

This definition clarification will not result in a discrimination of materials, products, methods, or systems of construction.

#### Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

This definition clarification will not result in any degradation of the code effectiveness.

## 2nd Comment Period

<b>Proponent</b>	George Wiggins	<b>Submitted</b>	5/23/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	No
------------------	----------------	------------------	-----------	--------------------	----

### Comment:

Confusion over whether the definition of "repair" includes replacement of damaged members has been unclear in existing definition language and this clarifies that distinction. Similar to CA7505

CA7508-G1

## 2nd Comment Period

<b>Proponent</b>	Harold Barrineau	<b>Submitted</b>	5/26/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	No
------------------	------------------	------------------	-----------	--------------------	----

CA7508-G2

**Comment:**

I agree with this modification.

**Section 202**

[A] **REPAIR** The reconstruction, replacement or renewal of any part of an existing building for the purposes of its maintenance or to correct damage.

<b>Date Submitted</b> 12/4/2018	<b>Section</b> 202	<b>Proponent</b> George Wiggins (BOAF)
<b>Chapter</b> 2	<b>Affects HVHZ</b> No	<b>Attachments</b> No
<b>TAC Recommendation</b> No Affirmative Recommendation		
<b>Commission Action</b> Pending Review		

**Comments**

<b>General Comments</b> Yes	<b>Alternate Language</b> No
-----------------------------	------------------------------

**Related Modifications**

Section 202

**Summary of Modification**

Removal of unneeded language to correlate with Building and Residential Codes

**Rationale**

This modification removes unneeded language to correlate with the Building and Residential Codes.

**Fiscal Impact Statement**

**Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

None

**Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code**

None

**Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code**

None

**Impact to small business relative to the cost of compliance with code**

None

**Requirements**

**Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

Provides clarity to definition of "approve"; and correlates to match language in Building and Residential Codes

**Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction**

Improves code with regard to correlation of definitions.

**Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities**

No material, product, method or system is impacted.

**Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code**

Improves effectiveness by correlating definition of "approved" in all codes.

**2nd Comment Period**

<b>Proponent</b> George Wiggins	<b>Submitted</b> 5/23/2019	<b>Attachments</b> No
---------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------

**Comment:**

This modification removes unneeded language to correlate with the Building and Residential Codes and accurately & clearly states the authority for determining code compliance as the building official instead of potential confusion in current text.

**2nd Comment Period**

<b>Proponent</b> Harold Barrineau	<b>Submitted</b> 5/26/2019	<b>Attachments</b> No
-----------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------

**Comment:**

I agree with this modification.



[A] **APPROVED.** Acceptable to the code official ~~or authority having jurisdiction.~~

<b>Date Submitted</b> 12/14/2018	<b>Section</b> 202	<b>Proponent</b> TJ Jerke
<b>Chapter</b> 2	<b>Affects HVHZ</b> No	<b>Attachments</b> No
<b>TAC Recommendation</b> No Affirmative Recommendation		
<b>Commission Action</b> Pending Review		

**Comments**

<b>General Comments</b> Yes	<b>Alternate Language</b> No
-----------------------------	------------------------------

**Related Modifications**

**Summary of Modification**

The modification helps clarify, and create, uniformity for referencing approved agencies. With no fiscal impact, the proposal is a beneficial code change that maintains consistency with 2018 IBC language.

**Rationale**

The modification helps clarify, and create uniformity, for referencing approved agencies, which are generally approved for testing, inspections or product certification. With no fiscal impact, the proposal is a beneficial code change that maintains consistency with 2018 IBC language.

**Fiscal Impact Statement**

- Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**  
The proposal will provide clarity for local entities to clarify that product certification agencies are considered approved agencies.
- Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code**  
The proposal does not impact building and property owners relative to cost of compliance.
- Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code**  
The proposal does not impact the industry relative to the cost of compliance.
- Impact to small business relative to the cost of compliance with code**  
The proposal does not impact small business relative to the cost of compliance.

**Requirements**

- Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**  
Improves the health, safety, and welfare of the general public by providing clarity and assurance that product certification agencies are approved agencies.
- Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction**  
The proposed modification will provide clarity, and uniformity, throughout the code regarding approved agencies. Additional clarity and a more streamlined definition strengthens the code as it provides additional important information when implementing the code.
- Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities**  
The proposal does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction.
- Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code**  
The proposal only bolsters the effectiveness of the code by assuring product certification agencies are properly approved and maintains consistent code language.

**2nd Comment Period**

<b>Proponent</b> Bryan Holland	<b>Submitted</b> 5/21/2019	<b>Attachments</b> No
--------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------

CA8188-G1

**Comment:**  
Please reconsider this modification for approval. The revised definition simply adds the terms "furnishing product certification" which correlates with at least a dozen sections of the code that require a product to be "labeled by an approved agency". The current definition in the FBC implies that approved agencies only conduct tests or furnish inspection services. The revised definition corrects this omission.

**Approved Agency.** An established and recognized agency that is regularly engaged in conducting tests, furnishing inspection services, or furnishing product certification where such agency has been approved by the building official.

<b>Date Submitted</b> 12/12/2018	<b>Section</b> 302.3	<b>Proponent</b> Ann Russo4
<b>Chapter</b> 3	<b>Affects HVHZ</b> No	<b>Attachments</b> No
<b>TAC Recommendation</b> No Affirmative Recommendation		
<b>Commission Action</b> Pending Review		

**Comments**

<b>General Comments</b> Yes	<b>Alternate Language</b> No
-----------------------------	------------------------------

**Related Modifications**

401.2.1 407.1.1 404.2.1  
A106.2

**Summary of Modification**

The FEBC defines the term "code official" but it then uses both "building official" and "code official." Both terms are used in other Florida Building Codes, but none of the codes uses both. "Code official" is more appropriate

**Rationale**

There is a concern that a reference to other than the "building official" could cause confusion. A building official is the most appropriate enforcement entity for an existing building code. The IEBC defines the term "code official" but it then uses both "building official" and "code official." Both terms are used in other International codes, but none of the codes uses both. "Code official" is more appropriate for the FEBC because the FEBC addresses more than Building Code issues. It includes mechanical sections—the FMC uses the term "code official." It includes plumbing sections—the FPC uses the term "code official."

**Fiscal Impact Statement**

- Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**  
No impact to local entity as this is already a code requirement
- Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code**  
No impact to building and property owners entity as this is already a code requirement
- Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code**  
No impact to industry as this is already a code requirement
- Impact to small business relative to the cost of compliance with code**  
No impact to small businesses as this is already a code requirement

**Requirements**

- Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**  
Improves the health, safety, and welfare of the general public by cleaning up wording that could cause confusion
- Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction**  
Improves the code by cleaning up wording that could cause confusion
- Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities**  
Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities, this is a current code requirement that does not limit materials, products, methods, or systems of construction
- Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code**  
Increase the effectiveness of the code by cleaning up wording that could cause confusion

**2nd Comment Period**

<b>Proponent</b> Borrone Jeanette	<b>Submitted</b> 5/21/2019	<b>Attachments</b> No
-----------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------

**Comment:**  
I agree with the proposed revision.

**2nd Comment Period**

<b>Proponent</b> Harold Barrineau	<b>Submitted</b> 5/26/2019	<b>Attachments</b> No
-----------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------

**Comment:**  
I agree with this modification.

Revise as follows:

**302.3 Existing materials. Materials already in use in a building in compliance with requirements or approvals in effect at the time of their erection or installation shall be permitted to remain in use unless determined by the building code official to be unsafe.**

**401.2.1 Existing materials.** Materials already in use in a building in compliance with requirements or approvals in effect at the time of their erection or installation shall be permitted to remain in use unless determined by the building code official to be unsafe per Section 115.

**[BS] 404.2.1 Evaluation.** The building shall be evaluated by a *registered design professional*, and the evaluation findings shall be submitted to the *building official code official*. The evaluation shall establish whether the damaged building, if repaired to its predamage state, would comply with the provisions of the *Florida Building Code* for wind and earthquake loads.

**407.1 Conformance.** No change shall be made in the use or occupancy of any building unless such building is made to comply with the requirements of the *Florida Building Code* for the use or occupancy. Changes in use or occupancy in a building or portion thereof shall be such that the existing building is no less complying with the provisions of this code than the existing building or structure was prior to the change. Subject to the approval of the building code official, the use or occupancy of *existing buildings* shall be permitted to be changed and the building is allowed to be occupied for purposes in other groups without conforming to all of the requirements of this code for those groups, provided the new or proposed use is less hazardous, based on life and fire risk, than the existing use.

**Exception:** The building need not be made to comply with the seismic requirements for a new structure unless required by Section 407.4.

**407.1.1 Change in the character of use.** A change in occupancy with no change of occupancy classification shall not be made to any structure that will subject the structure to any special provisions of the applicable *Florida Codes*, without approval of the *building official code official*. Compliance shall be only as necessary to meet the specific provisions and is not intended to require the entire building be brought into compliance.

<b>Date Submitted</b> 12/14/2018	<b>Section</b> 401.2	<b>Proponent</b> Ann Russo4
<b>Chapter</b> 4	<b>Affects HVHZ</b> No	<b>Attachments</b> No
<b>TAC Recommendation</b> No Affirmative Recommendation		
<b>Commission Action</b> Pending Review		

**Comments**

<b>General Comments</b> Yes	<b>Alternate Language</b> No
-----------------------------	------------------------------

**Related Modifications**

401.2.1 401.2.2 401.2.3  
 403.1  
 404.1  
 602.1 602.2

**Summary of Modification**

Removes provisions from Sections 401.2,401.2.2,401.2.3,602.1 & 602.2 that wer already moved to Chapter 3 last cycle

**Rationale**

The modification removes provisions that were already moved to Chapter 3 in the last cycle. When they were moved, however, the remaining duplicate provisions addressed by this proposal could not be deleted because of Group assignments. Sections 401.2.1, 401.2.2, 602.1, and 602.2 are now in Sections 302.3 and 302.4. Section 401.2.3 is now in Sections 301.1.4.1 and 301.1.4.2. If 401.2.1 - 401.2.3 are deleted as proposed, the balance of 401.2 can be deleted as well. Section 403.1 is revised accordingly to cite the existing sections that cover new and existing materials. In Section 404.1, the two references to Section 401.2 are removed and not replaced because they are actually erroneous references that should have been removed in a previous cycle. Their removal here is at most editorial, but could even be construed as errata. The reference to 401.2 used to match a provision in FBC Chapter 34 that referred to Section 3401.2 Maintenance, but that section no longer exists in the FEBC in any of its compliance methods. The first instance could be revised to refer instead to 302.4, but it is frankly not needed, as 302.4 applies even without a direct reference. The second instance is clearly a mistaken reference to the old maintenance provision, not a reference to the current provisions about new and existing materials.

**Fiscal Impact Statement**

- Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**  
No impact to local entity as this is already a code requirement
- Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code**  
No impact to building and property owners as this is already a code requirement
- Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code**  
No impact to building and property owners as this is already a code requirement
- Impact to small business relative to the cost of compliance with code**  
No impact to small businesses as this is already a code requirement

**Requirements**

- Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**  
Improves the health, safety, and welfare of the general public by cleaning up duplicate language
- Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction**  
Improves the code by cleaning up duplicate language
- Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities**  
Does not discriminate against material, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities, this is a current code requirement that does not limit material, products, methods, or systems of construction
- Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code**  
Increases the effectiveness of the code by cleaning up duplicate language

**2nd Comment Period**

<b>Proponent</b> Borrone Jeanette	<b>Submitted</b> 5/21/2019	<b>Attachments</b> No
-----------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------

**Comment:**

I agree with the proposed revision to clean up the code

CA8231-G1

## 2nd Comment Period

<b>Proponent</b>	Harold Barrineau	<b>Submitted</b>	5/26/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	No
------------------	------------------	------------------	-----------	--------------------	----

CA8231-G2

**Comment:**

I agree with this modification.



**Delete without substitution:**

~~**401.2 Building materials and systems.** Building materials and systems shall comply with the requirements of this section.~~

~~**401.2.1 Existing materials.** Materials already in use in a building in compliance with requirements or approvals in effect at the time of their erection or installation shall be permitted to remain in use unless determined by the building official to be unsafe per Section 115.~~

~~**401.2.2 New and replacement materials.** Except as otherwise required or permitted by this code, materials permitted by the applicable code for new construction shall be used. Like materials shall be permitted for repairs and alterations, provided no hazard to life, health or property is created. Hazardous materials shall not be used where the code for new construction would not permit their use in buildings of similar occupancy, purpose and location.~~

~~**401.2.3 Existing seismic force resisting systems.** Where the existing seismic force resisting system is a type that can be designated ordinary, values of  $R$ ,  $0$  and  $C_d$  for the existing seismic force resisting system shall be those specified by the International Building Code for an ordinary system unless it is demonstrated that the existing system will provide performance equivalent to that of a detailed, intermediate or special system.~~

**Revise as follows:**

**403.1 General.** Except as provided by ~~Section 401.2~~ Sections 302.3, 302.4, or this section, *alterations* to any building or structure shall comply with the requirements of the *Florida Building Code* for new construction. *Alterations* shall be such that the existing building or structure is no less conforming to the provisions of the *Florida Building Code* than the *existing building* or structure was prior to the *alteration*.

**Exceptions:**

1. An existing stairway shall not be required to comply with the requirements of Section 1011 of the *Florida Building Code* where the existing space and construction does not allow a reduction in pitch or slope.
2. Handrails otherwise required to comply with Section 1011.11 of the *Florida Building Code* shall not be required to comply with the requirements of Section 1014.6 of the *Florida Building Code* regarding full extension of the handrails where such extensions would be hazardous due to plan configuration.

**404.1 General.** Buildings and structures, and parts thereof, shall be repaired in compliance with ~~Sections 401.2 and 404~~ this section. Work on nondamaged components that is necessary for the required *repair* of damaged components shall be considered part of the *repair* and shall not be subject to the requirements for alterations in this chapter. ~~Routine maintenance required by Section 401.2~~ Maintenance, ordinary repairs exempt from permit in accordance with Section 105.2, and abatement of wear due to normal service conditions shall not be subject to the requirements for repairs in this section.

**Delete without substitution:**

~~**602.1 Existing building materials.** Materials already in use in a building in compliance with requirements or approvals in effect at the time of their erection or installation shall be permitted to remain in use unless determined by the code official to render the building or structure *unsafe* or dangerous as defined in Chapter 2. **602.2 New and replacement materials.** Except as otherwise required or permitted by this code, materials permitted by the applicable code for new construction shall be used. Like materials shall be permitted for *repairs and alterations*, provided no *dangerous* or *unsafe condition*, as defined in Chapter 2, is created. Hazardous materials, such as~~

~~asbestos and lead based paint, shall not be used where the code for new construction would not permit their use in buildings of similar occupancy, purpose and location.~~

<b>Date Submitted</b> 12/14/2018	<b>Section</b> 401.2.1	<b>Proponent</b> Ann Russo4
<b>Chapter</b> 4	<b>Affects HVHZ</b> No	<b>Attachments</b> No
<b>TAC Recommendation</b> No Affirmative Recommendation		
<b>Commission Action</b> Pending Review		

**Comments**

<b>General Comments</b> Yes	<b>Alternate Language</b> No
-----------------------------	------------------------------

**Related Modifications**

401.2.2  
302.1 602.2

**Summary of Modification**

Deletes the "Existing [Building] Materials" and "New and Replacement Materials" sections from Chapters 4 and 6 because they are already inserted in chapter 3.

**Rationale**

This Modification deletes the "Existing [Building] Materials" and "New and Replacement Materials" sections from Chapters 4 and 6 because they are already inserted in chapter 3. The content in Chapter 3 applies to all methods in the FEBC so deleting these sections in the other method chapters reduces redundancy.

**Fiscal Impact Statement**

- Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**  
No impact to local entity as this is already a code requirement
- Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code**  
No impact to building and property owners as this is already a code requirement
- Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code**  
No impact to industry as this is already a code requirement
- Impact to small business relative to the cost of compliance with code**  
No impact to small businesses as this is already a code requirement

**Requirements**

- Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**  
Improves the health, safety, and welfare of the general public by removing wording that already is in Chapter 3
- Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction**  
Improves the code by removing wording that already is in Chapter 3
- Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities**  
Improves the health, safety, and welfare of the general public by removing wording that already is in Chapter 3
- Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code**  
Improves the effectiveness of the code by removing wording that already is in Chapter 3

**2nd Comment Period**

<b>Proponent</b> Borrone Jeanette	<b>Submitted</b> 5/21/2019	<b>Attachments</b> No
-----------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------

**Comment:**  
I agree with the proposed revision.

**2nd Comment Period**

<b>Proponent</b> Harold Barrineau	<b>Submitted</b> 5/26/2019	<b>Attachments</b> No
-----------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------

**Comment:**  
I agree with this modification.

## 2015 International Existing Building Code

**Delete without substitution:**

~~**401.2.1 Existing materials.** Materials already in use in a building in compliance with requirements or approvals in effect at the time of their erection or installation shall be permitted to remain in use unless determined by the building official to be unsafe per Section 115.~~

~~**401.2.2 New and replacement materials.** Except as otherwise required or permitted by this code, materials permitted by the applicable code for new construction shall be used. Like materials shall be permitted for *repairs* and *alterations*, provided no hazard to life, health or property is created. Hazardous materials shall not be used where the code for new construction would not permit their use in buildings of similar occupancy, purpose and location.~~

<b>Date Submitted</b> 12/15/2018	<b>Section</b> 601.2	<b>Proponent</b> Ann Russo8
<b>Chapter</b> 6	<b>Affects HVHZ</b> No	<b>Attachments</b> No
<b>TAC Recommendation</b> No Affirmative Recommendation		
<b>Commission Action</b> Pending Review		

**Comments**

<b>General Comments</b> Yes	<b>Alternate Language</b> No
-----------------------------	------------------------------

**Related Modifications**

EB52-15  
608.1

**Summary of Modification**

The current text talks about the condition "before the repair was undertaken." This means the damaged condition. What these provisions intend is to restore the condition that existed before the damage, not before the repair.

**Rationale**

The current text talks about the condition "before the repair was undertaken." This means the damaged condition. What these provisions intend is to restore the condition that existed before the damage, not before the repair.

**Fiscal Impact Statement**

**Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

Corrects code language to enhance the interpretation and enforcement of the code.

**Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code**

Corrects code language to enhance the interpretation and enforcement of the code. There is no impact on the cost of construction.

**Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code**

Corrects code language to enhance the interpretation and enforcement of the code. There is no impact on the cost of construction.

**Impact to small business relative to the cost of compliance with code**

Corrects code language to enhance the interpretation and enforcement of the code. There is no impact on the cost of construction.

**Requirements**

**Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

Corrects code language to enhance the interpretation and enforcement of the code.

**Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction**

Corrects code language to enhance the interpretation and enforcement of the code.

**Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities**

Corrects code language to enhance the interpretation and enforcement of the code. Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities.

**Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code**

Corrects code language to enhance the interpretation and enforcement of the code. Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code.

**2nd Comment Period**

<b>Proponent</b> Borrone Jeanette	<b>Submitted</b> 5/21/2019	<b>Attachments</b> No
-----------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------

CA8388-G1

**Comment:**

I agree with the proposed revision.

**2nd Comment Period**

<b>Proponent</b> Jennifer Privateer	<b>Submitted</b> 5/23/2019	<b>Attachments</b> No
-------------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------

CA8388-G2

**Comment:**

I agree with this change

## 2nd Comment Period

<b>Proponent</b>	Harold Barrineau	<b>Submitted</b>	5/25/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	No
------------------	------------------	------------------	-----------	--------------------	----

CA8388-G3

**Comment:**

I agree with this modification

Section: 601.2, 608.1

Revise as follows:

**601.2 Conformance.** The work shall not make the building less conforming than it was before the ~~repair was undertaken~~ damage occurred.

**608.1 General.** Existing mechanical systems undergoing *repair* shall not make the building less conforming than it was before the ~~repair was undertaken~~ damage occurred

<b>Date Submitted</b> 11/26/2018	<b>Section</b> 1401.2.4	<b>Proponent</b> Richard Schauland
<b>Chapter</b> 14	<b>Affects HVHZ</b> No	<b>Attachments</b> Yes
<b>TAC Recommendation</b> No Affirmative Recommendation		
<b>Commission Action</b> Pending Review		

**Comments**

<b>General Comments</b> Yes	<b>Alternate Language</b> No
-----------------------------	------------------------------

**Related Modifications**

**Summary of Modification**

Please refer to the attached file. The documentation for this proposal exceeds the 300 character limit.

**Rationale**

Rationale:  
 As currently written it says "this code" when in fact it was focused upon the Florida Building Code, Building. Reference is not needed back to the Florida Building Code, Building in this case. This is considered a clarification of the application of the Florida Building Code, Existing Building as it applies to alterations and repairs and will not change anything that is now required by the Florida Codes. The last sentence was removed and replaced with the exception. The concept of the exception was borrowed from Section 701.2 which allows the reductions if compliance with the Florida Building Code, Building is achieved.

**Fiscal Impact Statement**

- Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**  
 There will be no impact to local entities relative to the enforcement of the code. This revision is only a clarification of the current provision.
- Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code**  
 This will not increase the cost of construction. This revision is only a clarification of the current provision.
- Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code**  
 This will not increase the cost of compliance. This revision is only a clarification of the current provision.
- Impact to small business relative to the cost of compliance with code**  
 This will not increase the cost of compliance. This revision is only a clarification of the current provision.

**Requirements**

- Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**  
 This section is about the safety and sanitation of an existing building. The proposed revision provides clarity in clear and understandable language.
- Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction**  
 This proposal does not strengthen the Code, it provides clarity of an existing rule that will assist in a better understanding for enforcement.
- Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities**  
 The proposal makes no mention of specific materials, products, methods, or systems of construction.
- Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code**  
 This proposal helps the effectiveness of the code by providing clarity of the requirements.

**2nd Comment Period**

<b>Proponent</b> Harold Barrineau	<b>Submitted</b> 5/26/2019	<b>Attachments</b> No
-----------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------

**Comment:**  
 I agree with this modification.

CA7446-G1



**1401.2.4 Alterations and repairs.** An *existing building* or portion thereof that does not comply with the requirements of this code for new construction shall not be altered or repaired in such a manner that results in the building being less safe or sanitary than such building is currently. If, in the *alteration or repair*, the current level of safety or sanitation is to be reduced, the portion altered or repaired shall conform to the requirements of Chapters 2 through 12 and Chapters 14 through 33 of the *Florida Building Code, Building*.

**Exception:** Where the current level of safety or sanitation is proposed to be reduced, the portion altered shall conform to the requirements of the *Florida Building Code, Building*.

**Code Change No: EB74-15**

**Original Proposal**

**Section(s):** 1401.2.4

**Proponent:** Edward Kulik, Chair, representing Building Code Action Committee (bcac@iccsafe.org)

**1401.2.4 Alterations and repairs.** An existing building or portion thereof ~~that does not comply with the requirements of this code for new construction~~ shall not be altered or repaired in such a manner that results in the building being less safe or sanitary than such building is currently. ~~If, in the alteration or repair, the current level of safety or sanitation is to be reduced, the portion altered or repaired shall conform to the requirements of Chapters 2 through 12 and Chapters 14 through 33 of the International Building Code.~~

**Reason:** This section does not work within the IEBC as it did in the IBC. Generally we do not want an alteration or repair reducing the level of safety or sanitation. As currently written it says "this code" when in fact it was focused upon the IBC. Reference is not needed back to the IBC in this case. The last sentence is again sending the user of the code back to the IBC when we told them already that they could not reduce their level of safety or sanitation. As modified it will simply provide a baseline that the user of this chapter must meet. These revisions are needed to correlate with the 2015 IBC that deleted Chapter 34 on existing buildings. This is considered a clarification of the application of the IEBC as it applies to alterations and repairs and will not change anything that is now required by the I-Codes. This public proposal is submitted by the ICC Building Code Action Committee (BCAC). The BCAC was established by the ICC Board of Directors to pursue opportunities to improve and enhance an assigned International Code or portion thereof. This includes both the technical aspects of the codes as well as the code content in terms of scope and application of referenced standards. Since its inception in July, 2011, the BCAC has held 13 open meetings and numerous workgroup calls which included members of the BCAC as well as any interested party to discuss and debate the proposed changes and the public comments. Related documentation and reports are posted on the BCAC website at: <http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/BCAC/Pages/default.aspx>.

**Cost Impact:** Will not increase the cost of construction  
This proposal will not increase the cost of construction as this revision is only a clarification of the current provisions.

**Report of Committee Action Hearings**

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The main concern with this proposal was the deletion of the last sentence. In some cases existing buildings may have more conservative construction features than new buildings. Eliminating this sentence would eliminate the ability to simply comply with the IBC.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

**Public Comments**

*Public Comment 1:*

**Edward Kulik, representing ICC Building Code Action Committee (bcac@iccsafe.org) requests Approve as Modified by this Public Comment.**

**1401.2.4 Alterations and repairs.** An *existing building* or portion thereof shall not be altered or repaired in such a manner that results in the building being less safe or sanitary than such building is currently.

**Exception:** Where the current level of safety or sanitation is proposed to be reduced, the portion altered shall conform to the requirements of the International Building Code.

**Commenter's Reason:** The initial proposal was meant only as a clarification. Concerns were raised that by losing the last sentence the ability to allow a reduction that would meet the current building code would be lost. Therefore, the concept was borrowed from Section 701.2 which allows reductions if compliance with the IBC is achieved.

**701.2 Conformance.** An existing building or portion thereof shall not be altered such that the building becomes less safe than its existing condition

**Exception:** Where the current level of safety or sanitation is proposed to be reduced, the portion altered shall conform to the requirements of the International Building Code.

**Final Action Results**

**EB74-15**

**AMPC1**

<b>Date Submitted</b> 11/26/2018	<b>Section</b> 1401.2.5	<b>Proponent</b> Richard Schauland
<b>Chapter</b> 14	<b>Affects HVHZ</b> No	<b>Attachments</b> Yes
<b>TAC Recommendation</b> No Affirmative Recommendation		
<b>Commission Action</b> Pending Review		

**Comments**

<b>General Comments</b> Yes	<b>Alternate Language</b> No
-----------------------------	------------------------------

**Related Modifications**

**Summary of Modification**

Please refer to the attached file. The documentation for this proposal exceeds the 300 character limit.

**Rationale**

The current reference does not pick up the accessibility provisions for Level 2 and 3, additions or allowances for historic buildings when using the performance compliance method. The performance compliance method should be required to have the same level of access as any other alteration. Technical infeasibility and the 20% maximum rule for the accessible route costs would still be applicable.

**Fiscal Impact Statement**

**Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

There will be no impact to local entities relative to the enforcement of the code. This revision is only a clarification of the current provision.

**Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code**

This will not increase the cost of construction. This revision is only a clarification of the current provision.

**Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code**

This will not increase the cost of compliance. This revision is only a clarification of the current provision.

**Impact to small business relative to the cost of compliance with code**

This will not increase the cost of compliance. This revision is only a clarification of the current provision.

**Requirements**

**Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

The purpose of this section is to provide accessibility requirements for existing buildings that are undergoing work. The proposed revision provides clarity to all types of work and historic structures.

**Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction**

This proposal does not strengthen the Code, it provides clarity of an existing rule that will assist in a better understanding for enforcement.

**Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities**

The proposal makes no mention of specific materials, products, methods, or systems of construction.

**Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code**

This proposal helps the effectiveness of the code by providing clarity of the requirements.

**2nd Comment Period**

<b>Proponent</b> Harold Barrineau	<b>Submitted</b> 5/26/2019	<b>Attachments</b> No
-----------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------

CA7451-G2

**Comment:**  
I agree with this modification.

**1st Comment Period History**

<b>Proponent</b> Richard Schauland	<b>Submitted</b> 1/2/2019	<b>Attachments</b> No
------------------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------

CA7451-G1

**Comment:**  
Mod. F7450 is related to this Mod.

**1401.2.5 Accessibility requirements.** Accessibility shall be provided in accordance with Section 410, ~~er~~ 705, 806, 906, 1105, and 1201.4 as applicable.

**Code Change No: EB77-15**

**Original Proposal**

**Section: 1401.2.5**

**Proponent:** Edward Kulik, Chair, representing Building Code Action Committee (bcac@iccsafe.org)

**Revise as follows:**

**1401.2.5 Accessibility requirements.** Accessibility shall be provided in accordance with Section 410.07, 705, 806, 906, 1105, 1204 and 1205.15 as applicable.

**Reason:** The current reference does not pick up the accessibility provisions for Level 2 and 3, additions or allowances for historic buildings when using the performance compliance method. The performance compliance method should be required to have the same level of access as any other alteration. Technical infeasibility and the 20% maximum rule for the accessible route costs would still be applicable.

In July/2014 the ICC Board decided to sunset the activities of the Code Technology Committee (CTC). This is being accomplished by re-assigning many of the CTC Areas of Study to the applicable Code Action Committee (CAC). This proposal falls under the CTC Area of Study entitled IBC Coordination with the New ADAAG. Information on the CTC, including: the sunset plan; meeting agendas; minutes; reports; resource documents; presentations; and all other materials developed in conjunction with the CTC effort can be downloaded from the CTC website.

This public proposal is submitted by the ICC Building Code Action Committee (BCAC). The BCAC was established by the ICC Board of Directors to pursue opportunities to improve and enhance an assigned International Code or portion thereof. This includes both the technical aspects of the codes as well as the code content in terms of scope and application of referenced standards. Since its inception in July, 2011, the BCAC has held 13 open meetings and numerous workgroup calls which included members of the BCAC as well as any interested party to discuss and debate the proposed changes and the public comments. Related documentation and reports are posted on the BCAC website at: <http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/BCAC/Pages/default.aspx>.

**Cost Impact:** Will not increase the cost of construction  
The proposal is a clarification of current requirements; therefore, there is no impact on the cost.

**Staff note:** An errata was corrected to this section. The reference to Section 605 was revised to Section 705. It is shown as current code text.

**Report of Committee Action Hearings**

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** This proposal was approved as it more comprehensively references all of the relevant accessibility requirements found in the IEBC. There was concern raised in the correlation with this proposal and EB33-15 going forward. EB33-15 moved all the accessibility requirements to Chapter 3.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

**Final Action Results**

EB77-15 AS

<b>Date Submitted</b> 12/15/2018	<b>Section</b> 1401.2.5	<b>Proponent</b> Kimberly Gilliam
<b>Chapter</b> 14	<b>Affects HVHZ</b> No	<b>Attachments</b> Yes
<b>TAC Recommendation</b> No Affirmative Recommendation		
<b>Commission Action</b> Pending Review		

**Comments**

<b>General Comments</b> Yes	<b>Alternate Language</b> No
-----------------------------	------------------------------

**Related Modifications**

**Summary of Modification**

The proposed modification more comprehensively references all of the relevant accessibility requirements found in the FBC, Existing Building.

**Rationale**

The current reference does not pick up the accessibility provisions for Level 2 and 3, additions or allowances for historic buildings when using the performance compliance method. The performance compliance method should be required to have the same level of access as any other alteration. Technical infeasibility and the 20% maximum rule for the accessible route costs would still be applicable.

**Fiscal Impact Statement**

- Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**  
None. The proposal is a clarification of current requirements.
- Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code**  
None. The proposal is a clarification of current requirements.
- Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code**  
None. The proposal is a clarification of current requirements.
- Impact to small business relative to the cost of compliance with code**  
None. The proposal is a clarification of current requirements.

**Requirements**

- Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**  
No, the proposal is a clarification of current requirements.
- Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction**  
Yes, the clarification provides better coordination within the Code.
- Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities**  
No, it does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities.
- Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code**  
No, it improves coordination within the Code.

**2nd Comment Period**

<b>Proponent</b> Harold Barrineau	<b>Submitted</b> 5/26/2019	<b>Attachments</b> No
-----------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------

**Comment:**  
I agree with this modification.

CA8375-G1

**1401.2.5 Accessibility requirements.**

Accessibility shall be provided in accordance with Section 410, or 705, 806, 906, 1105, 1204 and 1205.15 as applicable.



Code Change No: **EB77-15**

**Original Proposal**

**Section:** 1401.2.5

**Proponent:** Edward Kulik, Chair, representing Building Code Action Committee (bcac@iccsafe.org)

**Revise as follows:**

**1401.2.5 Accessibility requirements.** Accessibility shall be provided in accordance with Section 410, ~~or~~ 705, 806, 906, 1105, 1204 and 1205.15 as applicable.

**Reason:** The current reference does not pick up the accessibility provisions for Level 2 and 3, additions or allowances for historic buildings when using the performance compliance method. The performance compliance method should be required to have the same level of access as any other alteration. Technical infeasibility and the 20% maximum rule for the accessible route costs would still be applicable.

In July/2014 the ICC Board decided to sunset the activities of the Code Technology Committee (CTC). This is being accomplished by re-assigning many of the CTC Areas of Study to the applicable Code Action Committee (CAC). This proposal falls under the CTC Area of Study entitled IBC Coordination with the New ADAAG. Information on the CTC, including: the sunset plan; meeting agendas; minutes; reports; resource documents; presentations; and all other materials developed in conjunction with the CTC effort can be downloaded from the CTC website.

This public proposal is submitted by the ICC Building Code Action Committee (BCAC). The BCAC was established by the ICC Board of Directors to pursue opportunities to improve and enhance an assigned International Code or portion thereof. This includes both the technical aspects of the codes as well as the code content in terms of scope and application of referenced standards. Since its inception in July, 2011, the BCAC has held 13 open meetings and numerous workgroup calls which included members of the BCAC as well as any interested party to discuss and debate the proposed changes and the public comments. Related documentation and reports are posted on the BCAC website at: <http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/BCAC/Pages/default.aspx>.

**Cost Impact:** Will not increase the cost of construction  
The proposal is a clarification of current requirements; therefore, there is no impact on the cost.

**Staff note:** An errata was corrected to this section. The reference to Section 605 was revised to Section 705. It is shown as current code text.

**Report of Committee Action Hearings**

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** This proposal was approved as it more comprehensively references all of the relevant accessibility requirements found in the IEBC. There was concern raised in the correlation with this proposal and EB33-15 going forward. EB33-15 moved all the accessibility requirements to Chapter 3.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

**Final Action Results**

**EB77-15**

**AS**

**CA7551**

19

<b>Date Submitted</b>	11/29/2018	<b>Section</b>	202	<b>Proponent</b>	George Wiggins (BOAF)
<b>Chapter</b>	2	<b>Affects HVHZ</b>	No	<b>Attachments</b>	No
<b>TAC Recommendation</b>	No Affirmative Recommendation				
<b>Commission Action</b>	Pending Review				

**Comments**

<b>General Comments</b>	Yes	<b>Alternate Language</b>	No
-------------------------	-----	---------------------------	----

**Related Modifications**

Building Code and Existing Buildings Code

**Summary of Modification**

Editorial Change to match Building Code & Existing Buildings Code

**Rationale**

Correlation with Building Code & Existing Buildings Code

**Fiscal Impact Statement**

**Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

None

**Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code**

None

**Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code**

None

None

**Impact to small business relative to the cost of compliance with code**

None

**Requirements**

**Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

Clarifies scope of repair

**Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction**

Improves code thru correlation with Building Code & Existing Buildings Code

**Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities**

Does not discriminate in these areas

**Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code**

Does not lessen or degrade effectiveness of the code

**2nd Comment Period**

<b>Proponent</b>	George Wiggins	<b>Submitted</b>	5/23/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	No
------------------	----------------	------------------	-----------	--------------------	----

**Comment:**

Correlation definition of "repair" with Building Code & Florida Building Code, Energy Conservation for consistency by adding the word "replacement" for clarity.

**CA7551-G1**

## 2nd Comment Period

<b>Proponent</b>	Harold Barrineau	<b>Submitted</b>	5/26/2019	<b>Attachments</b>	No
------------------	------------------	------------------	-----------	--------------------	----

CA7551-G2

**Comment:**

I agree with this modification.

**[RB] REPAIR.** The reconstruction, replacement or renewal of any part of an existing building for the purpose of its maintenance or to correct damage.

See also Section R202 of the Florida Building Code, Energy Conservation.

<b>Date Submitted</b> 12/4/2018	<b>Section</b> 202	<b>Proponent</b> George Wiggins (BOAF)
<b>Chapter</b> 2	<b>Affects HVHZ</b> No	<b>Attachments</b> No
<b>TAC Recommendation</b> No Affirmative Recommendation		
<b>Commission Action</b> Pending Review		

**Comments**

<b>General Comments</b> Yes	<b>Alternate Language</b> No
-----------------------------	------------------------------

**Related Modifications**

Already changed in the Building Code.

**Summary of Modification**

Changes definition of Permit to correlate with the current definition in the Building Code

**Rationale**

Changes definition of Permit to correlate with the current definition in the Building Code to be consistent.

**Fiscal Impact Statement**

**Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

None

**Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code**

None

**Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code**

None

**Impact to small business relative to the cost of compliance with code**

None

**Requirements**

**Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

Clarifies definition of "Permit" to correlate to Building Code

**Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction**

Editorial & correlation issue

**Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities**

Editorial & correlation issue

**Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code**

Improves clarity of definition of "Permit"

**2nd Comment Period**

<b>Proponent</b> George Wiggins	<b>Submitted</b> 5/23/2019	<b>Attachments</b> No
---------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------

**Comment:**

This change merely correlates with definition of Permit to correlate with the current definition found in the Florida Building Code in order to be consistent among. See text below:

Florida Building Code, Building 6th Edition

[A] PERMIT. An official document or certificate issued by the building official that authorizes performance of a specified activity.

**2nd Comment Period**

<b>Proponent</b> Harold Barrineau	<b>Submitted</b> 5/26/2019	<b>Attachments</b> No
-----------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------

**Comment:**

I agree with this modification.

[RB] PERMIT. An official document or certificate issued by the ~~authority having jurisdiction~~ building official that authorizes performance of a specified activity.